PrEseRvIng and sustainably governing Cultural heritage and Landscapes in European coastal and maritime regionS

Report of the 1ˢᵗ international stakeholder knowledge exchange workshop

Den Helder, Netherlands, 25 April 2019

Table of Contents

1. Rationale and objectives

PERICLES's first stakeholder knowledge exchange workshop was held on the 25th April 2019 in Texel, Den Helder, The Netherlands. The rationale for the workshop was to share experiences of management of Coastal and Maritime Cultural Heritage (CMCH) in the case regions.

The main objective was to understand how cultural heritage management works in each case region: what works, what doesn't work and why, to identify good approaches and existing challenges.

In total, 10 invited guest stakeholders participated in the workshop along with project partners and two members of the PERICLES Science-Impact Advisory Committee.

2. Summary of activities

The workshop started with presentations from six participants who shared their stories of cultural heritage management, issues of concern and good practice in their respective regions. The diversity of the presentations made it possible to first have a national (Scotland) approach to the CMCH's management methods and then to gradually focus on a regional (Portugal) and then local context (Locmariaquer- Brittany and Khinu-Estonia Island).

The rest of the workshop focused on good practices and challenges of four main themes within cultural heritage management: i) managing intangible cultural heritage, ii) managing tangible cultural heritage, iii) risk awareness and adaptation and iv) community participation. This was done through two main activities. The first consisted of an exercise where participants, divided into 4 groups of 4 to 5 people, noted thoughts on each aspect of the main themes i.e. what works well and the challenges for each and then selected the ones they considered most important. All the notes made during this exercise are reproduced as fully and as faithfully as possible in Annex A for reference.

The second activity was a more in-depth discussion of each of the themes during which participants could themselves select which theme they wished to discuss further. These discussions are summarised in the following section.

3. Summary of discussions

It was interesting to note that most of the participants chose to discuss the theme of intangible cultural heritage further, several also chose to discuss tangible heritage, one chose risk awareness and adaptation, and nobody chose to explore community participation although this topic often came up in discussing the other issues. For PERICLES partners this was an interesting observation that indicates that intangible cultural heritage and/or its management is something that participants felt they wanted to learn from each other about.

i) Managing intangible cultural heritage (ICH)

It was pointed out that it is important to manage for, or to be aware of, the importance of ICH not only for marine planning or heritage preservation purposes but also because it is important for people. By this was meant that it is important for people's identity, for a sense of who you are, which was considered particularly relevant in a globalised world; it is important for future generations, for their identity and for pride in their identity. ICH is a living and constantly changing thing with an important social role, is not 'folklore' or something of the past.

In seeking to manage for it we must recognise this and allow for ICH to change naturally rather than trying to preserve a static version. The nature of ICH raises a number of challenges in that as it is constantly changing and should be allowed to do so, it is difficult for heritage professionals to work with as it adds a new dimension to heritage within their remit and it adds a new type of heritage to their remit which requires new and as yet unfamiliar ways of working. At the same time, it is also at high risk of loss as it is inextricably linked to people. It is therefore important to identify things that are, or are at risk of, fading away – this is where the local community can play a significant role. However, for this to be successful, there must also be the political will to support local communities and heritage professionals and the relationship must be built on trust and on dialogue.

Linked to this is the question of who is responsible for protecting intangible cultural heritage? (ownership is clearer to identify for tangible heritage). Some participants considered it the responsibility of political actors to identify that heritage is at risk and to take, or at least to enable, action and not to wait for communities to force their representatives to act, as often local communities will not have the necessary resources to take the initiative. The story of the Ilhavo Maritime Museum was given as an example where local pride and interest in heritage increased following the refurbishment of the museum (i.e. local interest in heritage and identity was reinvigorated following a political initiative, the museum refurbishment was not driven by community demand). Artistic interventions which aim to collect or show the memory of a place (or even a monument) through communication

can also be a good way to approach the issue and can offer a way to combine political initiative and local knowledge.

ii). Managing tangible cultural heritage

There is a lot of existing expertise in managing tangible cultural heritage however not all existing heritage can be preserved. The main challenges identified in the management of tangible heritage are the linked issues of limited resources and the need to prioritize to inform allocation of available resources taking into account questions of how to do so and who should do so. Stakeholder participation was considered important, but difficulties identified within this were those of institutional fragmentation, a multiplicity of organisations and difficulties of engaging local populations. Further, stakeholder participation does not necessarily lead to consensus.

