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

Project no.:	**770504**
Project full title:	**PrEseRvIng and sustainably governing Cultural heritage and Landscapes in European coastal and maritime regionS**
Project Acronym:	**PERICLES**

Deliverable number:	D5.4
Deliverable title:	Report on policy related aspects of the demonstrations
Work package:	WP5
Due date of deliverable:	M26
Actual submission date:	M26 – June 2020
Start date of project:	01.05.2018
Duration:	42 months
Author/editor:	Laura Ferguson, Wesley Flannery, Katia Frangoudes, Elaine Azzopardi, Irene Beguier, Carsten Jahn Hansen, Simone Martino, Lisa Sousa, Ana Margarida Silva, Cristina Pita, Jordi Vegas Macias, Maili Rolo, Sybill Henry, and Marloes Kraan.
Contributing partners:	QUB, UoY, AAU, WU, UAVR, MKA, UBO

Dissemination level of this deliverable	**Public**
Nature of deliverable	Report

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary

PERICLES is an EU-funded research and innovation project, running 2018-2021, which promotes sustainable, participatory governance of cultural heritage in European coastal and maritime regions. This report presents policy aspects of PERICLES demos in 8 case regions.

Northern Ireland

The main policy themes in the Northern Ireland demo are: inadequate protection for maritime heritage; tension between development and heritage; inequalities in heritage development; exclusion of communities; and funding. Policy implementation is described as fragmented, with poor execution of public engagement and much heritage overlooked due to economics. The focus on a dominant aspect of Belfast's maritime heritage is criticised as a poor manifestation of conservation, development and tourism policy aims. A more holistic view of heritage is recommended, with a broader view of Belfast's maritime heritage and for tourism to cater to minority and local markets, and ownership of heritage should remain with communties.

Scotland

The main policy themes in the Scottish demos are: integration of marine cultural hertiage into national marine management; policy conflict; inadequate recognition of the value of heritage; lack of protection for intangible cultural heritage; changing understanding of heritage; the need for increased participation; development of the relationship between food, tourism and heritage; and marine heritgae as tourism assets. It is still too early to fully assess the impact of incorporating heritage within the marine planning system but planning professionals feel that is has been beneficial, though flawed. For the improved integration of cultural heritage, it is recommended that issues with training, resources and transparency are addressed. The second demo recommendeds that fishing is diversified for tourism.

Portugal

The main policy themes in the demos in Portugal are: inadequate protection/enhancement of ethnographic resources; the recognition of coastal and maritime heritage in sector-based regional and local policies; and a complex governance framework. There are a number of concerns with respect to policy implementation, incliding a limited connection to and knowledge about the territory, overlap in the tutelage, responsibilities, different interests and priorities, excessive bureaucracy, and old and inadequate legislation. It is recommended that an integrated approach is adopted and a shared vision with a long-term strategy developed. An effective and transparent governance framework is a necessity.

Malta

The first demo in Malta is related to policies that aim to foster sustainable fish consumption and encourage use of more local species and traditional recipes. The second is related to policies looking to bridge cultural and natural heritage, provide visibility to less known heritage sites, and make intangible heritage visible, as well as understanding how tourist flows and mobilities are governed. The third relates to policies involving community participation and stakeholder engagement. PERICLES work in Malta has led to the recommendations that more multidisciplinary approaches are adopted, that policies allow for more democratic use of combining technologies and heritage, and that the importance of fisheries as part of the Maltese cultural heritage are stressed more strongly.

Denmark

The main policy themes in the Danish demos are: emerging attention to intangible maritime cultural heritage; emerging community attention to the role of intangible cultural heritage; changes in attention to museums, local communities and citizen participation as a resource for planning; inter-municipal and local community cooperation and coordination; and lack of resources for local development and planning. Cultural heritage-oriented policies are not in place, but new practices are emerging. It is advised that cultural heritage issues have a better chance of entering policy agendas if they are claimed as instrumental in developing and transforming local communities.   Policy processes for local development can benefit significantly from deliberative 'mobilisation' approaches and from realising the importance of building policies based in local communities and their organisation, cultural and practices.

Estonia

The Estonian demos are developing participatory processes aimed at incorporating cultural heritage into ongoing MSP efforts in the case study area and investigating ways to ensure cultural heritage is protected. The main policy theme is the Pärnu county maritime spatial plan that was implemented in 2017. While Kihnu culture is well presented and used in tourism, the cultural characteristics of other small islands in the study area remain less known and should be better emphasised.   It is important to map more cultural threads which can be used in the future MSPs, and also in land-based spatial plans. Intangible cultural heritage is also a very important part that should be encompassed in spatial plans.

France

Policy themes in the French demos include: coastal risk; consideration of heritage in planning policies; lack of knowledge and recognition of heritage; complex management of maritime heritage on the public maritime domain; lack of reference and the competent authority; the plurality of bodies involved in the management of maritime heritage; underutilisation of existing tools; lack of an overall strategy for sustainable heritage management; and lack of funding and resources. Among the suite of recommendations to address issues assocated

with these are defining maritime heritage, promoting local cultural heritgae management, encouraging the consultation of all stakeholders and defining a common strategy for managing cultural heritage.

Netherlands

In PERICLES, the focus is on the Dutch Wadden Sea area and on the topics: coastal defence (dikes); nature and fisheries; cultural heritage; and interactive governance. The implementation of the many policies affecting nature conservation and fisheries in the Waddensea area in the Netherlands is organised via convenants: agreements on main topics and goals between different stakeholder groups, which then need to be operationalised further. This is very complex in practice. The recommendations from the demos in the Netherlands are not clear yet, but policy learning will arise once the work is complete.

Work on all of the PERICLES demos that will further explore policy-related aspects and contribute to the improvement of CMCH policy and its implementation is ongoing, and results will be published in due course.

2. Introduction

PERICLES is an EU-funded research and innovation project running from 2018-2021. PERICLES promotes sustainable, participatory governance of cultural heritage in European coastal and maritime regions, intending to develop and demonstrate a comprehensive framework to understand, preserve and utilise maritime cultural heritage for societal good.

PERICLES is exploring the integration of cultural heritage into maritime and coastal policies. In doing so, PERICLES seeks to understand how cultural heritage is understood by policymakers and practitioners, and what institutional, cultural, knowledge or professional obstacles prevent more integrated policies and practices. PERICLES aims to use this information to determine how policymaking might be improved for more effective preservation and sustainable exploitation of cultural heritage.

Activities in PERICLES case regions are operationalized through region-wide activities and local and regional demonstrators ('demos') that focus on specific themes or issues, linking research and innovation. This report summarises the policy-related aspects of PERICLES demos in Northern Ireland, Scotland, Portugal, Denmark, Estonia, Malta, France and the Netherlands. Each contributing case region has reported on policy themes, policy implementation and the recommendations that have resulted from one or more of their demos. The report also outlines planned work in the demos that will further contribute to our understanding of coastal and marine cultural heritage policy issues and the development and transfer of good practice across the PERICLES regions.

3. Northern Ireland

3.1 Policy Themes

The demo on **Exploring Maritime Industrial Heritage** in Belfast, Northern Ireland, uses the PERICLES framework to understand how dominant heritage narratives have been used to marginalise local communities, investigates how urban industrial cultural heritage can provide a platform for social regeneration, and explores options for more inclusive forms of community participation. Work to date has been focused on semi-structured interviews with heritage experts, policymakers and NGOs, as well as mapping monuments and murals associated with maritime cultural heritage for analysis. The following main policy issues have been identified from these activities.

Inadequate protection for historic maritime buildings and sites
A lot of Belfast's maritime heritage is overlooked and it is not sufficiently protected. Many significant buildings in the Titanic Quarter (a large waterfront regeneration project linking Belfast and the Titanic story) were rapidly demolished, meaning much of the historic context has gone, with only some heritage left. Concerning this, it was stressed by one interviewee that the setting of heritage assets is not considered enough in heritage policies and can detract from them (e.g. for the drawing offices). The UK Marine Policy Statement and the Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland both state that the setting of heritage assets and the historic seascape must be taken into consideration by public authorities when considering planning proposals for development. The reach of these policies in urban settings like the city of Belfast, however, is unclear.

Tension Between Development and Heritage
It was noted that there is a disconnect or tension between development and heritage in Belfast. Titanic Quarter has a very rich maritime heritage and it has been reduced into something that interviewees described as shiny and marketable more than real and authentic. The community element was also raised in interviews about this, with the view that former industrial maritime sites were looked on as empty spaces for development rather than lived-in places with communities.

The museum is the flagship visitor attraction of the Titanic Belfast re-development and is the largest Titanic visitor experience in the world. © Laura Ferguson

Geographical and Thematic Inequalities in Heritage Development

The focus on a single dominant aspect of Belfast's maritime heritage (the Titanic) and a dominant location for heritage development (Titanic Quarter) was noticeable in the mapping and were key issues raised in the interviews. There were calls for more development on the other side of the river and better inclusion of other maritime heritage in development and tourism policies, for example, merchant shipping and the city's international connections.

Exclusion of Communities

A lot of people are excluded from the Titanic redevelopment, for example, communities of East Belfast have been shut out of the development of heritage in Titanic Quarter. It was criticized that the Titanic redevelopment is more for visitors to NI and does not encourage repeat visits from local people. As on interviewee stated: "The planning has been around tourism and attracting tourists rather than protecting the heritage." It was stressed in interviews that communities are the most important heritage actors and should have more control over their heritage. It was also highlighted that communities don't financially benefit from the tourism in the Titanic Quarter.

A plaque in East Belfast memorialises shipyard workers who lost their lives in the construction of the R.M.S Titanic. © Laura Ferguson

<u>Funding</u>

There were complaints from interviewees that there was a lack of funding directed at heritage other than Titanic, particularly at the community level. Any community heritage projects that are funded tend to get short-term funding and then disappear into the ether afterwards, having only scratched the surface. Some small community heritage initiatives, such as the plaque pictured above, are self-funded by community groups.

3.2   Policy Implementation

Discussion of policy implementation in the SI2 interviews contained a series of clear criticisms. It was suggested by several interviewees that industrial heritage has not generally been well-managed in Northern Ireland. The fragmented approach to heritage was criticised, with policies viewed as not holistic enough and heritage work as uncoordinated. Preservation, management and development of heritage were considered insufficiently joined-up.

Referring specifically to Titanic Quarter, it was lamented that a lot of heritage had been overlooked, particularly heritage linking to communities in East Belfast. The reason persistently speculated for this was that policy was driven by economics rather than heritage.

This was typically mentioned in relation to economic returns to the city from the development, although one interviewee implied money was also used to persuade government away from the policy: "It's basically 'follow the money' so whatever policies exist are kind of irrelevant in terms of who's got the money to persuade government."   It was suggested that if the driver for Titanic Quarter had been heritage, then they would have used the heritage buildings already there rather than making something shiny, new and commercially appealing. Furthermore, the value of the demolished heritage has not been realized until too late. This is perhaps a reflection more of past mistakes than a current issue, however, as the Regional Development Strategy RDS 2035 explicitly recognises the contribution that Northern Ireland's built heritage assets make to its sense of place and history, as well as their importance as a resource for tourism and recreation.

The focus on a single dominant aspect of Belfast's maritime heritage (the Titanic) and a dominant location for heritage development (Titanic Quarter) was criticised as a poor manifestation of conservation, development and tourism policy aims. The policy aim, as outlined in A Strategic Framework to Unlock the Potential of Heritage-led Tourism in Northern Ireland was for heritage to be framed in a narrative that celebrates people and place, and the Titanic was chosen as a unifying narrative of industrial prowess. The failure in the implementation of this has been the exclusion of much of the remainder of the city's rich maritime heritage.

