

HERMAN: management of cultural heritage in the Central Europe area

3rd Work Package Coordination (WP3, WP4, WP5) meeting

3rd Steering Group meeting

9 October 2013, Ferrara, Italy

Minutes

The meeting was organised in the frame of a complex partner meeting: on the first day, 8 October, 2013 the **mid-term conference** was held with the following title: moving forward from protection to management of cultural heritage. With the involvement of truly high level speakers, the conference focused on the local adaptation of the Historical Urban Landscape approach, initiated by the UNESCO in late 2011. The message of the conference for the HERMAN project is that however this brand new approach is not planned in the project, and discussions among the professionals have just started worldwide, it is a huge opportunity for partners to deal with this issue and take the HUL approach into consideration as much as possible.

During the afternoon on 8 and 9 October, a **good practice visit** was organised, focused on the complex territory of the UNESCO site in Ferrara, since it contains a medieval-renaissance city as well as a wetland, the Po delta, thus it is an interesting theme from cultural heritage management point of view. As for the good practice visit, the summary template will be filled in later.

All partners were represented at the 3rd WP Coordination and Steering Group meeting, altogether there were 34 participants. The meeting was moderated by the external expert, appointed by the Lead Partner, but the different topics were presented by responsible partners. Since all participating SC members attended the WP Coordination meeting too, at the end of the session, a summary was presented for the Steering Group, and a separate section of the recent minutes includes the most important issues.

The supporting documents have been sent to the partnership by responsible partners prior to and after the meeting. The agenda was a bit re-structured in the beginning of the meeting due to the lack of time. Therefore all partners shall read those documents, which were sent out for comments before: the summary report about the SoP and the Pacha summary reports and the Benchmark Study.

The present minutes contain only those issues where partners have defined concrete tasks, decided deadlines and made decisions.

The first presentation was made by the LP about the results of the online mid-term evaluation, which was a perfect frame for the meeting. This evaluation had the following key messages for the future:

- All in all, partners have a positive picture about the project in general, and despite the long process of the partnership change at the start of the project, partners have shown a positive attitude
- The most useful things in the project are practical examples concerning use of cultural heritage
- The final documents (handbooks, etc.) will be useful at long lasting perspective

- Experience described by partners concerning management in UNESCO CH sites (as new issues learnt)
- There are some new and innovative ideas (HUL, pilot actions)
- Until today we only preserved our cultural heritage, and now we should start to manage it! (as lesson learnt)
- The ability to engage other than governmental institutions and organizations (stakeholders) in the process of managing cultural heritage (as key learning)
- The paradigm shift from protection towards management needs the involvement and cooperation of all different stakeholders. Stakeholders need to be involved from the very start of all actions (as key learning)
- Improve the communication between partners
- More involvement from certain partners (e.g. Lublin)
- Speeding up the activities particularly in WP2
- Might be more time for discussion during meetings
- High expectations related to management courses, staff exchanges and good practice visits, since it would be useful to learn by specific study case
- More active involvement of knowledge provider partners
- More input would be useful from partners on how their project part is progressing
- The requests are not always clear (as role of the LP)
- Persuasion of partners is sometimes difficult
- “We do not have much contact with our knowledge provider and we are able to deal with our task on our own”
- High expectations related to the final outputs
- Preparing the strategy and action plan is a really heavy issue which might require support

I. Most important upcoming tasks in WP2

Municipality of Regensburg, responsible for WP2, has already started to work on the different WP2 activities, since the public procurement (launched in late May) was closed. Therefore Regensburg and the LP paid all partners' attention that it is our joint work to catch up ourselves in WP2 activities, Regensburg will give inputs and templates, plus coordinates the activities, but most of the job shall be done at local level.