Repurposing or reuse of buildings was considered a potentially effective approach that could give a new lease of life to heritage otherwise at risk. However, again there are potential problems associated with this such as: ensuring that the new use is appropriate for the location and for local people (i.e. is not exclusive) and ensuring that the new use is accepted. Examples of the difficulties that can arise in attempts to repurpose heritage sites were evident in the example of the Venice Biennale presented by Luca Zan.

Protective legislation and designation are crucial tools in the management of tangible heritage. However, it was pointed out that critical awareness of assumptions about what constitutes heritage and broadening them would be beneficial as would linking cultural heritage to natural heritage in management efforts.

iii). Risk awareness and adaptation

This theme was discussed by a participant alongside a project partner. The main risks for CH identified were the effects of climate change (storms, floods, erosion) and high anthropogenic pressures (tourism, aquatic activities, deliberate or accidental degradation). Many ideas to raise awareness and inform people about the risks threatening coastal maritime heritage were mentioned. The main idea retained was the importance of developing educational tools and disseminating information on the vulnerability of the tangible and intangible heritage, for children and adults alike (e.g. discussion workshops, voluntary participation to inventory the CH, organization of exhibitions/conferences, creation of educational kits for schools, games and videos for museums, tourist offices).

Fostering interdisciplinary exchanges between academics, museum administrators, citizens and elected officials was also seen as a way to guide management adapted to this threatened heritage. The challenges identified are to get the authorities to accept this notion of risk and to cooperate systematically in order to find appropriate solutions. The need to establish a legal framework for the protection of intangible heritage and to ensure that existing

regulations for the protection of cultural, natural and landscape heritage are accepted and applied at the individual level also emerged as a priority.

The issue of adaptation was considered difficult. With regard to climate change, it was considered difficult to find solutions to a threat that is sometimes not very concrete or that can manifest in various ways. The difficulty of finding answers to this question of adaptation to climate change, and the interest in adapting to it if it is inevitable, may explain the presence of only one person to discuss this theme. However, with regard to risk adaptation, the following positive initiatives were mentioned: the planning of risk anticipation scenarios (e. g. vulnerability map, modelling, case study) and the implementation of educational kits or "what to do in case of risk" notices. The need to build a consensus on climate change was identified as a key issue for the future.

iv) Community participation

No participants chose to discuss this theme further beyond the brain-storming carousel exercise although the issue did come up in discussion of the other three themes and is covered in the respective sections. During the first brain-storming exercise it was noted that many of the points raised coalesced around the issue of intangible heritage and that it was a new area of concern for many participants. Throughout the day the importance of engaging with people with local knowledge and indeed with the wider community was often mentioned. All participants were also very aware that there are challenges associated with this such as generating interest in heritage and in participation, sharing knowledge across different perspectives and backgrounds, having sufficient resources to enable proper participation and how to identify who 'should' participate i.e. what constitutes a local community (e.g. local community vs community of use/ interest).

v) Other important points

During the discussions throughout the day, other points were raised that are not restricted to any of the four main themes.

Tourism: Tourism was one recurring topic as the relationship between heritage and tourism can be a complex one. Tourism has important economic dimensions: intangible heritage has the potential to 'bring places to life' although, this can be hard for tourists to access or recognise unless they spend some time in one place. Tourism itself can pose a threat to heritage (visitor numbers) and can lead to a lack of authenticity if heritage is solely promoted for tourism purposes. Efforts to manage ICH should not be driven by tourism but because it plays an important social role. However, it was also argued that tourism is generally appreciated by local communities and that authenticity is itself not static. Emphasis should be on looking at policies or measures that allow for a continuation of an authentic way of life (e.g. for seaweed harvesters, fishers, boat builders etc) rather than address the issue through a tourism lens.

