



EUROPEAN UNION  
EUROPEAN REGIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT FUND



## **HERMAN: management of cultural heritage in the Central Europe area**

### **Workshop on cultural heritage management**

### **Seminar on cultural heritage assets' development**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Work Package Coordination (WP3, WP4, WP5) meeting**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Steering Group meeting**

***10-11 April 2013, Lublin, Poland***

### **Minutes**

All partners were represented at the meeting, including the new partner, representative of Regensburg. The meeting was moderated by different persons: Ms Zsuzsa Kravalik, external expert of the Forster Centre, Mr Boguslav Szmygin on behalf of Municipality of Lublin, and Mr Ferenc Szigeti-Böröcz, on behalf of the Lead Partner. The different presentations and workshops were made by responsible partners, based on the questionnaires sent prior to the meeting. See the attendance sheet and agenda attached. At the end of the day on 10 April, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Steering Group meeting was organised, 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 the meeting. These were discussed in detail during the meeting. Presentations have been already sent out to partners by Lublin.

The present minutes contain only those issues where partners have defined concrete tasks, decided deadlines and made decisions. All partners have to read the revised methodologies, the situation analyses (SoP and Pacha) and especially the summary reports about SoPs and Pachas, prepared by IRM and Forster Centre. These files will be sent by responsible partners in line with the deadlines set in the present minutes.

### **I. Most important upcoming tasks in WP2**

Municipality of Regensburg, responsible for WP2, has already started to work on the preparation of the different WP2 activities; however it can launch any procurement process if the Monitoring Committee of the CENTRAL Programme approves the partner change (we expect that the JTS will inform us until 15 May). During the meeting, the representative of Regensburg introduced the different, most important upcoming activities with a detailed flow-chart and discussed with others the necessary deadlines. As a first step, partners agreed on the following tasks and deadlines (first line in the below table), and also Regensburg set the other below deadlines until the next partner meeting (October, 2013):

Task	Responsible	Deadline
Partners send the <b>necessary inputs</b> (1. logo of the city/organization, 2. article about the partner's intention, targets, expected outputs and results linked to the project, 3. article about the partner, 4. good, high-resolution images about the partner city/organization with image rights) for the <b>website and brochure</b>	all partners	7 May, 2013
<b>Local press releases linked to project launch</b> – after the launching conference each partner shall create a press release in national language.	all partners (9 press releases)	1 June, 2013
<b>Communication strategy and action plan:</b> first draft by Regensburg	Regensburg	sent out on 28 February, 2013
<b>9 Local media appearance linked to local milestones</b> – each partner shall collect local media appearance continuously.	all partners	1 September, 2013
<b>Joint campaign action plan:</b> 1. firstly Regensburg drafts a proposal for partners. 2. partners prepare campaign based on the approved proposal.	Regensburg	15 November, 2013
<b>Dissemination campaigns and promotion materials linked to pilots</b> – each partner who has pilot action should prepare 3-3 promotion materials. Regensburg prepares a draft proposal.	Regensburg: 6 partners:	15 November, 2013 1 February, 2014
<b>Local awareness-raising campaigns linked to pilots</b> – the campaigns themselves. . Regensburg prepares a draft proposal.	Regensburg: 6 partners:	15 November, 2013 February - November, 2014
<b>Local press releases linked to local dissemination events</b> – linked to campaigns. Your role: to coordinate.	all partners	February - November, 2014
<b>Launching brochure:</b> design and the basic text will be created by Regensburg, based on 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 partners:	31 July, 2013 4 September, 2013
<b>1<sup>st</sup> project leaflets:</b> 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 partners:	12 September, 2013 30 September, 2013
<b>1<sup>st</sup> e-newsletters:</b> design and the basic text will be created by Regensburg, based on partners' inputs. Partners shall translate it, add locally interesting texts if needed.	Regensburg: 6 partners:	9 September, 2013 20 September, 2013
<b>Dissemination and knowledge sharing strategy</b>	Regensburg	19 September, 2013

## **II. Most important upcoming tasks in WP3**

Within WP3 the **methodology for CH Management Strategies** (act. 3.4.1 – which will be called Strategies and not Models anymore) **were discussed together with the local action plans (act. 4.4.1.)**, since these will be the different parts of a single local strategic document. Based on the discussion and Forster Centre's proposal, a detailed methodology will be sent out by Lublin later.