- The **website concept** was presented and approved by partners, however further discussion is needed related to the knowledge sharing strategy between Regensburg and Eger.
- All partners shall send continuously the different **press** (releases and collected articles) and **promotion materials** (e-newsletters, leaflets, launching brochure, printed locally).
- Partners discussed Regensburg's proposal (a joint exhibition about pilots) related to the **joint pilot campaign**, but they decided to create a joint, creative film, related to the pilots. Regensburg will prepare a scenario for the film, to be discussed in Cracow.

- Regensburg presented its **new communicational model**, which was prepared in the frame of the UNESCO related work in the city. This is an interesting recommendation to be used by all partners.
- The design and the common text related to the **1st e-newsletters and leaflets**, will be prepared by Regensburg until 31 October, and partners shall produce the first outcomes on local language (1st e-newsletter and leaflet) still this year. Due to the delay of these actions, some partners have already prepared promotion materials (e.g. Eger prepared the leaflet for the international CH day in September, since it was an open day for pilots). Partners shall note that until the end of the year three e-newsletters (out of 5) and three leaflets (out of 4) are planned, so if there are interesting and relevant local events, partners can produce these outputs based on local needs.
- The **launching brochure** template is ready, partners shall publish the local versions until 30 November, 2013.
- **Press release linked to the mid-term event** shall be prepared immediately after the conference by Regensburg and translated by partners.

Partners agreed on the following tasks and deadlines.

Task	Responsible	Deadline
Mid-term press release – based on the model press release prepared by Regensburg, city partners prepare local versions	Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Ravenna, Lublin, Treviso	20 October, 2013
The launch project brochure to be published by partners on local languages	Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Ravenna, Lublin, Treviso	30 November, 2013
Website – based on partners’ inputs Regensburg prepares and operates the website	Regensburg	15 December, 2013
Local press releases linked to project launch – some partners have already done it, others shall prepare it asap	all partners (9 press releases)	15 October, 2013
Regensburg prepares a proposal related to the joint pilot campaign film	Regensburg	15 November, 2013
9 Local media appearance linked to local milestones – each partner shall collect local media appearance continuously	all partners, collected by Regensburg	1 November, 2013
Dissemination campaigns and promotion materials linked to pilots – each partner who has pilot action should prepare 3-3 promotion materials.	6 partners	1 February, 2014
Local awareness-raising campaigns linked to pilots – the campaigns themselves.	6 partners:	February - November, 2014
Local press releases linked to local dissemination events – linked to campaigns.	all partners	February - November, 2014
1st project leaflets : design and the basic text will be created by Regensburg, based on partners’ inputs. Partners shall translate it, add locally interesting texts if needed, and print it (no number of copies is defined in the AF, so it is based on partner budgets).	Regensburg: 6 city partners (Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Ravenna, Lublin, Treviso):	31 October, 2013 15 December, 2013

<p>1st e-newsletters: design and the basic text will be created by Regensburg, based on partners' inputs. Partners shall translate it, add locally interesting texts if needed.</p>	<p>Regensburg: 6 partners Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Ravenna, Lublin, Treviso:</p>	<p>31 October, 2013 15 December, 2013</p>
<p>Discussion on the structure of the Dissemination and knowledge sharing strategy</p>	<p>Regensburg, Eger</p>	<p>1 November, 2013</p>

II. Most important upcoming tasks in WP3 and WP4

The next agenda point was the discussion of the LP's proposal related to the **adaptation of the Historical Urban Landscape (HUL)** approach within the project. After the presentation there was a deep and long discussion, finally partners approved the following issues:

- Since this brand new approach is not planned in the project originally, this is only a recommendation by the LP, and related to only the elaboration of the pilot projects. The LP and Forster Centre will finalise the checklist to be used by interested partners in order to "assess" the pilot project implementation based on the HUL approach. The experience will be described in the Cultural Heritage Management Strategy and the Action Plan as well as in the final outputs, if possible.
- It can be a huge opportunity for partners to deal with this issue and take the HUL approach into consideration as much as possible during the implementation of the pilots, however partners approved Regensburg's proposal: focusing on success factors mainly.
- While finalising the checklist, Gábor Soós's presentation (conference) should be taken into consideration as well.
- The checklist will be discussed by partners in Cracow.