Ownership and responsibility: These questions were particularly pertinent with respect to intangible cultural heritage as ownership of tangible heritage is usually clearer. But who is responsible for recognising intangible heritage at risk, taking appropriate measures and doing so without imposing measures that will unintentionally result in undesired and unforeseen changes? Some participants felt that responsibility should lie where the most resources were i.e. with political actors although consultation with heritage professionals and local communities built on mutual trust and dialogue was considered essential.

Scale: It was regularly suggested that appropriate management should be addressed at the local community level or by local communities and the importance of 'democratising heritage' by empowering local communities in decision making is now high on the heritage management agenda. However, this then raises issues of resources (financial and knowledge), drive and of scale. Is scale an issue for heritage managers? How do we align different operational scales? For example, if heritage protection is a national concern and planning is being done at a regional scale but heritage itself differs or operates at smaller scales (e.g. across villages) or even thematically (e.g. boat building).

Annex A: Notes made by participants on each of the topics discussed

Managing Intangible Cultural Heritage			
What works well	**No. of scores given**	**Challenges**	**No. of scores given**
Using music	2	Identifying what it is	4
Recording oral history	2	Issues of scale: planning at a regional/national level but cultural differences can be between villages	3
Sound recording of actions (like the cod fishermen back-slapping to warm hands)	1	Risk of loss of stories as generations pass	3
National audio archives (eg. of songs in Estonia) and national inventories	1	Questions of authenticity (who assigns authenticity?)	2
Cooperation avec un artiste comme mediation pour faire emerger les savoirs traditionels	1	By putting it in a box you might change it or not allow it to change; our heritage is only verbally handed down where it is 'relevant' for the next generation and if it evolves; to accept that intangible heritage is evolutive	2
Capture video/audio technology	1	Connecting the local community with their heritage	1
To fund scientific PhD	1	Easier to lose as linked to people	1
Socio-linguistic work on Breton language about the names of fish, places or spaces. It needs the involvement of stakeholders to find the Breton names .	1	Manipulation of stories ('Hollywoodisation')	1

Importance of new models/cooperation	1	Objectivity and/or the impossibility of this	1
Increased visibility through fiction	1	Skills of knowledge transmission when CH is used in eco-cuisine	1
To work with old persons about the past	1	Place names in Breton are disappearing along with the language	1
Aging in production and consumption		Translating languages (not all agree)	
UNESCO intangible heritage list (e.g. Kihnu designation)		Legislating for it	
National level projects		Funding is harder to get	
By knowing that it exists you might prevent unintended consequences of policy		What about films, video games heritage? How to distinguish between tangible and intangible (e.g. the game itself or the act of playing it?)	
Clear roles among different parties		What is 'appropriate' cultural heritage e.g. what if it is racist/sexist etc?	
Getting things going (projects); critical mass, recording (songs, dance), oral history		Misuse - i.e. calling something heritage? Like bonfires e.g. Schwerin bonfire	
More awareness of regional or minority languages		Difficulty of assigning importance	
School language education		Needs to be linked to education, schools and new generations	
Pericles portal (eventually…)		Less interest from younger generations	
Existence of musical archives		Does not receive much attention	
Small movie clips/social media		Need interested and committed volunteers	
Business of history		Préserver le savoir-faire des métiers traditionnels. Preserve the know-how of traditional trades.	