A mural celebrating the Titanic being built in Belfast © Laura Ferguson

Finally, public engagement was criticised, with consultation viewed as ineffective (often in the sense that the public was asked but there was no sign of results from this) and communities and their interests overlooked. Policy analysis had suggested this to be an ongoing issue, however, there was a trend for more recent policies to be more engaged than earlier ones. For example, the Belfast Integrated Tourism Strategy (2015-2020) involved 6 months of extensive consultation, involving face to face interviews with over 120 stakeholders in the Belfast tourism industry, as well as another 70 people through workshop settings, and remote consultation via business surveys. Local-level policies, such as the Community Plan for Causeway Coast and Glens 2017-2030, were also found to feature community interests more strongly and had incorporated more active participation of stakeholders, as well as being particularly encouraging of bottom-up stakeholder involvement. The Belfast case study work suggests that the implementation of such methods needs to be improved across the board so that all policy meets these standards. The Drawing Offices redevelopment, however, was cited as an example of good practice in heritage preservation. A full-scale engagement plan was launched, the results of which were used in the design, and also the heritage spaces have to be accessible to the public when not in use. There are plans to adopt such a model for the proposed development of the Thompson Dock.

3.3   Recommendations

1) A more holistic view needs to be taken with heritage, e.g. natural and cultural heritage should be looked at together.
2) There is a need to represent the financial value of heritage to developers.
3) The next Strategic Framework to Unlock the Potential of Heritage-led Tourism in Northern Ireland should include broader development and promotion of Belfast's maritime heritage beyond the Titanic.
4) Traditional skills need to be recognised and skills training is needed, as a lot of old skills, crafts and trades are dying away.
5) Tourism is currently aimed towards the mass market but other visitor segments and locals also need to be catered for in future Northern Ireland and Belfast tourism plans.
6) Ownership of heritage should remain with communities and it should be used in a way that is representative of and beneficial to the community that owns it.
7) The setting, or heritage landscape, policy in the UK Marine Policy Statement and the Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland, needs to be considered equally in urban maritime settings as in remote seascapes.
8) Stakeholder participation could be implemented better in future policy development, particularly at national and regional levels.

4. Scotland

4.1 Policy Themes

The demo on **Integrating Cultural Heritage into Coastal and Maritime Spatial Planning** has so far consisted of policy and practice stakeholder interviews, with the planned cross-regional workshop delayed due to COVID-19. The policy themes identified in the work to date are as follows.

Integration of marine cultural heritage into national marine management
The Marine Scotland Act, approved in 2010, represents a revised framework for the protection of the seas. One key feature is that the protection of maritime cultural heritage (MCH) is now integrated within marine management and nature conservation. While the Marine Scotland Act is itself based on the UK Marine Policy Statement, which does include statutory provision for cultural heritage, the fully integrated approach adopted in Scotland is unique in the UK; Scotland is world-leading in taking this approach. Protecting MCH within the National Marine Plan, and therefore within regional marine plans, rather than alongside them, means a simpler approach to marine licensing and public authorities must consider heritage protection obligations in marine licensing decisions. Further, where necessary, marine conservation orders do provide increased protection for sites. Scotland now has 8 historic Marine Protected Areas, all protected within the National Marine Plan.

Policy conflict
There were concerns about conflicting national policies as some are aimed at the conservation of both cultural and natural heritage while others are intended to promote growth through industries such as aquaculture and tourism which inevitably impact on the former. The fear was that heritage, in general, would lose out in decisions that would favour growth policies.

Inadequate recognition of the value of heritage
It was felt that the broader value and contribution of cultural heritage is neither clear nor recognised in other policies or by non-heritage actors. In other words, heritage is still considered as a separate sector rather than an intrinsic dimension of the natural environment and the way that the natural environment and heritage come together to create a "shared offering" is not well recognised. Therefore, the broader value of heritage is difficult to capture and is underappreciated.

In the UK, there is also an argument being made for definitions of the marine environment in policy to include heritage. It was felt that MCH suffers from a "double deficit" in that cultural heritage is underrepresented and under-resourced in comparison to natural heritage and further, that marine heritage is less well catered for than terrestrial heritage.

Lack of protection for intangible cultural heritage

Intangible cultural heritage (ICH) is not currently protected in UK legislation but is clearly of importance and concern, to local communities, heritage professionals and planning professionals. Heritage professionals noted that while they recognise its importance, proper consideration of ICH will necessitate new ways of working and skills that they do not yet possess. Planning professionals noted the difficulty of adequately capturing and protecting ICH in a spatially based system.

View to Pladda Lighthouse from The Arran Coastal Way. The way that the natural environment and heritage come together to create a "shared offering" is not well recognised. © Laura Ferguson

Changing understanding of heritage

It became clear that there is currently a change in the heritage sector. Cultural heritage was previously conceptualised and managed in a top-down way where what was considered important heritage to be protected was based on expert opinion. This is now changing, and heritage professionals are seeking to take a much more inclusive approach to what is considered heritage and to include other aspects such as social value. In so doing, heritage professionals are having to change their perceptions and working practices and may not yet be familiar with methods needed to work in this new way.

Need for increased participation

There is a widely recognised need for greater community participation, which is also part of a broader Government agenda. Community participation is essential in changing understandings of what is important heritage to be protected. It was also noted that a failing of planning, in general, was that civil society was not well represented. If the regional marine plans are to achieve their full potential, effective participation is essential in identifying locally valued heritage and places of value early in the regional marine planning process so that it can be well incorporated and used to inform direction. Both heritage organisations and planning partnerships were making concentrated efforts to increase community participation, but community input was recognised as a consistently weak link.

A second Scottish demo focuses on **Diversity on Landings and Local Food: Rejuvenating Inshore Fisheries**. This demo consists of two main parts: i) a survey and choice experiment designed to investigate how residents and visitors value local fisheries and; ii) interviews with business owners who supply fish in their businesses. From the survey and the interviews conducted so far, the following policy themes have become evident.

Food, tourism and cultural heritage

Scotland's national strategy for food and tourism ([Food Tourism Scotland](#)) is to double the economic impact of farming, fishing, and food & drink industries. To achieve this, it has set out an ambitious plan based on several pillars, of which the two relevant to the demo are the following:
Pillar 1: Sustainable local food supply chain
Pillar 2: Quality products and experiences for all

The strategy explores how the local food supply chain meets increased demand and operates to ensure any gaps are identified and filled. The strategy is to work with farms, estates and crofts to develop food tourism as a sustainable contributor to the agricultural sector, including the development and continuation of the monitor farm scheme. However, there is a gap in terms of how to operate with fishermen to valorise products and activities stemming from the marine environment.

In addition, it wants to develop a brand and logo that identifies a diverse collection of interesting and compelling food and drink stories that will both enhance and inspire tourism products. The plan by 2030 of [Food Tourism Scotland](#) is to evolve the "*Taste our Best*" logo into a world-leading business-to-consumer Quality Assurance Scheme.

The food & tourism strategy has also the goal to unveil the history, heritage and culture behind what is grown, harvested, prepared and consumed in a particular area. In other words, to address the who, what, where, when, why and how food and drink becomes part of the fabric of a community and sheds light on the physical, social, cultural, economic and spiritual factors that inform their experience of food and drink.

The goal of the food & tourism strategy is to have in 2030 a diverse and critical mass of food tourism products and experiences with Scottish ingredients at their foundation. These experiences will reflect Scotland's heritage, culture and landscapes. Local food and drink will be easily identifiable in all retail and foodservice settings. Curiosity about who grows and prepare food and drink and the traditions and stories behind local dishes and regional specialities will make part of the tourist experience. The choice experiment has shown that heritage is one of the components that may enhance seafood consumption and must be valorised through a logo or a specific marketing scheme.

The food & tourism strategy wants to valorise local food and describes the connection between food producers and consumers within a given geographic area. Anything that is grown, raised or harvested in Scotland or made from ingredients that are grown, raised or harvested in Scotland is considered local food or drink. The choice experiment as shown the preferences that locals and visitors have for local and fresh seafood.

Arinagour Harbour on the Isle of Coll in the Western Isles. Local seafood caught by fishers based here is popular with guests at the island's hotel. © Laura Ferguson

Fisheries management and culture

The fisheries management strategy is pivoting around several objectives; one of the most important is to achieve environmentally conscious and sustainable fishing, to protect biological diversity and ensure that marine ecosystems continue to provide economic, social and wider benefits for people, communities and industry. Secondly, to support fishing and onshore seafood industries of all sizes, to grow sustainably, provide economic gains for coastal communities, and help secure employment in fish processing plants across Scotland.

The fisheries management policy is aligned with the Food and Tourism policy. Fishery management policy recognises the excellence of the marine environment and quality of food and drink one of the major marketing attractions of Scotland. As such, marine and coastal tourism plays an important role in Scotland's rural economy.

The fisheries management policy states that high environmental standards can deliver and add a premium for seafood products. The choice experiment has shown that fish caught sustainably received the highest appreciation among all the attributes. The policy question is whether it is for government to support environmental improvements and monitoring or should it be the industry to fund these activities given the added premium they deliver.

Marine heritage and tourism

The National Marine Plan encourages the valorisation of the historic environment: the development and use of the marine environment should protect and, where appropriate, enhance heritage assets and the setting of important coastal heritage assets in a manner proportionate to their significance.

This policy is aligned to the ones mentioned in the tourism and fisheries section of Scotland Outlook 2030, Responsible Tourism for a Sustainable Future that recognises that it is important for tourism to bring net benefits to communities across Scotland, for example by contributing to Scotland's events, heritage and cultural sectors that local people can enjoy. Communities are essential and have a say in the way that the tourism evolves locally, and be reassured that tourism-related concerns are dealt with, as and when they arise.

Natural assets, landscape, scenery, natural and built heritage will be cared for, protected and invested in for our current and future generations to experience and enjoy.

Scotland's Marine Tourism Strategy addresses key issues, such as transport and access, digital connectivity and onshore facilities (accommodation, retail and food and drink) and relate them to the wider tourism offering of Scotland's coasts and communities, history and heritage, adventure and food & drink.

Policies above mentioned are well aligned with the choice made by locals and tourists in fact of food characteristics preferences. The demo shows that there could be a risk to not valorise

or to damage heritage if not included in a new tourism dimension encompassing the experience of food and drink consumptions.

4.2   Policy Implementation

Integrating Cultural Heritage into Coastal and Maritime Spatial Planning

It is still too early to fully assess the impact of incorporating heritage within the marine planning system but planning professionals feel that is has been beneficial, in part as it can allow for greater recognition of locally valued heritage and of Cultural Ecosystem Services which include heritage and heritage values. However, it was acknowledged that while this works well at a national level and for protected sites, it does not yet work as well for sites that have cultural and heritage value but which are not protected legislatively. In Scotland, Regional Marine Plans will be developed which have the potential to address this, two are currently in draft stages, but this is still a new process and the partnerships developing the regional plans are not very well resourced.

Many heritage assets in Scotland, such as Castle Coeffin on the Isle of Lismore, are part of the coastal landscape. © Laura Ferguson

One difficulty raised is about where MCH sits within the planning system. It is included in the Productive Seas Principle which has valuation implications, i.e. the importance of MCH is

currently being evaluated in economic terms, with the consequence that the full qualitative value of MCH is obscured. It was noted that while the impact on heritage must be considered in licensing, it is unclear what weight it would be afforded in licensing decisions which must balance many different factors. This is especially relevant for non-protected but valued sites. A related concern was some decisions being driven by economics rather than conservation.

Integrating MCH within the marine protection framework means that the dominant stakeholders in developing the marine management framework are Marine Scotland. While Historic Environment Scotland (HES) were involved in every stage of policy formation, and lead on heritage, they were not the main policy drivers. However, collaboration between the main national-level stakeholders is well-established even while there may be gaps in understanding the broader contribution of heritage. There are greater, recognised difficulties in engaging other stakeholders. It is difficult for small and 3rd sector organisations to make their voices heard and to collate a coherent voice in a very fragmentary sector, although HES saw it as part of their role to facilitate this. Consultations are the standard means of participation but tend to be time consuming and technical. Many organisations do not have the resources to engage properly and instead go through representative individuals or through umbrella organisations which themselves may not be well resourced.

Community participation is promoted at a national level by community councils which are statutory consultees. However, the councils experience limited participation. Also, council members are not experts. A lack of specialist knowledge of the subject (e.g. Marine Planning issues) and the system (e.g. when to participate) was identified as a barrier to effective participation. There is also a strong feeling that when people do participate, either as individuals or through other organisations, their views are not taken into account. There are therefore inherent power and knowledge imbalances within some aspects of the participatory process and drives to include public participation are in danger of being considered token efforts. This is especially relevant in terms of planning decisions. Another acknowledged difficulty of community participation is stakeholder fatigue, compounded by the observation that while community engagement is high on agenda, it is slow to impact on policy.