Also, Ms Zsuzsa Kravalik, external expert, introduced the **European Benchmark Study** (act. 3.2.3.). The study will be finalised after the Lublin meeting.

Regarding WP3, during the meeting, the most important step was the discussion of the **SoP reports** in the frame of a moderated discussion, and also based on **IRM's detailed summary presentation**.

Due to delays, unfortunately only Lublin's and Treviso's SoP reports were discussed in detail based on the questionnaire sent out by the LP prior to the meeting. The most important recommendations for them:

### **Lublin:**

- As it was reported by the representative of the city, Lublin needs integrated CH development and efficient community engagement, and this will be aimed also as minimum requirement during the next reporting period (see: Community Led Development). Therefore Lublin has to take the opportunity given by the HERMAN project (budget for proper stakeholder involvement and a pilot project aiming exactly what they need) and use already existing knowledge (HerO project results and local support group. Krzysztof Jan Chuchra, who was invited as external speaker, is happy to help Lublin regarding community engagement technics).

### **Treviso:**

- Since the pilot project is pretty much specialized, it would be worthy to draft the CH Management Strategy and the local action plan in a more complex way (e.g. based on the European Benchmark Study, how to develop the library network as a core element of the city's cultural services).

Since there was no time to discuss other partners' situation analyses due to the fact that we clarified other key questions, the LP kindly ask all partners, and especially those who were missing from here, Regensburg, Ferrara, Ravenna, Eger and Forster Centre to report correctly these activities to IRM (joint report about SoPs) and Foster (joint report about Pachas). Finalised SoP reports must be available in an intranet site of the project website.

The SoP reports – basically a kind of SWOT analysis - shall highlight weaknesses and threats, since there are missing from the files (besides strengths and opportunities of course).

Partners agreed on the following tasks and deadlines.

Task	Responsible	Deadline
Partner shall finalize the <b>pilot plans</b> until 26 April, 2013, based on the questionnaire LP/Forster sent out before (the original deadline was prior to the meeting).	Lublin, Ravenna, Forster, Eger, Ferrara, Treviso	26 April, 2013
IRM sends out the <b>summary presentation about SoP reports</b> , partners shall amend the document, <b>answer the questions correctly</b> , and reflect on its facts.	Lublin, Ravenna, Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Treviso	3 May, 2013
<b>SoP reports</b> shall contain SWOT as well, and shall be approximately 10-15 pages long, separate document/study (not filled in questionnaire), with necessary logos.	Lublin, Ravenna, Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Treviso	3 May, 2013
Based on the pilot plans as well as the discussion during the meeting, Lublin prepares the <b>Cultural Heritage Management Strategy template/methodology</b> .	Lublin	13 May, 2013
Based on the finalized SoP reports, IRM prepares the <b>joint report</b> (3.3.1.)	IRM	1 June, 2013
The <b>European Benchmark Study</b> to be finalized	LP	3 may, 2013

Other deadlines, set until the next meeting in the AF, are the same for all partners:

<b>Stakeholder group</b> (minimum requirement): 1. the final SoP shall be discussed with MSP members; 2. MSP members are to be involved in defining the vision, strategy and basic principles of the local/regional Cultural Heritage Management Strategy and the pilot plans.	Lublin, Ravenna, Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Treviso	until October, 2013
Starting the preparation of the <b>pilot actions, based on the pilot plans</b>	Forster, Lublin, Treviso	pilot actions shall be finished until June, 2014
Starting the drafting of the <b>CH Management Strategies</b> . Draft version to be discussed in Ferrara.	Lublin, Ravenna, Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Treviso	September, 2013

### **III. Most important upcoming tasks in WP4**

Within WP4 the **structure of the Good Practice Visits** (act. 4.3.2.) was discussed with partners, led by Forster Centre. Partners made some recommendations for possible destinations for the remaining 9 places: 1. Ferrara/Ravenna during the mid-term conference, for all partners; 2. Edinburgh (proposed by the LP); 3. München/Stuttgart (proposed by Treviso); 4. London (proposed by Treviso); 5. Cracow during the management course, for all partners; 6-7-8. Leipzig/Berlin/Dresden (proposed by Lublin); 9. Regensburg (not the management training, because it is too late). Forster Centre also proposed as alternative locations, cities/countries from the Balkan Peninsula.