Due to its importance, the next agenda point was the discussion of the WP5 activities, but after that partners "jumped back" to WP3 and WP4, thus these are listed below.

The **methodology for assessment of pilot results** was presented by Lublin, but since the draft template had not been sent out prior to the meeting, partner shall send their comments related to this document until 31 October, and it shall be discussed in Cracow.

Due to the lack of time, there was no discussion related to the **SoP and the Pacha summary reports** and the **Benchmark Study**, therefore all partners shall read these documents, which were sent out for comments before.

Finally partners briefly summarized the **recent status of the implementation of the pilot projects**. Based on the feedbacks, all pilots are on the right track, they can meet the deadline for finalisation (June, 2013) and are implemented in line with the AF. As for the details of the pilot project in Lublin, a bilateral consultation is needed.

The **methodology for Action Plans** will be drafted by IRM until 31 October and shall be discussed in Cracow.

Also, **good practice visits** are running, the schedule is continuously updated by Forster Centre, host partners keep the contact with participants.

Partners agreed on the following tasks and deadlines.

Task	Responsible	Deadline
Finalisation of the HUL adaptation checklist, to be discussed in Cracow	Forster, LP	10 November, 2013
Bilateral consultation regarding the details of the pilot project	Lublin, Eger	15 October, 2013
IRM prepares the template for the Action Plans, to be discussed in Cracow	IRM	31 October, 2013
Each partners are requested to add comments on the methodology for assessment of pilot results, to be discussed in Cracow	each partner, Lublin	31 October, 2013
Next GPVs: Regensburg - Munich, Venice-Ravenna, Cracow	each partner	

III. Most important upcoming tasks in WP5

Based on the assessment of the training needs, LP and Forster Centre prepared a proposal for the curricula of the first management course to be held in Cracow. Later on this was updated by IRM and sent out to partners. Cracow shall prepare the curriculum with Ravenna's help until 31 October, 2013. Also, until this time MarcoPolo will draft a proposal for the curriculum of the 2nd course. Ravenna is requested to coordinate these training courses and the preparation of the curricula properly, since partners expressed high interest in these activities.

Ravenna will finalise the proposals for the staff exchanges (concrete dates and themes without overlapping), until 20 October, 2013. Based on this proposal partners shall create a matrix (who goes where, number of participants, exact positions) until 30 November, 2013.

Partners agreed on the following tasks and deadlines.

Task	Responsible	Deadline
Cracow prepares the final curriculum	IRM, help by Ravenna	31 October, 2013
MarcoPolo prepares the draft curriculum	MarcoPolo, help by Ravenna	31 October, 2013
Final proposal about staff exchanges	Ravenna	20 October, 2013
Partners create a matrix regarding the staff exchanges	each partner, coordinated by Ravenna	30 November, 2013
1st management course in Cracow – preparation, organization, keeping partners updated	IRM	asap (course: 18-22 November, 2013)

IV. Most important upcoming tasks in WP1

LP made a short presentation about the status of the submission of the PR1/PCR and the PR2.

It is important to mention that we have been waiting for Ravenna for more than 2 weeks in order to submit the hard copies of the PCR and PR1. It generates delays in the payment accordingly.

The other important issue is that partners have mainly caught up all the delayed activities, except WP2 activities.

V. Summary for the 3rd Steering Group meeting

Participating SG members listened and actively participated in the discussions during the 3rd WP Coordination meeting and they **approved the above deadlines**. Thus there was need for a separate SG meeting. Partners have to take into consideration that there is no possibility for postponement of the project, thus partners shall catch up themselves in the upcoming reporting periods and definitely keep the deadline of the pilot projects (June, 2013), as it was confirmed by partners during the meeting by each partner.

The Lead Partner handled out the signed copies of the 1st Amendment of the Partnership Agreement, one to each partner.