Transmission des pratiques et des savoir faire - atelier cuisine		Rituels ; pêche de nuit; matériel utilisé. Rituals; night fishing; equipment used	
Visits of shore: I show my job to young and others - transmission of knowledge		Musée du goémoniers et des algues; problème des écomusées sans transmission de savoir. Seaweed eco museum to maintain some activities. But the know how is not there. We keep the material without knowing how it functions.	
Reception of tourists at oysters farms where women explain the story of the activity and practices, test oysters (sell during the visits)		To transform intangible heritage in Disney tales	
Present our activity and work done by scientists and researchers		Harry Potter effect	

Managing Tangible Cultural Heritage			
What works well	**No. of scores given**	**Challenges**	**No. of scores given**
Reuse (e.g. cod site as a museum)/ Bottom up/ reuse buildings	4/1	Reuse of tangible heritage - is the new use accepted? (e.g. churches)	4
To have a large conception of CH (technical factories not only churches)	3	Multiplicity of actors/organisations	3
Site-specific designation/ protection	3	Institutional fragmentation	2
Restoration of buildings and how local people appropriate these buildings? Local	2	Prioritizing	2

population should be involved in the discussion on finding new uses for buildings			
Legislation	1	Selfish stakeholders	1
Technology (e.g. 3 D scans)	1	Selfie stick holders	1
Linking sustainability with cultural heritage	1	Tangible heritage can also be invisible (e.g. shipwrecks)	1
Including heritage in events	1	Lack of public support/ policy (Brittany)	1
Patrimoine professionnel protection des lieux de productions par la règlementations. Les bâtiments sont protégés car ils sont liés a l'activité. Oysters farms consider their activity as heritage. A law to protect this production and places of production. Buildings are protected as they are linked to the activity (buildings cannot be sold to other people)	1	Problème de management de l'argent pour réaliser les projets. Problem of managing the money to carry out projects. Lack of funding.	1
Policies supporting adaptation/ reuse of buildings		Who owns it?	1
Public/private partnerships: attract private funding to help restore/protect		Restauration faite pour les tourismes pour la vitrine qui n'a rien à voir avec l'identité. Quand c'est pour l'image, les business (?), les "sachants", lesi "l'experts" qui écartent le savoir des habitants locaux. Restoration of some buildings are responding to tourism needs not to local identity. "Knowledgeable experts" reject local knowledge for business or image reasons.	
Money/funding: community acceptance/ support for expenditure (on heritage/		Inventory of tangible heritage	1

museum)			
Museum complexes		Identifying all tangible heritage important to local communities	1
You can see it - that works well to well-restored tangible heritage		Public/private partnership (e.g. public authorisation required for alteration works)	
		Management pour réhabiliter mais aussi tenir compte de l'aspect culturel, de la mémoire, de l'identification au patrimoine. Management to rehabilitate but also take into account the cultural aspect, memory, identification with the heritage	
		The respect for legislation (i.e. lack of)	

Risk awareness and adaptation			
What works well	**No. of scores given**	**Challenges**	**No. of scores given**
Citizen science projects (e.g. ALERT and SCAPE in Scotland)	4	How to involve young generations	2
Cooperate with conservationists and scientists/ partnerships across disciplines	4	Losing stories as generations pass	1
Raise awareness and involve local people (education, schools); initiate projects and get them going with locals; tap knowledge of citizens (their contribution) sensibilization	2	Prioritization: how? / Making a choice means ignoring some/many problems	1
Pericles portal for uploading stories	2	Identification of the immaterial heritage	1

Scenario planning	2	Working with/across multiple authorities	1
To teach local history in schools	1	Getting authorities to agree/ buy in to the risk	1
To fight against tourist simplification	1	Lack of consensus on climate change	1
To give a good historical format to tourism offices	1	No long-term view on adaptation: what does the future look like?	
Inventory like first step		Involve local people	
Adaptation case studies and toolkits		lack of legal or formal protection for intangible heritage	
Technology: apps that are easy to use		The sale of rough historical souvenirs (e.g. widespread made in China souvenirs, not locally relevant)	
To make the entrance of cultural places free		Avoiding commodification	
On site information (information panels)		Problème des activités nautiques qui dérangent les écosystèmes; l'interdiction est mal acceptée. The problem of leisure activities which are impacting the eco-system. Prohibition is poorly accepted by users (leisure)	
To produce historical tales or videos or games		Respect: following rules is difficult on an individual level	
Prise de conscience de la part des populations sur les questions environnementales et patrimoniales. Awareness of the population on environmental and heritage issues			
Dynamique de compréhension avec des petits groupes de discussions, avec des acteurs différents. Exposition photos sur les espèces en voie de			