It was widely thought that the cultural heritage sector is not as well-resourced as the natural environment sector. Further, there are insufficient resources made available to the Planning Partnerships to encompass different areas of expertise or to develop unfamiliar methods needed to fully explore locally valued heritage. A lack of resources was also identified as a barrier to participation as it was recognised that many organisations did not have the resources necessary to engage in every consultation.

SI3 Diversity on Landings and Local Food: Rejuvenating Inshore Fisheries
Food heritage is related to the implementation of policies on tourism and fishing along three dimensions:

1) Policies on tourism, food fisheries and heritage converge on the importance of enhancing tourism experience via mixing nature, culture, heritage and food around stories and providing a new experience to visitors.

2) Food and fisheries policies valorise local products to boost the economy of local communities.

3) Fisheries policies consider sustainable harvesting essential for the protection of the environment and for ensuring the long-term viability of commercial and processing operations.

Seafood consumers appreciate all the above aspects as elicited in a choice modelling approach. Local fresh produce harvested sustainably is what people desire the most. However, appreciation is also provided for heritage conservation. More specifically, people stated a positive willingness to pay of £1.4 on the heritage-related characteristic of seafood. This is, as expected and found in the literature, lower than the WTP stated for other seafood characteristics such as local origin (£9.78), freshness (£3.17), being fished by local vessels (£3.31) and environmentally certified (£7.89).

Eyemouth Harbour operates a popular traditional fish market where fishers sell some of their catch fresh from the sea. © Laura Ferguson

Policy Formation

Scotland outlook 2030 states that communities are considered essential and have a say in the way that tourism evolves locally, and can be reassured that tourism-related concerns are dealt with, as and when they arise.

Food tourism development is managed as a collaborative process. With leadership from Scotland Food & Drink and the Scottish Tourism Alliance, a Strategy Board representing key partner organisations, including Scottish Government and VisitScotland, was formed to guide the research and development of this national action plan.

For the successful creation of a food tourism plan, a broad community was involved in the process from start to finish. Stakeholders from across Scotland were engaged throughout the strategy development process with input from over 850 interested parties via surveys and questionnaires, interviews, meetings, workshops and other sessions.

The result is an evidence-based food tourism action plan that reflects the insights gained from that research process. Food Tourism Scotland is for – and co-created by – the industry.

In terms of funding, the fisheries management policy makes explicit statements about how to use public money for improving marine tourism through fishing. The policy states that the decision to use public money to support private businesses is not one to be taken lightly and should be deployed only where there is a legitimate reason to intervene in the face of market failures such as the development of complementary aspects such as marine tourism through fishing and maritime heritage projects.

4.3 Recommendations

Integrating Cultural Heritage into Coastal and Maritime Spatial Planning

1) Training:

Consultation is not the most effective or accessible way to engage communities and in those sectors that wish to increase community participation, there is a need for training which could also include methods for value elicitation and participatory deliberation. Community councils and interested organisations would also benefit from training in the planning system in general as well as in Marine Planning more specifically. This should include training on the concerns that marine planning addresses as well as in how they can participate in regional marine plan development, although the sustained efforts by planning partnerships to include a wide range of stakeholders, including community councils, are recognised.

2) Resources:

Heritage bodies and planning partnerships need more resources to better protect marine cultural heritage, to promote its importance, to engage with communities and to collect information of locally valued places and heritage. Current employees are already stretched so

better financing of these bodies will allow for increased investment in the human resources needed.

3) Transparency:

Transparency was an important concern raised by community representatives. It was felt that it was not clear how, or indeed if, their views were taken into consideration in planning decisions. This point was raised in relation to terrestrial planning but could also be a potential issue in marine planning. It was also suggested that there should be clear and widely shared statements of any concluding analyses. Greater transparency is essential if participation is to work in the long term, otherwise there is a significant risk of mistrust developing and people disengaging.

Diversity on Landings and Local Food: Rejuvenating Inshore Fisheries

The food and tourism policies focus mainly on sustaining agri-tourism activities that connect visitors to what is being grown and produced in specific areas. However, the marine tourism strategy wants to add value to visitors' maximising the economic impact from the sector, in particular, linking strongly with coastal communities and tourist destinations, and celebrating the rich diversity of marine and coastal wildlife. Moreover, it will act as an entry point into the Scottish tourism offer – the history and heritage, the scenery and wildlife, visitor attractions and experiences, and Scotland's unique food and drink offering.

Two elements can be added to strengthen the current tourism policy and reinforce the protection and valorisation of cultural heritage within the context of food and tourism. There is strong evidence of the will to improve the role of agri-tourism, but fewer considerations on diversifying fishing for tourism purposes. Pesca-tourism is not yet a reality in Northern European countries like in the Mediterranean. Another important element to implement the tourism policy is to enhance the cultural dimension of fishing. The fisheries management policy shows strongly the concept of an environmentally sustainable way of fishing, but the protection of the cultural heritage related to fishing is not highly emphasised. A way to consider the latter aspect would be the creation of a green marketing strategy based on the formulation of a food and drink label that reflects the cultural dimension of fishing, processing and consuming other than the reduced impact of fishing on the environment. The current marketing strategy "*Taste our Best*" already recognises and celebrates businesses providing locally sourced, quality produce including restaurants, cafés, bars and takeaways. To date, more than 1,000 businesses have received this accreditation. This label can be extended to consider further dimensions of food such as stories related to its origin and its transformation.

5. Portugal

5.1 Policy Themes

The demos in the Ria de Aveiro region are focused on coastal and maritime symbols, traditions and products that contribute to the identity of this region. These are the Aveiro lagoon traditions (**Integrating CH into Maritime Spatial Planning in the Aveiro Region: Preserving Aveiro Lagoon Traditions**), the traditional boats (**Integrating CH into Coastal Tourism: The Lagoon Traditional Boats ("Moliceiros") from Transport to Tourism**), the saltpans (**Salt CH – from Mono to Multifunctional Anthropogenic Landscape**), and the gastronomy (**Culinary Route in the Aveiro Lagoon Region: Understanding, Preserving and Exploring Fish Food CH Through Gastro-tourism**). Three main policy themes have emerged.

Inadequate protection/enhancement of ethnographic resources
Ria de Aveiro coastal and maritime cultural heritage results from the long-lasting interaction between nature and humans and cannot be dissociated from the lagoon/natural heritage. Despite their recognized relevance to the region, they are overlooked and not sufficiently protected under the [cultural heritage national policy](.).

Moliceiros (traditional boats) at Aveiro city canals (P2) © Ana Margarida Silva

Coastal and Maritime Cultural Heritage recognized in sector-based regional and local policies

The cultural and natural heritage of the Aveiro Region is perceived, within the framework of regional tourism and development policies, as identity resources with the potential of increasing the attractiveness of this territory, promoting local and regional competitiveness, generating employment and contributing to a better quality of life.

In the Regional Tourism Development Plan of the Centre (2020-2030), as regards the Intermunicipal Community of the Region of Aveiro, the *moliceiros*, saltpans and gastronomy are stated as strategic pillars. Several actions with the purpose of structuring and qualifying tourist products related to culture, history, material and immaterial heritage, gastronomy, endogenous products, events, festivals and traditions are proposed.

Saltworkers transporting salt in traditional baskets (P3) © Cristina Pita

Complex governance framework

The Ria de Aveiro coastal lagoon is embedded in a complex governance framework, characterized by the involvement of a variety of government entities (from national to local), non-governmental agencies and other stakeholders. Eleven municipalities have jurisdiction over different parts of the lagoon and its management is mostly sector-based. This situation raises several constraints in relation to the preservation and enhancement of cultural heritage, to the development of new uses and activities in the lagoon, among others.

5.2   Policy Implementation

There are several government entities acting on Ria de Aveiro coastal lagoon, most of them being national entities. This raises a number of concerns, namely the limited connection to and knowledge about the territory, the overlap in the tutelage, responsibilities, different interests and priorities, excessive bureaucracy, old and inadequate legislation.

The stakeholders identified the need to assess the carrying capacity in the city canals, as well as the environmental pressure caused by *moliceiros*. Until 2023, the combustion engines of *moliceiros* operating within the city's canals will be replaced by electric motors, and the Aveiro municipally will install electrical supply stations along the canals.

The quality and accuracy of the information provided by the tourist guides on board of *moliceiros* about Aveiro, its heritage and history are considered poor and need improvements.

5.3   Recommendations

1) Adopt an integrated management approach to the Ria de Aveiro coastal lagoon, finding consensus between sectoral interests, ensuring environmental sustainability and promoting a more holistic approach to cultural and natural heritage.
2) Develop a shared vision for the Ria de Aveiro coastal lagoon and a long-term plan/ strategy for and its uses while safeguarding traditional activities (e.g. the development of the Estuary Management Programme, a spatial planning tool created in 2008 but not yet developed).
3) Create an effective and transparent governance framework.
4) Map, inventory and create a public database of CMCH.
5) Strengthen and enhance the brand *Região de Aveiro* as well as the Ria de Aveiro by their authenticity and unique features.
6) Creation of cultural heritage interpretation centres.
7) Promote literacy on CMCH.

6. Malta

6.1 Policy Themes

The demo **Fishing for recipes: The Fish Festival Mir-Raħal tas-Sajjieda or Festa Ħut** is related to those policies aiming to foster sustainable fish consumption and encourage people to use more local species and traditional recipes that are linked to the identity and place of Malta. In that sense, globalization and tourism trends changed the food consumptions patterns in Malta, which have promoted globally standardised foods. When it comes to fish and seafood, the visibility is lower. Hence, the demo aims to provide a space, within local food and folkloric festivals to raise awareness, to make sustainable fish consumption and traditional recipes a more fashionable option and to recover a culinary heritage and knowledge before it gets lost.

Fishing is strongly linked to the identity and place of Malta © Jordi Vegas Macias

The demo **Stories of the waterfront: Digitally guided tours in and around Marsaxlokk Bay** has several aims related to different policies:

i) For cultural policies, it relates to policies that are looking to bridge cultural and natural heritage, provide visibility to less known heritage sites, and especially to make visible the intangible heritage via digitalization platforms.

ii) In terms of tourism, the demo seeks to understand the way in which tourists flows and mobilities are organized and governed. In the case of Marsaxlokk, the saturation of the waterfront indicates that there is little control and policy to govern tourists flows. The demo aims at spreading tourist flows by creating and promoting guided tours and information about certain sites. This would also enhance the experience of the tourists.

By reflecting heritage in coastal areas through digital means, it is possible to have a more holistic policy that could even be included in those related to sustainable development, within MSP or the so-called blue growth.

The demo aims to address the risk of losing intangible heritage and ensure a knowledge transfer, as well as address the risk of mass tourism saturation in fishing villages, so by constructing crowd-sourced content and quality, the tourist experience can be enhanced.

Traditional boats © Jordi Vegas Macias

M3 Stakeholder workshop in marine cultural heritage relates to policies that involve community participation and stakeholder engagement, in the sense of governance and co-development. It aims to enhance the democratic character and the involvement of citizens and stakeholders in heritage governance. It is noted that stakeholders participating in PERICLES, have more in common than they previously thought and they barely worked together. In this regards, PERICLES in Malta is also looking at representativeness and expertise from multiple angles.

6.2 Policy Implementation

<u>M1 Fishing for recipes. The Fish Festival Mir-Raħal tas-Sajjieda or Festa Ħut</u>
This particular demo promotes the culinary maritime heritage of Malta. By promoting recipes and involving the community, it is possible to instil local pride, provide a space for fish and seafood from Malta to be fashionable and encourage sustainable consumption.

There have been some campaigns in 2014 and 2019 such as https://eatfreshfish.com.mt/, that were linked to policies to encourage consumption of fresh fish and increase the knowledge on fish recipes and fisheries in Malta. They came from the Parliamentary Secretary for Agriculture Fisheries and Animal Rights.