disparition (oiseaux). Establishment of small groups of discussion. Then it is easiest to create awareness as the comprehension dynamic is easiest in small discussion groups /photos exhibition with the population (community level). Photo exhibition on endangered species (birds).			
Des échanges avec les artistes et la mise en place de projets artistiques dans les écoles sur ces questions de vulnérabilité patrimoniale, afin que les enfants puissent ensuite sensibiliser leurs parents. Exchanges with artists and the implementation of artistic projects in schools on these issues of heritage vulnerability, so that children can then raise awareness among their parents.			

Community participation			
What works well	**No. of scores given**	**Challenges**	**No. of scores given**
Engaging community gatekeepers/ key persons	3	Involvement of the local community in the process of heritage policy	1
Leveraging local enthusiasm in SH workshops/meetings	2	Following up on ideas/submissions from community members	1
Public dialogue/ focussed discussion groups (time, detail, interactive)	1	Ideas into action and demonstrating results	1

Investing sufficient time and space (challenge of resources)	1	How we translate knowledge to communities to decide by themselves about CH	1
To share power decisions	1	Defining community: municipal, occupation, etc	
Honouring the participation: can say no but must explain why/ reasoning of decision	1	How to decide who is 'in' (part of the community)	
Récoltants d'algues - on est l'économie du littoral qui doit en protéger l'écologie pour pouvoir … Seaweed harvesters: our activity is supporting coastal economy and we must protect the resources for the future.	1	Spatially defined communities vs communities of the 'mind'	
Schools and youth involvement, instilling ethos at a young age; going to sea with parents/ family; children treasure hunts (CH sites); interactive exhibits in museums;	1	Social media broadens community	
Children and museums: theatre/arts initiatives, boat models, tactile experiences, forest school movement, fisher-tourism boats		Whose view counts more/less? Locals? Property owners? Public? Etc?	
Range of communication techniques to target: retired older, working population, children ~		Education/ school; key point?!	
Developing and maintaining channels of communication		Reaching different demographics with different media and technologies	
Working with local and regional media to reach the community		Strategies for wider public involvement (busy lives, information overload)/ attention, demand overload	
Public lectures, attraction of the		More people require more resources to	

topic		avoid box ticking	
To promote community members ideas and initiatives		Sufficient attention to various, diverse views (could work well)	
Lowering differences co-constructing options		Equal voice/ allowing for quieter ones to come forward	
Forums of discussion - deliberation of scenarios		Self referentially/ self-interest/ NIMBY-ism	
Volunteer workers to interact with community		Top down methods	
Social media (twitter) to involve fishers (@sea)		To overcome the leadership	
Universities work with local politicians (community level): through this work politicians become aware about environmental issues and then acted		Difficile pour la communaute de professionnels de ? Contre le modèle capitaliste. It is difficult for the seaweed/fisheries industry to act against the dominant economic models like capitalism	
Encouraging children to work on environmental issues; parents will learn from the children how to conserve the environment		Identity and heritage - what relation?	
Personal interest; to keep money; adaptation to present discourse		Dreams to reality: feasibility but retaining positivity and optimism	
Regroupement de comité de profesionels pour faire falloir leur metier traditionnel: Seaweed harvesters establish their own organisation to give a value to their job		Professionnalisation qui donne des droits et elaslit (?) des règles. C'est compliqué a faire comprendre: Professionalization of one activity dealing with resources gives the right to make management rules. Which are difficult for the whole group to understand.	

Travail avec les universitaires qui va vers la population : enfants etc - Aire Educative Marine. Work with universities, who is dealing with the local population. Creation of some training for pupils (Educative Marine Area is a programs run with primary schools to teach children about environmental issues and is financed by the national agency of biodiversity)			