Some policies or initiatives already aim to influence policies in this particular theme. The NGO Fish For Tomorrow and the Mediterranean Culinary Academy, both involved in PERICLES, advocate for sustainable fish consumption and the recovery of the traditional culinary heritage linked to fish and seafood and Malta. Tools such as the quick fish guides for sustainable seafood consumption and research studies have been elaborated to encourage more sustainable consumption and influence policy. In the sense of traditional recipes, there is no defined policy except for actions that can raise awareness and make local and traditional cuisine more attractive, such as workshops or video tutorials on how to be more familiar with traditional fish recipes and usage of seasonal and local fish species.

Tourists at the fishmarket © Jordi Vegas Macias

Although they had some influence, It seems like these campaigns couldn't engage totally with the local fishing communities and the source of expertise from local fishing communities is not yet fully captured. In that regard, with the demos in PERICLES stakeholders and experts can be guided and encouraged to capture the relationship between fish/seafood and the sea as part of the identity of coastal areas and promote it or make it more educational and visible within festivals. By using events as a space to celebrate food, more visibility, pride and promotion of fresh fish consumption and Maltese recipes are possible.

Stories of the Waterfront: Digitally Guided Tours in and Around Marsaxlokk Bay
In the local context of Marsaxlokk some relevant policies are linked directly to this demo. The first policy called Waterfront regeneration project aims to reorganise the space of the waterfront. Nowadays, the space is under a conflict of users such as fishermen, restaurants, souvenir sellers and of course the local community, as this is a public space. Fishermen lost part of their space, affecting the character of the village which is one of the main attractions for tourism, in favour of restaurants and souvenirs sellers that are taking over the space. In addition, tourism flows are under-controlled and saturate the space, which adds a feeling of gradually losing the ownership and belonging for the locals.

This policy intends in a way to reorganise the space, but so far, the local council, together with the national government responsible for fisheries and transport, are doing a slow progress which is not yet efficient, and meanwhile, the current situation erases the cultural identity of the place. Lastly, it seems to be like the policy did not allow for open discussions and more participatory approaches form the village to decide what could best to find a common agreement between all the parties.

Another policy to be acknowledged is the Boat Restoration Scheme, a fisheries policy that aimed to restore traditional Maltese vessels for professional (or semi) uses, due to its cultural value. The policy was inefficient and in supporting the small scale fisheries and regenerating the fishing identity, as it did not include the vessel category MFC for recreational uses in which most of the traditional vessels belong. Moreover, this scheme was only provided for one year.

Taking these policies into account, our demo here provides a further elaboration and implementation of these policies, in the sense of providing not only more visibility and reinforcing the fishing character of the waterfront, but also to explore how participatory approaches and digital platforms can at least provide more visibility to the intangible and tangible heritage of Marsaxlokk. The waterfront, which can receive up to 40,000 visitors on a Sunday Market, gets saturated and little is known about the history and stories that can be told in it.

Moreover, the area of Marsaxlokk goes beyond the waterfront, where more sites and CMCH can be promoted by using audio guides that are crowd-sourced and co-created with the local community and the PERICLES stakeholders. In this sense, tourist flows can be somehow

spread or at least be offered to discover as well as other sites, which could help and release the space of the waterfront. In addition, this demo is also opening possibilities for the local boat tour operators using traditional vessels, in a way to tell their stories while adding value to their experiences as well. It is in a way, a demo that captures the cultural and natural value of the place to create a more sustainable outcome that can serve both locals and visitors with regards to the risks that can be associated to the mentioned policies.

M3 Stakeholder Workshop in CMCH (Marine Cultural Heritage)

The reason to include and further elaborate this demo is that we did not find a specific policy or frame that enables an interdisciplinary approach to talk about maritime cultural heritage. In that sense, not much has been seen in terms of evaluating and discussing the state of CMCH and what mitigation and promotion initiatives can be done. It seems to be that in Malta that expertise regarding CMCH is wide, yet, segregated. There are few or no working groups that put together different expertise to further elaborate strategies regarding the coastal heritage and fishing identities. Fisheries, tourism, heritage, local communities, researchers and NGO, to name some of them, barely meet to put their visions in one place and try to find commonalities around CMCH.

In that context, stakeholders respond very positively to the workshops organised as part of the PERICLES demos for Malta. As a result of this, working groups and advisory committees have been formed to move developments forward in how to promote and sustainably manage CMCH at risk. With the PERICLES funding, a push has been given for more stakeholder and public participation in cultural heritage management and decision making. For example, the stakeholders participating in M1 made it important for their agendas to closely cooperate for further events and developments, in providing space, knowledge and diverse views on how to implement more fish food and Maltese fish recipes to the traditional Festa, as an important part of the folklore and the identity. This also reflected the gap that was missing in terms of cooperation between a wider group of stakeholders with some interests in common.

6.3   Recommendations

1) Need for more multidisciplinary approaches in cooperation and innovation. Sectors or stakeholders are in general segregated in their respective sectors. Hence, combining expertise and angles, i.e. fisheries and tourism, new policies that support involvement and sustainable development for fishing communities and marine heritage preservation can be possible. For instance, a policy for fishing tourism or more frameworks for CBT in fishing villages, to increase the quality of the tourists' experiences via heritage or cultural tourism.
2) The advanced technological cluster in Malta has developed good initiatives in heritage, but they are quite exclusive in general (high tech or defined technologies for 3D scan). Policies should also allow for more democratic use of combining technologies and heritage, with wider participation and involvement of more stakeholders and communities of meaning.

3) To stress more strongly the importance of fisheries as part of the Maltese cultural heritage, in regards to gastronomy, history, identity and places with character.

7. Denmark

7.1 Policy Themes

The demo **Integration of CH into Development and Blue Growth Plans/Strategies in Transboundary Decision-making** explores how local communities and people can adapt to contemporary conditions using their cultural heritage to help tackle the challenges they face, while also investigating how some initiatives such as blue growth development may also generate risks to cultural heritage and seascapes. The main policy themes emerging from this demo are detailed below.

Emerging attention to intangible maritime cultural heritage in municipal and local planning
Tangible cultural heritage is dealt with by default in Danish municipal planning activities (according to the Planning Act), which in practice means that there are specific assessment tools (e.g. the SAVE method) for registering and valuating buildings and other physical constructs. This is also the case in the Vilsund and Slettestrand areas, and their respective three municipalities (Thisted, Morsø and Jammerbugt). However, intangible cultural heritage has so far been given little or no attention. In the Vilsund area, current local strategies and plans have not yet integrated cultural heritage aspects. In Slettestrand, the latest strategy for the area, 'Strategiplan 2030' from 2017 (version 3), primarily focuses on 'nature' as a basis for coastal development. Cultural heritage aspects are, at best, hinted at in this strategy. In all three municipalities, planners have increasingly started to realise this lack of priority and to look for methods and activities to integrate intangible cultural heritage aspects into strategy-making and planning for local coastal communities. Based on interviews and meetings, the motivation is often argued to be to find and apply new parameters of 'attractiveness' for both tourists, visitors and potential residents – hence it is seen as a lever for local tourism and housing policies. There is also a realisation among planners of the potential role of intangible cultural heritage in the further development or transformation of local communities, e.g. that local narratives can play an important part in rebuilding place identities. However, similar attention to the role of intangible cultural heritage still seems to be mostly lacking among local politicians, who tend to focus on more traditional business and tourism development projects and activities. A local head of planning mentions that cultural heritage aspects are rarely on the radar of the politicians when discussing local development. This is also why planners are observant to try to identify applicable parameters of attractiveness to argue relevance.

Emerging local community attention to the role of intangible cultural heritage
In Slettestrand, boat building and beach-based fishery mean that there is some attention in the local community itself to local maritime narratives. This potentially provides a pillar for local development policies, however as indicated above, this has yet to find its way to such

policies. In the Vilsund area, there are only a few buildings and constructions that show tangible maritime cultural heritage elements, and only one that has been recognised in planning – the Vilsund-bridge (from 1939) connecting the two parts of the area, see photo below.

The Vilsund (road)bridge, 382 meters long and built in 1939. ©Carsten Jahn Hansen

There are some pride and many metaphors associated with the Vilsund bridge. It connects two very distinct parts of Northwest Denmark – the areas of Thy and Mors (the latter is an island). Before the bridge, ferries connected the two parts, and the place has been a known crossing for people and trade since the Bronze Age. It is this narrative about 'connectivity' and 'Vilsund as a meeting place' that the local communities on each side of the sound have started to realise, especially after the 75-year celebration of the bridge in 2014, as being 'untold' and underplayed in local development policies. The recent renovation and transformation of an old minor shipyard in Vilsund into a centre for maritime and water sports has also created a push for more attention to the history of the place, and increasingly to narratives on Vilsund as a meeting place as well as for Fjord-based living. See photo below from the renovated shipyard. This increased interest in historical aspects is rather pragmatic and several local actors have expressed that, given the limited show of actual physical and tangible cultural heritage elements (apart from the ones mentioned here), they are in fact 'building a narrative' based on rediscovering their past, rather than adding to an existing and established narrative. One local actor rhetorically asked; 'what kind of cultural heritage do we want?'. This also illustrates a propensity among local community actors to be very engaged and entrepreneurial in the development of their area, and they are using this to push local politicians and planners to support them.

The renovated shipyard in Vilsund © Carsten Jahn Hansen

Changes in attention to museums, local communities and citizen participation as a resource for planning

In all three municipalities (Thisted, Morsø and Jammerbugt), the last 10 years have seen a significant increase in attention to how to make better use of local knowledge and locals in place-development activities. In general, it is fair to say that it has been a period of experimentation with citizen and stakeholder participation, in which planners (mostly, but supported by the municipal councils) have been looking for new 'models' and approaches for involving locals, and sometimes even to leave planning to the locals. In particular, the municipalities have realised that they need to test new participatory setups to release local potentials, engagement and resources better. In doing so, they have increasingly moved away from traditional desk-based and land use-oriented planning, and instead opened up for the development of more situation- and place-specific approaches, e.g. by taking into account local social capital and networks. This change in planning ideas and approaches has become a theme in itself. See examples with more detail in the 'Policy implementation' section (in subsection 'New arenas for policy and development – and new strategies and plans').

It is quite clear that this has been based on perceptions that the municipalities do not have sufficient resources for creating a balanced development. They need help from below and from alternative sources (funds). It also illustrates a rather general 'having the back-against-the-wall' mentality in this part of Denmark – as an outskirts area away from the reach of

larger urban areas. Some locals claim that this has always been the case, however, a couple of decades of 'trimming' of the Danish welfare model has created more innovation and push from below in such areas for taking responsibility for their development. In this process, the local museums (Thy and Mors) in the Vilsund area have felt mostly ignored, apart from their formalised role in relation to protecting tangible cultural heritage in the shape of buildings and excavation procedures and archaeology. The museums do not feel that their competencies are used actively in local development processes, especially concerning intangible cultural heritage, local narratives and histories. They have tried to bring this to the attention of the municipalities of Thisted and Morsø, and in recent years the planners have become more prone to listen to such arguments.

Inter-municipal and local community cooperation and coordination
The Vilsund bridge connects not only two parts of the country, but also the two municipalities of Thisted and Morsø. Hence, a municipal border runs through the sound of Vilsund. This is clear in all local strategies and plans made by the two municipalities, e.g. their plans only show, on maps, what is inside and what is planned for on their side of the sound, while the other side is left as blank or grey. This is despite the fact that both municipalities have made efforts to create more specialised and place-tailored plans, e.g. efforts to try to map place potentials in new ways that look beyond earlier categorisations and borders inside their municipalities. Apparently, such efforts stop exactly at the municipal border, even though the other side of the border may contain qualities and potentials of obvious relevance to the municipality and its citizens. Whereas such coordination has not found its way into municipal strategies and plans, the planners have become more observant of each other and on discussing potentials for increased coordination and collaboration. They tend to inspire each other and to meet, and recent development efforts in the Vilsund area has created a platform for this interaction, see more below. However, the creation of joint cross-municipal planning for the Vilsund area still seems to be a challenge.

This has not stopped the two local communities on each side of Vilsund in building their strategies, plans and shared development activities. Here, the bridge anniversary in 2014 played an important part in showing, that 'there was no troll under the bridge, after all', as one local actor has mentioned. They have discovered, or perhaps rediscovered, their interdependence. The roll-back of municipal services have also had an important influence on creating incentives for increased local collaboration. For instance, public schools on each side were closed, which led to the start of a private school with pupils from each side of the sound. And, in later years collaboration on local development and strategy-making across the sound has increased significantly.

Resources for local development and planning
In Thisted municipality, resources for planning in the administration has been underfinanced. This has improved lately, resulting in more attention to the facilitation of local development

and planning initiatives. In Morsø and Jammerbugt municipalities, this has had more attention, leading to more experimentation with creating new approaches.

7.2   Policy Implementation

Cultural heritage is, although slowly, becoming part of the municipal agenda for local development and planning. Not much cultural heritage-oriented policy exists at the moment in the municipalities of Thisted, Morsø and Jammerbugt, and there is no real policy for other than tangible cultural heritage (protecting some buildings and constructions). Hence, the current changes in attention, mentioned above, has to do with policymaking and discussions among planners, museums and locals on how cultural heritage aspects may have a potential for entering into policies, thereby adding to or even transforming existing visions and strategies for local coastal development in the area. This is still in its early phases. Cultural heritage-oriented policies are not in place, but new practices seem to be emerging. Also, the primary agenda of local development policies is economy and growth, or rather to avoid degeneration of the local economy. In policies made by municipalities, cultural heritage must be argued primarily in such terms to be integrated, whereas the more citizen-driven strategy-making activities tend to be more socially driven, and more caring for using cultural heritage as part of building local place identity and the local community.

Whereas the Slettestrand and Vilsund localities may still suffer from a lack of municipal cultural heritage-oriented policies (other than the obligation in the municipal plan to 'protect a few buildings'), the same localities illustrate how new arenas for policy and development – and new strategies and plans – seem to create a new scene for citizen-based influences and new types of agendas, as indicated above. In Slettestrand, the building of 'Strategiplan 2030' was based in a new explorative approach where the municipality of Jammerbugt attempted to 'bring more human resources into play' through a 'mobilisation process' consisting of facilitated workshops, interviews, new kinds of 'fuzzy boundary' mapping, etc. This created a new arena for policy-making that informed municipal planning in several ways. In particular, it led to the establishment of a 'model' for citizen-driven and mobilisation-oriented planning in Jammerbugt municipality, called 'Local Development Plans'.

However, and as mentioned above, in 'Strategiplan 2030' the primary focus was limited to 'nature', and hence local cultural heritage actors did not manage to get their say in an otherwise successful bottom-up oriented approach. It can be claimed that an effective arena was created because it led to more local engagement and responsibility as well as the generation of local resources (knowledge and funding). Here, cultural heritage agendas could have emerged and unfolded further, but the opportunity was lost, at least for now, probably because nature-oriented qualities stand out as the main overall attraction of the area.

Similarly, the municipality of Morsø has developed specific strategy-making and planning approaches for villages and rural areas. For instance, the planners have tried to view villages in terms of networks and relations, in particular in order to focus on interdependences and to make the best of each other's potentials and actual capacities. The idea is that villages can reinforce each other through place specialisation. However, and as in Slettestrand, cultural heritage issues tend to have been downplayed in this first round of experimentation and building of new approaches and ultimately of informing new local (municipal) policies.

In both localities, and seen exclusively from a cultural heritage perspective, there are strong indications that the municipalities have, so far, developed 'the right instruments', but 'the wrong focus', and perhaps 'the wrong crowd'. The instruments, here perceived in broad terms as the new generation of more citizen-driven development and strategy-building models mentioned above, have turned out to be successful in activating local knowledge, engagement and resources. However, the focus in those activities have centred on obvious, easily arguable and mostly tangible place qualities, which is not necessarily wrong (in fact it can be claimed a good and exemplary first step), but it still leaves aspects untold and underdeveloped, such as intangible cultural heritage aspects. It goes to show, how cultural heritage may have more difficulty in becoming integrated into policy agendas and actual development processes, compared to traditional and more tangible development ideas. It also indicates, that for cultural heritage to enter the scene with more strength, more attention should be given to cultural heritage stakeholders, their knowledge, and their views on how cultural heritage may actively contribute to forward-looking transformation, and not only to backwards-looking preservation as many other actors in the demos have presumed when faced with cultural heritage aspects in the first place. If such more subtle cultural drivers (but arguably essential to renewing place-identities) are meant to become influential, this also leads to a call for adjustments in the organisation of the next generation of citizen-driven approaches in the area. It implies attention to more deliberative approaches, meaning a more strategic use of participatory settings, where the product of the process (the output), in this case, increased integration and activation of cultural heritage aspects in transforming places, becomes essential. This is in contrast to participatory setups that primarily focuses on the ethics of the process itself, e.g. where success is then considered to be about equality in participation rather than about output. The latter set up types tend to build on perceptions that 'the locals are always right', which for instance makes it difficult for externals, or even locals not usually participating, to introduce new themes, even though such themes may be argued from identifiable local characteristics. Hence, such setups risk 'lock-in' effects (as commonly argued in economic geography and regional innovation studies).

Apart from municipality-driven innovations in planning and facilitating local development, the Vilsund area has shown remarkable attention to build strategies and plans on their own. Each side of the sound has several local masterplans, strategies or visions, produced locally, supported by external funding, and sometimes assisted by consultants. The municipalities have mostly played a role as a participant among many in those, but usually, they have

resulted in some influence on municipal policies over the funding of local projects. This is very much the outcome of strong local networks, social capital and a propensity for self-organisation, in sum two strong local communities. In recent years, and especially after the 2014 bridge anniversary, the two communities have gathered and joined forces. This has led to the establishment of a joint forum, 'Collaboration Forum Vilsund'. It indicates how the two local communities see a need for building a local discussion- and decision-space for themselves, across the municipal border, and as such, they have managed to do more than their respective municipalities. This has even led to a first attempt at a common vision for the area, called 'Turning point Vilsund'. However, cultural heritage aspects were not explicitly included in this document and the focus is mainly oriented towards water sports, based in the new maritime sports centre.

<u>The Vilsund process – a reversed cultural heritage policy implementation process, and the role of science and external knowledge</u>

Compared to the processes mentioned above, the current process in the Vilsund area seems to stand out, as it is, from the beginning, oriented toward cultural heritage aspects and the activation of those in local development and planning. The role of PERICLES cannot be ignored in this. By introducing PERICLES and the potential of increased attention to maritime cultural heritage aspects in local development, local community and development actors saw the opportunity to legitimise and start a process that intends to be made for cultural heritage-oriented policy input to the two municipalities. This has only been possible because of the realisation among both local community actors and municipalities, in advance, that they need each other, that they need and want external help 'to see what they cannot see themselves' and to bring in professional expertise on matters that they recognise as important, but also where they have exhausted their competences.

From the outset, it was not the intention by the AAU-researchers to play a key part in facilitating the process, rather to provide input for this and to assist with citizen science methods. However, as it happens, the municipalities (the heads of planning) see in this an opportunity to get relatively unbiased (meaning: not their own bias) input for building a next (second) and more focused generation of local citizen-driven development and planning processes in both municipalities. By letting AAU-researchers suggest and help design a more deliberative approach to participation, they claim, they say, to stand a better chance with their politicians in legitimising and inspiring them to change policies. The approach is deliberative in the sense that, for instance, it strategically uses key local development and knowledge actors and networks as a basis for legitimising and implementing a wider, but cultural heritage focused, discussion in the area (e.g. by using workshops and citizen science). The purpose (and output) is also clear – to produce policy guidelines and input that helps to integrate cultural heritage into local development.

Also, the two local communities see this as a natural next step in the creation of their own shared space for local policymaking and planning, as well as for adding a deeper cultural perspective to their newly established maritime and water sports centre.

As a consequence, AAU researchers have played a significant role in tailoring the process as well as arguing overall attention to cultural heritage. However, in terms of contents and building actual analyses of local cultural heritage and cultural heritage-oriented input for policy-making, this has mainly been the job of the local museums in collaboration with locals. The museums see this as an opportunity for influencing municipal policymaking in ways they would not have been able to on their own, at least until now. Through the Vilsund process, they get the chance to show their worth in much more proactive ways, providing mostly intangible cultural heritage input for local community building, communities of practice, and actual development processes. This is not entirely new to them, they have previous experience in trying to 'activate cultural heritage' in local development processes in the area, however with less direct links to policy formation. The process has also been agreed upon (sanctioned) and has participation by the municipal planners themselves, in particular in its later phases where identified local cultural heritage elements will be translated into policy guidelines and input. In other words, the Vilsund process builds on cross-bordering local communities of practice and on matching those with cultural heritage expertise. This again informs planners and municipal policymaking.

7.3   Recommendations

1) Cultural heritage issues match well to a trend where 'locals' (residents or users) are seeking (new) ways to see themselves as 'part of the place', e.g. referring to notions of 'sense-of-place' and finding meaning and place-identity.
2) Cultural heritage issues stand a better chance to enter into policy agendas if they are claimed as instrumental in developing and transforming local communities
3) Cultural heritage issues have a significant potential to provide extra needed dimensions to the assumptions in policies of the 'attractiveness of a place' to both tourists, visitors and residents
4) There is a strong need to move beyond traditional perceptions of tangible cultural heritage and limited views of their protection only. In particular, the potential of intangible cultural heritage elements should be matched with and explored further in actual local development settings.
5) Policy processes for local development can benefit significantly from deliberative 'mobilisation' approaches and from realising the importance of building policies based in local communities and their organisation, culture and practices.
6) Integrating cultural heritage into such processes (ad 5) requires caution, as cultural heritage aspects can easily be given lower priority by most parties. Here, the combination

of external and local knowledge and experience on cultural heritage relevance to local development can assist in agenda-setting.

7) Cultural heritage practitioners and experts seem to have the most influence when they create alliances with local communities and show their worth through assisting locals directly in building cultural heritage aspects into the analysis of local place qualities and ultimately into citizen-driven strategies.

8. Estonia

8.1 Policy Themes

The Estonian demos are developing participatory processes aimed at incorporating cultural heritage into ongoing MSP efforts and investigating ways to ensure cultural heritage is protected. They also include work on viable means to continue development and employment for locals which includes and protects aspects of their unique culture.

The main policy theme is the Pärnu county maritime spatial plan that was implemented in 2017. Wrecks and other underwater cultural objects that are not national monuments will be treated as national monuments (not to be harmed). In case of the discovery of new objects, they will be treated with care and will be unharmed before their cultural value is ascertained. According to the plan, there will be cultural heritage preservation area in the Bay of Livonia in case preservation of an object is impossible *in situ*. The exact location of this area will be selected when the need for it arises. This area should not be deeper than 20-30 m and should not cover shipping routes or other planning sectors (e.g. offshore energy). This area could be used as a diving tourism destination in the future. Lighthouses are also marked in the plan as historical-cultural objects.

Kihnu cultural space was inscribed as UNESCO intangible cultural heritage in 2008. In the small islands, local traditional activities are used as touristic destinations (e.g. stone shipbuilding in island of Kihnu).

In 2003 Pärnu county thematic spatial plan "Environmental conditions that determine inhabitation and land use" was implemented and valuable landscapes with historical-cultural value were appointed in the Sea Park of Kihnu Strait (Kihnu Väina Merepark). The island of Ruhnu is covered with national maritime spatial plan, which is in the stage of public display and will be implemented in October 2020. The main objectives and methods of protecting known and presently unknown underwater cultural heritage is the same as in the Pärnu county maritime spatial plan. In the national maritime spatial plan county portraits have been compiled according to the

Remains of Kihnu stone ship in the port of Rohuküla.. © Maili Roio

most important sectors in every county. Ruhnu is a part of Saare county, which is characterised as a place with strong local identity and different activities directed to the sea (ports, harbours and shipbuilding, sailing, producing food of maritime products). As one of the historical characteristics of the county, Vikings have been mentioned in the county portrait. All this can be to some extent used in Ruhnu island, too, but during the making of the maritime spatial plan, this island has not been separately emphasised, which can be a future perspective.

The biggest risks stated by local stakeholders in a questionnaire for PERICLES project were the damage caused by tourists on the one hand, but also fading of life in the islands due to the lack of jobs and other economic activities. Tourism is highly seasonal in small islands. in the winter many people live on the continent and do other work. This is how life is kept up in the islands even when economic activities are seasonal. The risk of too many tourists is tried to deal with in the national spatial plans (maritime, but also land-based), where communities are approached to map their landscape. In the small islands, local traditional activities are used as touristic destinations, for example, stone shipbuilding in the island of Kihnu,

Local maritime rescue is compiled of the women of the island of Kihnu. © Maili Roio

8.2 Policy Implementation

With underwater cultural heritage, the policy is followed according to the instructions by the National Heritage Board of Estonia. Everything connected to Kihnu cultural space is very well organised and controlled by local cultural associations Kihnu mere selts (Kihnu Maritime Association) and Kihnu kultuuriruum (Kihnu Cultural Space). Tourism on the island is organised

according to policies and different cultural events to present Kihnu culture take place mostly during the summer season. Leaders of those associations participate as stakeholders in several international projects which concern cultural heritage.

8.3 Recommendations

1) While Kihnu culture is well presented and used in tourism, the cultural characteristics of other small islands in the study area remain less known and presented. Therefore, in future policies (e.g. the island of Ruhnu in the national maritime spatial plan) unique cultural characteristics of other micro-areas of the Livonian Bay could also be emphasised more to use this information for touristic purposes, but also to preserve traditions as intangible heritage.

2) Distinct cultural features form a very important part in implementing different policies, including the maritime spatial plan of Pärnu county (for Kihnu) and the national MSP (for Ruhnu). It is important to map even more cultural threads which can be used in the future MSPs, but also in land-based spatial plans when land-based objects are concerned.

3) Intangible cultural heritage is also a very important part that should be encompassed in spatial plans, and future work in the project will be concerned mainly with mapping cultural heritage and intangible cultural heritage in both small islands.

9. France

9.1 Policy Themes

The French demos are conducted in Brittany, with one of the main activities is to support the Maritime Regional Park, PNRGM, regarding cultural heritage. The following results come from interviews with regional and district public authorities, mayors and the park of Morbihan and the workshop organised in November 2020 by PNRGM where almost the same actors were present, plus the regional authorities' "tourism and CH" and conservatoire du littoral who is in charge of managing and protecting the coastal areas. There are several policy themes associated with the French demos.

Coastal Risk
Two coastal risks were highlighted during the interviews: storms and sea-level rise linked to climate change. The main consequence of these two phenomena is flood risks. Flood risk is taken into account by "flood risk prevention plans" which are aiming the definition of areas directly or indirectly exposed to flood risks to regulate land use. Urbanization can be forbidden within these areas. They are based on vulnerability maps allowing the identification and localisation of risks to facilitate the application of appropriate prevention measures. The "flood risk prevention plan" is referring to culture heritage without giving it a priority. The ranking of risks by priority order is the following: human issues (personal safety, human life, etc.), structural issues (water and communication networks, access routes, etc.) and economic issues (business parks, etc.) and, finally, cultural heritage issues. These plans are integrated into territorial planning documents, such as urban planning and constitute the main tools of action for risk at the local level.

Consideration of heritage in planning policies
In France, planning policies, integrating maritime heritage or not, are present at different levels. At the national level, there is the Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) implemented in the four French seafronts through the 4 strategic seafront documents. The implementation of the MSP is complementary to existing sectoral policies and requires a coherent articulation of other available planning documents. MSP is implemented on a macroscopic scale and doesn't take into account the maritime heritage. Because its main objective is to define the Sea and Coastal Strategy of France to ensure environmental protection and encourage blue growth. On a lower scale, Regional Natural Parks are representing good planning tools. For example, the Natural Park of Golf of Morbihan (PNRGM) charter includes an axis and orientation report which specifies the priority measures of: (1) protection of the environment and its heritage, (2) sustainable spatial planning, (3) economic and social development respecting the balance between environment and its natural and built heritage and (4) public education and training.

This charter requires consistency and continuity in the measures implemented on the territory. It provides an initial lever for the protection of the heritage and landscapes.

Probably the best tool for integrating maritime heritage at the local level is the "*sea enhancement schemes*" (*Schéma de Mise en Valeur de la Mer - SMVM*). SMVM implementation allows an effective regulation of activities impacting natural heritage. Measures for the sustainable development of the territory allow indirectly to better take into account built maritime heritage.

Cale, môle et perche, Crac'h © Laurent Picard

Lack of knowledge and recognition of heritage

The lack of knowledge and recognition of maritime heritage was also mentioned by the interviewees and participants at the workshop. Many people are not aware of the regulations and uses associated with the preservation of cultural and heritage. Incivilities and lack of resources of control and monitoring are added to the lack of knowledge. This lack of awareness concerns mainly "*small heritage*" (*petit patrimoine*) elements which do not benefit from the same recognition as traditional heritage elements listed or classified as Historic Monuments or archaeological remains. The dissemination of knowledge from archaeological and/or heritage studies is relatively low. This does not help to promote heritage to the public.

Complex management of the maritime heritage on the public maritime domain

Most of the maritime and coastal heritage is located in the public maritime domain. This space, owned by the State, is inalienable. Exemptions are however granted for the exercise of

certain traditional activities (shellfish farming, fishing, etc.) or tourist and leisure activities (restaurants, yachting, etc.). Thus, in Locmariaquer municipality (case study), there are infrastructures related to oyster farming (holds, basins, building sites, medians, etc.) throughout the public maritime domain. These infrastructures are necessary for the practice of this primary activity. They are, therefore, authorised by derogation and subject to conditions. Temporary occupation permits are granted by the State, which requires "the return to the natural state" in case of cessation of the activity. Thus implies the destruction of all built infrastructure on the coast and at sea. Some of these developments are old, sometimes more than several decades, and now belong to the local landscape and contribute to the identity of these places and spaces. Some, such as medians, also contribute to the fight against erosion. They are viewed by the local habitants and tourists as part of cultural heritage elements of interest but their management is still complex:

(i) In the case of cessation of activity all built infrastructure on the public maritime domain; practised thanks to temporary occupation permits, should be demolished or destroyed. This administrative and regulatory constraint may generate a risk for the maintenance and preservation of the "small heritage" because no management strategy is available;
(ii) To obtain a temporary occupation permit, shellfish farmers wishing to build infrastructures on the public maritime domain should make an application to the maritime district authorities (named DDTM). However, the authorization to construct the infrastructures is given by the municipality based on the rules of the local urban planning plans. This double entry is often a source of confusion;
(iii) A lack of coherence between the different State services, regarding maritime heritage located on the public maritime domain, is observed. Facilities and infrastructures are often at the core of disagreements between the regional bodies in charge of culture affairs (who wish to preserve heritage), the environment affairs (who wish to see the public maritime domain return to its natural state and impose the destruction of infrastructures) and the marines' affairs-DDTM (which is intended to be the responsible of the public maritime domain).

Lack of reference and the competent authority
The definition of maritime heritage, in France, is complex. Each State administration has its own definition according to their competences and action and it varies from one individual to another, according to his point of view and interest. For many interviewees, there is a lack of a competent reference authority dedicated to maritime cultural heritage. For them, this new entity could be responsible, among other things, for defining cultural heritage and its evolution over time according to the new social issues; implementing coherent and harmonised heritage preservation measures and actions on a territorial scale, etc.

The plurality of bodies involved in the management of maritime heritage
The plurality of bodies and their natures (state entities, municipalities, public bodies involved in natural protection such as the "coastal conservatory reinforces the complexity of sustainable management of maritime and coastal heritage. The mosaic of structures involved

in cultural heritage issues and the resulting administrative complexity generates confusion which is counterproductive in the management of maritime heritage.

Underutilisation of existing tools

According to the authorities, the tools used at the local level to protect heritage are not adapted to sustainable management. The lack of specific tools for cultural heritage management generates a wrong use of the available planning tools. At the local level, the urban code is often used for protection purposes but it is not adapted to such use and offers weak and unsustainable protection to maritime heritage.

Lack of an overall strategy for sustainable heritage management

Based on the observation that heritage protection is generally a matter of local political will, it appears difficult to implement a large-scale cultural heritage preservation program. The Ministry of Culture has not established a global strategy for the identification and protection of maritime heritage for example. Existing strategies generally concern a particular type of cultural heritage and are implemented on a national level without taking into account local specificities.

Pont Suspendu Le Bono © Irène Béguier

<u>Lack of funding and resources</u>

Lack of funding and resources is the main obstacle to the sustainable management of maritime heritage. According to the various stakeholders interviewed, local level (municipality) is the best scale for managing risks and maritime heritage. But municipalities possess low financial, technical and human resources. The lack of resources does not allow the implementation of the controls and monitoring essential for maritime heritage sustainable management. The lack of resources also makes compulsory the definition of a strategy prioritizing cultural heritage, because their number is too high in relation to the costs of restoration and maintenance.

9.2 Policy Implementation

According to the expert interviewees, decentralization of risk management to the local level is the best solution because it is the most relevant and appropriate level for implementing effective risk management measures. However, the risk prevention plans used to manage risks do not aim for the preservation of maritime heritage but human lives. Although cultural heritage is mentioned in these plans, little protection is given. According to the local stakeholders, these plans are not taken into account when defining and implementing prevention, protection and cultural heritage preservation measures.

Sustainable management of maritime heritage is more or less integrated into planning documents (urban plans, etc.) and depends on the objectives of each of these documents, planning strategies and geographical areas. MSP takes little account of maritime heritage. The "*strategic seafront documents*" are too macroscopic tools to effectively integrate maritime heritage. Their main purpose is to present the socio-economic and environmental stakes. Cultural heritage issues, that are important from an economic point of view (tourism, culture, etc.), are also considered. For example, the "*strategic seafront document*", which includes the Gulf of Morbihan, emphasises the quality of the landscape but without presenting any detailed measures for its sustainable management. Moreover, these documents essentially concentrate on sea areas and elements located on the coastline and the public maritime domain are little or not taken into account.

The management of the public maritime domain is an important problem because it is located at the land-sea interface. However, the lack of coordination between the various State administrations makes difficult the preservation and the management of built maritime heritage located in this area. A contradictory position between public administrations is observed when it comes to the built heritage, especially when it deals with temporary occupation permits. Better integration of policies related to coastal management and the preservation of natural and built heritage could lead to better preservation of the maritime heritage.

The rehabilitation of the oyster cultural heritage of the Bono municipality (Gulf of Morbihan) was often mentioned in interviews as a good example. This example of best practice shows how a good collaboration between local elected officials (politicians) and the state administration allowed the restoration and enhancement of abandoned oyster sites and infrastructures and put an end to the conflicts that arose at the beginning of the project in the municipality. This cultural heritage is now an educational trail on the theme of oyster farming.

Educational trail on the theme of oyster farming at Le Bono municipality (Gulf of Morbihan), Pluneret © Sybill Henry and Katia Frangoudes

At the local level, planning policies are mainly the local urban plans in which cultural heritage is identified but unfortunately are not good management tools. Even if the cultural heritage of interest is identifying by a "star" in the urban plans; no regulatory constraints are taken in case of non-maintenance and protection. The protection generated by urban plans is weak and not very effective.

The *sea development scheme* seems (*Schéma de mise en valeur de la mer –* SMVM) is the most relevant tool to protect maritime heritage, because it is integrating different policies at the territorial level. The objectives of SMVM are to reconcile the development of maritime economic and recreational activities and the preservation of natural or remarkable spaces to enhance coastal areas. However, this tool is very little used, even though it allows: (i) to regulate activities that have an impact on the environment (sustainable landscape management) and (ii) to raise awareness of sustainable territorial development approaches (sustainable management of maritime heritage). Moreover, it is noted that, when it exists, it is not easily integrated into urban plans. The planning documents are not flexible and are difficult to link up with effective tools in terms of management.

Minoterie Pont Sal, Pluneret © Irène Béguier

Among these tools, there are: (i) classification procedures for historic monuments, remarkable heritage sites, etc. regulated by the cultural heritage code; (ii) natural parks (regional or marine natural) reserves and others under the frame of environment code; (iii) definition of "sensitive natural areas" under the frame of urban planning code and (iv) planification and urban document impacting indirectly cultural heritage.

These strong protection tools are under the frame of cultural heritage and environmental codes (Acts). They are often used in an integrative approach for cultural heritage protection. In this case, decision making is dominated by general interests and site classification protection procedures are long. According to the interviewed experts, the average time for such type of classification is 10 years because the procedure itself requires at least three years to be performed: 1 year to realise the study, 1 year for public consultation and 1 year for the institutional phase. To counter this administrative length, legal tools are often diverted from their primary objectives to allow rapid protection of the threatened cultural heritage. The process of declaration of interest allows rapid protection but without being supported by management measures. As a result, these emergency measures are not fully effective.

9.3   Recommendations

1) Defining maritime and coastal heritage:
   Maritime heritage must be defined jointly with all stakeholders and policymakers (politicians and managers). The study (identification, inventory, qualification) of cultural heritage must be carried out at several scales, from local to territorial, regional and national.

2) Defining a coherent geographical entity:
   The definition of a specific geographical entity will allow to encompass the entire maritime heritage in an entity of its own. Planning tools can be used to define this territory in coherence with available territorial measures (especially those initiated by the region).

3) Promoting local cultural heritage management:
   The local scale seems to be the most relevant for effective and integrated management of maritime heritage. However, the promotion of this local management requires enough financial, technical and legal tools and resources within the municipalities. Also specific legal tools will have to assist municipalities in the management of maritime heritage belonging to private owners.

4) Encourage the consultation of all stakeholders (associations, citizens, elected officials, trade unions, etc.):
   The implementation of the consultation phase to design the strategies towards maritime heritage preservation should encourage the involvement of stakeholders to ensure success. The consultation phases can be supplemented by mediation and/or awareness-raising measures aimed at all publics (tourist population, schoolchildren, etc.).

5) Define a common strategy for managing cultural heritage:
   Small-scale management strategies are not intended to be prescriptive. They make possible to give precise definitions (cf. recommendation 1) and to preserve a coherent geographical entity (cf. recommendation 2). The definition of a global maritime heritage management strategy will make it possible to define and implement actions at the local level (cf. recommendation 3) with all the stakeholders in the area (cf. recommendation 4). These common strategies will make possible to establish harmonised and precise action programmes targeting all maritime and coastal heritage (as opposed to current protection strategies which are carried out on a case-by-case basis and by type of cultural heritage. Example: the lighthouses of Brittany, etc.).

6) Improving the articulation and coherence of existing tools:
   Several tools are identifying and listing cultural heritage (inventories, etc.) but they need to be more coherent with each other. A diachronic approach of inventories must be taken to make them fully effective as tools for the preservation of maritime heritage. A reduction in the number of protection tools should improve this coherence.

7) Develop specific protection tools adapted to cultural heritage:
   The implementation of a specific tool adapted to the maritime heritage will enable stronger and more sustainable protection. Thus, planning tools, often used by default for

cultural heritage protection, will be able to link up with these new tools to make protection more efficient.

8) Softening the existing policies:

Make the implementation of certain planning tools more flexible to allow a better consideration of local cultural heritage by adapting to local specificities. This will also reduce the delay and procedures for classification.

9) Create a reference entity for the cultural heritage:

The establishment of an entity fully dedicated to cultural heritage would allow for a better representation of cultural heritage issues within the authorities defining strategies and objectives of planning documents.

10) Preserving the memory of what can't be preserved:

Cultural heritage is not immutable and the implementation of strategies for the sustainable management of maritime heritage (cf. recommendation 5) requires prioritisation of the issues and associated resources. It is, therefore, necessary to keep the memory of abandoned cultural heritage.

11) Managing anthropic pressure on natural and cultural heritage sites of tourist interest:

There are many existing tools for managing anthropogenic pressures and channelling the public to preserve and improve the quality of natural sites of landscape or cultural heritage interest. On a local level, the application of these type of protection policies can be encouraged, for example by developing car parks (out of the protecting areas), regulating the number of entrances, reducing the opening periods of sites, setting up labels (such as the "Grand site de France" label) or registration as "Historic Monuments".

12) Good practices:

There are many examples of successful sustainable management of maritime heritage at different scales. The implementation of new actions should take into consideration these good practices and different feedback. On a local scale, the Gulf of Morbihan has already witnessed successful experiences concerning rehabilitation and/or sustainable management of cultural heritages. One of them is the example of the rehabilitation of oyster farm heritage at Bono into an educational trail or the transformation of the semaphore of Locmariaquer into a sailing school, etc.

10. The Netherlands

10.1 Policy Themes

The Waddensea area has a complex governance structure, with an international, national and sub-national structure. In PERICLES focus is on the Dutch Wadden Sea area, and on the topics: coastal defence (dikes), nature and fisheries, cultural heritage and interactive governance. The international component is firstly that the Waddensea is the largest tidal flats system in the world and because of its unique geological and ecological values it is listed as a UNESCO World Heritage site. It stretches out for the coasts of Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands. The UNESCO site is managed under the Common Wadden Sea Secretariat. Fisheries in the area are partly managed under the Common Fisheries Policy (EU), partly by national fisheries policy (for fisheries within the 12nm territorial waters). Nature and environmental policy is managed at EU level under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (achieving Good Environmental Status) and the Water Framework Directive (achieving good water quality) and N2000 (protection of vulnerable habitats and species). These directives are international (EU) guidelines implemented nationally by the member states.

Waddensea is listed as a UNESCO World Heritage site because of its unique geological and ecological values. © Wageningen University

At the national level, two ministries are responsible for different aspects of nature and fisheries policy in the Netherlands: The Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Safety (responsible for fisheries and nature policy) and the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management (responsible for water policy; water quality, protection against the sea, and spatial management). Rijkswaterstaat is an important organisation in the Netherlands, responsible for the implementation of the infrastructure and water policies (for instance maintaining the dikes). The ministry responsible for cultural heritage is the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. The implementation of the heritage policy is done by the Cultural Heritage Agency. State forest management (Staatsbosbeheer) is another important actor, in charge of managing many of the nature areas (national parks) for the Dutch Government.

At sub-national level, there are three provinces involved (Noord Holland, Friesland and Groningen) and 14 municipalities (5 island municipalities: Texel, Vlieland, Terschelling, Ameland and Schiermonnikoog; and 9 municipalities on the mainland: Den Helder, Hollands Kroon, Sûdwest Fryslân, Harlingen, Waadhoeke, Noardeast Fryslân, Het Hogeland, Delfzijl, Oldambt). The provinces are responsible for implementing nature policy (for instance N2000) in their areas. Another important structure in the Netherlands is the water boards (Waterschappen). These are among the oldest forms of local governance (13th century). Waterboards are responsible for local water management, taking care of flood control; managing the beaches and dikes along the coast to maintain the safety on the islands and the coastal areas from the sea as well as managing the water level and outlet of sweet water onto the sea. There are 4 waterboards in the Wadden area: Wetterskip Fryslân, Noorderzijlvest, Hunze en Aa's and Hollands Noorderkwartier.

As the Dutch government has assessed that the governance of the Waddensea area is very complex ('governmental spaghetti') it has created the Governance Authority Wadden (Beheerautoriteit Wadden) in 2019. The task of this institution is to coordinate the nature, fisheries and water management tasks of the Netherlands as well as the responsibilities towards UNESCO for the Wadden sea area, thereby bringing all responsible parties (two ministries and three provinces and municipalities) under one roof. In addition, two consultation platforms have also come into place: Management consultation platform Waddenarea (Bestuurlijk overleg waddengebied) and a stakeholder consultation platform (Omgevingsberaad Waddengebied). This new institution has already been criticized as having a lack of funds and power (Eenhoorn 2019).

From this description of the governance structure it has become clear that there are many policies affecting the Waddensea area; international treaties, EU policy, national policy and sub-national policies directed at area management (land and sea), nature conservation, managing different uses of the area (fisheries, but also shipping, tourism, oil and gas etc.), heritage (natural and cultural). An attempt to bring many of these policy-ambitions together is a document The Netherlands is currently working on: the Area agenda Wadden 2050 (Gebiedsagenda Wadden 2050).

Demo Coastal adaption planning

In this demo we will look at the plan of local inhabitants from the coastal town Holwerd, to burst the 11th century dike, create a storm surge barrier and a flushing basin in order to bring back tidal activity and to connect the Waddensea with the Frysian lakes. Bursting this dike and flooding the characteristic polder is a bold plan, and counters the general approach in the Netherlands to keep the (salt) water out. It does fit with the relatively new approach 'Ruimte voor de Rivier' for water management of the great rivers in the Netherlands. By creating more space for water, risks of flooding inhabited areas are reduced. It also resonates with the fish-migration-river (vismigratierivier), where a connection is re-established between Lake IJssel and the Waddensea, allowing fish to pass freely, instead of bumping in the hard barrier of the Afsluitdijk (the main dike installed in 1932 between North Holland and Friesland, changing the Zuiderzee (salt water) into Lake Ijssel (sweet water).

What is interesting about this plan is that it is a local plan. Local inhabitants of the Waddensea area have the feeling that many people from outside the area make all the decisions, affecting their lives. Yet at the same time, bottom-up approaches to governance have been idealized without substantial research in the Wadden region to back up these assumptions. A case-study of the Holwerd at Sea project, to examine value integration of a bottom-up citizen-led governance process through the lens of spatial imaginaries may uncover whether this approach does, in fact, improve integration of local values in decision-making.

The risks dealt with in this demo are related to coastal protection, salination and climate change (flooding). The risk the local inhabitants wish to solve is the marginalization of their community as well as top-down governance (lack of participation). The municipalities in the North of Friesland and Groningen wrestle with decreasing populations due to lack of opportunities, which are then exacerbated by the fact that people move out. By this project, they aim for more economic activity (tourism), job creation and thereby to contribute to improved livability of the community to maintain and increase social (health care, wellbeing) and cultural services.

Demo Traditional fishing practices

In this demo, we map the cultural heritage of fishing communities in the Waddensea area, based on the gross list (which we will develop with fishing community members). To do this we first need to define fishing communities map them and then, with local inhabitants, map the cultural heritage of their fishing community. We will need to develop a methodology to do this. The mapping will take place on the cultural heritage portal of the PERICLES project.

Increasingly there is an understanding that fisheries management and management of the marine environment strongly relates to people and society, and that this requires explicit

attention of policymakers to prevent unintended consequences of the policy. Fishing as an activity not only impacts the natural environment but contributes to society; it provides jobs, fish as food, contributes to the (local) economy, but in addition to that also is of (in)direct value for coastal communities (some dependent on fishing) and contributes to societal wellbeing in many ways. Thus the rules that are made on how fish are caught, by whom and when not only has consequences for the impact on the environment but also influences the societal outcomes. Rules can, for instance, strengthen or undermine the resilience of coastal communities.

The CFP has a couple of social objectives, but compared to ecological and economic objectives these are much less operationalized. This makes ex-ante explicit considerations of social outcomes of policy measures more difficult, often resulting in unintended consequences of policy measures. The need to develop indicators that allow for explicit trade-off analysis of possible policy measures has been recognized at ICES, resulting in the start of WGSOCIAL (of which some of us in PERICLES are a member). Cultural heritage can be seen as one of such social indicators. By then putting this cultural heritage of fishing communities on the map, makes this societal impact of fisheries (from the past till date) visible. This demo contributes to highlighting the social value of fisheries in order for it to be weighed in better in policy decisions on management measures of fisheries. Thereby it can contribute to preventing negative social consequences of fisheries management decisions.

DEMO M.3 Governance of fishing and nature protection (link with Visual Problem Appraisal)

In this demo we sim to use the visual problem appraisal tool in a governance process in the Waddensea area. Visual Problem Appraisal (VPA) is a film-based learning strategy with ethnographic, deliberative and artistic aspects, which aims to enhance the problem analysis of complex issues and to facilitate the development of actions. VPA creates a space for social dialogue.

A VPA set is made up of a series of filmed stakeholder portraits and accompanying documentaries. The framework for a The VPA will follow the argument elaborated by Fabinyi et al. (2010) that recognizing complexity requires further unravelling of the diversity of, and nuance in opinions and views to countervail often assumed homogenous interpretations of important actor groups like fishers, locals, tourists and policymakers. The Netherlands has a long history of controversies of fisheries, nature conservation and economic development of the Wadden Sea Area. Diverse stakeholders (citizens, managers, fishers, tourists, policymakers and others) have diverse framings of the area, of required developments and issues at stake. Similar to other coastal areas governance in Europe we often recognize a dichotomy between nature and culture. With this VPA we search to create new images, narratives and dialogues. We depart from the quality of cultural heritage to show connections over centuries as we bring on stage how people lived and worked in close relation with the existing natural systems and land and seascapes and how this resounds in contemporary communities, cultures and

practices. One of the concrete cases where we think we can apply this method is the dialogue sessions between fisheries and nature preservation. Risks are on the one hand socio-cultural and economic risks of fisheries being curtailed too much versus on the other hand the environmental quality of the area if fisheries impact is more than the environment can take. The VPA methodology might also resolve governance-process risks, as it might solve two well-known problems: a shortage of time and means for stakeholders to participate (stakeholder fatigue) and the fact that often the same people participate in diverse arenas (the usual suspects). Demos 2 and 3 are linked and will further be discussed as one.

10.2 Policy Implementation

Demo Coastal adaption planning

This demo is an interesting case of changing the dominant approach of protection against flooding. The dominant approach is to make the dikes higher, where a dike will be breached. How will the risk of flooding be managed? But it might also alter the perception of inhabitants about the link and ties with the Waddensea. Friesland and Groningen have high dikes to protect the hinterland and inhabitants (with the exception of the harbours and fishing communities) live with their back towards the sea. This Holwerd aan Zee project will re-establish a connection between the hinterland (and lakes) in Friesland and the Waddensea. By re-establishing a link between land and sea, it might also help bridge between the nature and culture divide (see below). The demo focusses on understanding the differences in imagined landscapes and on how bottom-up initiatives are integrated in governance processes. Will the project remain bottom-up? Was it truly bottom up? How does the plan fit in, and tie up to the different policies?

Demos: Traditional fishing practices & Governance of fishing and nature protection

The implementation of the many policies affecting nature conservation and fisheries in the Waddensea area in the Netherlands is organised via convenants: agreements on main topics and goals between different stakeholder groups, which then need to be operationalised further. The convenants (used since 2008) proposed a solution to the previous situation where perceptions on how to manage fisheries were widely apart, with disputes over the science and where the government would give out permits for fishing which were then contested in court by nature organisations (Floor 2018). The progression on implementing of the convenants is mixed but seems to become more difficult in recent years. The complexity of the topic is huge; there are a plethora of actors and ever since the 1970s there is a polarised debate on how to manage the area and to balance economic use and nature conservation. Although high-level goals seem to be in accordance to the many stakeholder groups, yet the perceptions as to what the goals mean and which steps are needed to reach

them differ (see De Koning and Steins 2019 for the mussel fishery case). Also, the underlying knowledge is often contested or interpreted differently (Floor 2018).

Terschelling Island in the Dutch Waddensea © Wageningen University

One possible solution is to overcome the nature-culture dichotomy, which seems to underlie the issue and to define the area as an 'agricultural-maritime landscape' (Egberts 2018). Currently, the boundaries of the UNESCO site underline the nature-culture divide, by only including the 'wet area' (sea). The Waddensea is also often framed as 'unspoilt nature' influencing people's perception. However, the Waddensea is a perfect example of a 'transgressive coastal landscape' that became what it is today due to the interaction between nature and man. There is no topic where this artificial nature-culture divide and focus on the frame 'unspoilt nature' can be better felt than in fisheries. Policy is focussing on the protection of natural values, without weighing in what the socio-cultural significance is of fisheries. In Demo 2 we will gather evidence of fishing cultural heritage in coastal communities in the Dutch Waddensea area and 'put fishing communities on the map'. In Demo 3 we will search to create new images, narratives and dialogues.

10.3 Recommendations

The recommendations from these are not clear yet but have been established in such ways that policy learning will arise once these demos are fully completed For example, the **demo on Coastal adaption planning** is set up to understand whether this approach (a bottom-up plan) does improve the integration of local values into decision-making.

The other demos are set up to promote better understanding, valuation and expression of cultural heritage in fisheries and nature policy in the Waddensea, aiming to broaden the discussion and hopefully altering the nature-culture dichotomy.

11. Conclusions and Next Steps

Despite the geographical and thematic variation between the demos, the reporting on policy aspects has suggested that several strong common themes concerning policy are emerging.

There was a sense across demos that there is a lack of attention to coastal and maritime cultural heritage in policies. Some cultural heritage is overlooked (Northern Ireland, Scotland, Denmark, Portuga, Estonia, & France) and in many case regions, there is a lack of protection for heritage, especially maritime heritage and particularly intangible heritage. There is a need for coastal and maritime cultural heritage to be given higher priority than it currently has, and a particularly urgent need for policy to provide a safety net for at-risk heritage before it is lost (as stressed in work from the French demos).

Basic issues concerning governance and policy formation arose that require addressing for policy concerning coastal and marine cultural heritage to be more effective. Work on the PERICLES demos has exposed a lack of clarity with regards to heritage in policy, including a lack of clarity in basic definitions of terms (France demos).   Deficiencies in the integration of cultural heritage into policy and the need for improvement in this was also emphasised (e.g Portugal demos & Malta demos), as was the need for more effective governance and transparency. Decisions favouring economic growth over heritage conservation have received specific criticism and improvements in governance and transparency would help to remedy this.

The exclusion of communities in the governance of their heritage was another frequently criticized aspect. In some countries, this is established in law, although the effectiveness of the realisation of this can vary. Communities and their opinions are often overlooked (e.g. the demos in Scotland and Northern Ireland) and there can be a lack of benefit for communities in major heritage development projects (Northern Ireland). There is a need to improve participation in policy formation and to mobilise communities in the governance of their heritage.

When it comes to policy implementation, there is a need for better coordination and cooperation in the implementation of policy with regards to coastal and maritime cultural heritage and that there is a lack of funding to implement policies effectively.

Work on PERICLES demos that will further explore policy-related aspects and contribute to the improvement of CMCH policy and its implementation is ongoing. Each of the case regions has research activities planned to resume when they can safely do so, after suspension due to COVID-19.

The demo on **Exploring Maritime Industrial Heritage (Belfast)** will include a tourist survey to assess tourist attitudes towards the various maritime heritage narratives. This will reveal

attitudes towards the heritage aspects of tourism and development policies which are focused on the Titanic narrative and provide recommendations as to how community heritage can be effectively integrated into these going forward. The survey was originally intended to be conducted through EastSide Visitor Centre in Summer 2020. At this stage, the survey is still planned, but it is unclear if it will be postponed or considered for dissemination via alternative means due to COVID-19.

The demo on **Diversity in Landings and Local Food: Rejuvenating Inshore Fisheries (West Coast of Scotland)** the role of cultural fishing heritage is going to be examined for different suppliers along the food chain with particular interest on the local food processing industry. Interviews are delayed because of COVID19 and it is possible that not all of the planned interviews will be carried out. Interviews will involve also officers working for the Argyll County Council.

For the **Portuguese demos**, capacity building activities with *moliceiros* tourist guides are being prepared in order to raise awareness to the importance of preserving and communicating cultural heritage. In order to maximize their usefulness to tourist operators, the stakeholders have been involved in the co-design of the courses' contents. Coastal and maritime cultural heritage in Ria de Aveiro region is being collected and mapped, and will be available in the PERICLES portal, filling one of the gaps identified by stakeholders. Citizen science mapping activities with local communities and schools will be organised to promote the use of the portal and raise awareness on CMCH, using an intra and intergenerational approach. Gastronomic products and heritage are being identified and will be included in a culinary itinerary. In addition, several dissemination and education materials are being produced, such as:

- An informative guide on cultural heritage surrounding the Aveiro city canals, in collaboration with local stakeholders;
- A short animation video about CMCH in Ria de Aveiro region;
- A booklet about CMCH in Ria de Aveiro region for visitors (national and foreign);
- An ethnographic documentary.

Also, a participatory risk assessment will discuss mitigation measures for the risks associated with the demo on **Salt Cultural Heritage – From Mono to Multifunctional Anthropogenic Landscape** using a participatory framework developed by PERICLES, with the aim of informing decision-making.

Due to COVID-19, the demo on **Fishing for Recipes. The Fish Festival Mir-Raħal tas-Sajjieda or Festa Ħut** has to be placed on hold for some time, as it is uncertain when it would be possible to have a festival in Malta. At the moment, the coming festival in September 2020 might be cancelled and we will look at other opportunities in Spring and Autumn 2021. Having said this, the work planned so far aims to develop the different initiatives that take within festivals -

follow the fish stands, fishermen wives performing show cooking, a repository of culinary marine heritage recipes. All these initiatives involve community participation and interaction, and can be linked to policies that aim to encourage sustainable fish consumption and preservation of traditional food recipes linked to the sea.

The demo on **Stories of the Waterfront: Digitally Guided Tours in and Around Marsaxlokk Bay** is ongoing and progressing well. Time availability and technologies are good factors during the lockdown and more items and itineraries are been created via the platform izi.TRAVEL. The aim is to have the tours tested and ready by summer so they can be widely promoted. Looking at how this demo can linked to policy issues, it is possible to relate this demo to issues related to the visibility and promotion of tangible but especially intangible heritage in coastal areas, policies in tourism and promotion of destinations that are not fully involving or engaging local communities, as well as policies for sustainable tourism development to better control the flows of tourists. In that regards, this demo can be broadly speaking addressing issues related to sustainable development.

The demo on **Stakeholder Workshop in Marine Cultural Heritage** aims to monitor how communities of participation and communities of meaning interact and participate in the analysis and discussions of their maritime heritage, as well as developing the demos and other initiatives beyond PERICLES. It is in a way, a demo that addresses issues related to stakeholders engagement and participation, providing spaces for action and for reflection in the sense of how participation and collaborations should be happening more often.

For the demo **Integration of CH into Development and Blue Growth Plans/Strategies in Transboundary Decision-Making**, the workplan for the Vilsund process is being revised alongside developments in the COVID-19 crisis. Workshop 1 – What is CMCH in Vilsund? Is currently scheduled for June but is likely to be postponed further. This workshop will initiate the citizen science phase of data collection and will feed into analysis and potentials for activating cultural heritage. Workshop 2 – How to Activate CMCH in Vilsund? will be developed from this, which will lead to the final analysis and policy input.

Future work in the **Estonian demos** will include bringing out the cultural characteristics of other micro-areas of the Livonian Bay so that this material could be used in future policies. Information will be collected during local stakeholder workshops in Kihnu and Ruhnu islands. Since Ruhnu is less presented and highlighted in maritime spatial plans, it is necessary to collect information on Ruhnu cultural heritage that could be used in future policies.

In **France**, PNRGM organised an exchange workshop in November 2019 which brought together decision makers (Mayors), scientists and administration civil servants responsible either to manage maritime public domain, cultural heritage, environment and municipalities. The workshop objective was to share a global vision of the issues related to the enhancement of the built maritime heritage in Gulf of Morbihan. In order to continue the dynamic initiated

in 2019, additional meetings were planned in the spring of 2020 to reflect and suggest this common strategy for maritime heritage management. Because of the pandemic, this action was postponed to autumn 2020. In between, other actions targeting the consolidation of the network will be run, for example the preparation of a national policy brief and the translation of the PERICLES policy brief to French.

For the Waddensea demos in **The Netherlands** Demo 1 has been altered from fieldwork to online work. Investigations are underway to explore the options for fieldwork for demos 2 and 3. Contact has been made with Program Rich Waddensea (Programma Rijke Waddenzee) to use the VPA in one of their stakeholder processes. This organisation assists the national and local governments, societal organisations (NGO's), inhabitants and users (fishers) to achieve their policy goals by challenging, stimulating, developing and connecting with a focus on transitions towards nature improvement and sustainable (economic) use of the area.

PERICLES will also provide policy advice to improve the integration of cultural heritage in key marine and environmental policies and the implementation of associated EU directives. This will be based on the findings of the previous desk study and semi-structured policy and practice stakeholder interviews, along with synthesis of the demos, and planned policy good practice workshops.

Through the demos and policy-based activities, PERICLES will help enable an effective broad scope approach to policymaking that ensures both inclusion of specific interests and broad democratic representation of citizens, and will provide evidence on how to link environmental and cultural policies, thereby contributing to improved implementation of European policies on coastal zones and maritime areas.