Forster prepares a table based on partners' inputs for finalisation of the schedules. This includes the name responsible for organisation tasks as well as possible participants. Partners have travel costs only planned for this action. The LP has to check with the JTS those destinations, which are outside of the CE area (London, Edinburgh)

Also, the main structure of the **local action plans (act. 4.4.1.)** was discussed since these will be incorporated to a single local strategic document together with CH Management Strategies.

Also, Ms Zsuzsa Kravalik, external expert, introduced the **European Benchmark Study (act. 4.2.3.)**. The study will be finalised after the Lublin meeting and shared with all partners.

Regarding WP4, during the meeting, the other most important step was the discussion of the **PACHA reports** in general, and also based on **Forster Centre's detailed summary presentation**.

Unfortunately there was no time to discuss other partners' situation analyses due to the fact that we clarified other key questions, the LP kindly ask all partners, and especially those who were missing from here, Regensburg, Ferrara, Ravenna, Eger and Forster Centre to report correctly these activities to IRM (joint report about SoPs) and Foster (joint report about Pachas). Finalised SoP reports must be available in an intranet site of the project website.

The Pacha reports – basically a kind of SWOT analysis - shall highlight weaknesses and threats, since there are missing from the files (besides strengths and opportunities of course).

Partners agreed on the following tasks and deadlines.

Task	Responsible	Deadline
Partner shall finalize the <b>pilot plans</b> until 26 April, 2013, based on the questionnaire LP/Forster sent out before (the original deadline was prior to the meeting).	Lublin, Ravenna, Forster, Eger, Ferrara, Treviso	26 April, 2013
Forster sends out the <b>summary presentation about PACHA reports</b> , partners shall amend the document, <b>answer the questions correctly</b> and reflect on its facts.	Lublin, Ravenna, Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Treviso	3 May, 2013
<b>PACHA reports</b> shall contain SWOT as well, and shall be approximately 10-15 pages long, separate document/study (not filled in questionnaire), with necessary logos.	Lublin, Ravenna, Regensburg, Eger, Ferrara, Treviso	3 May, 2013
Based on the finalized PACHA reports, Forster prepares the <b>joint report (4.2.4.)</b>	Forster	1 June, 2013
<b>The European Benchmark Study</b> to be finalized and shared with partners	LP	3 may, 2013
Partners send the exact destinations and dates (weeks) for <b>Good Practice Visits</b> to Forster	Ferrara, Ravenna, Eger, Treviso, Lublin, Regensburg	26 April, 2013
With the finalized proposal LP asks the <b>JTS's approval</b> regarding London and Edinburg	LP	3 May, 2013
Responsible partners organize the <b>Good Practice Visits</b> , based on Forster's methodology	all partners	continuously until October, 2013

#### **IV. Most important upcoming tasks in WP5**

Unfortunately it was not possible until the meeting to collect all assessment questionnaires regarding CHCU members' capacities and training needs. Based on the inputs, Ravenna will send out the joint assessment report (act. 5.2.2.) of capacities and training needs soon and start the preparation of the different curricula with relevant partners (IRM, MarcoPolo, Regensburg and Ravenna itself).

Partners decided to plan the management courses as it was planned in the AF with the time schedule set during the 1<sup>st</sup> WP Coordination Meeting, but concrete deadline are to be defines during the development of the curricula:

- Course 1 (5.3.1.) about general management issues in Cracow in October, 2013.
- Course 2 (5.3.2.) about special management issues in CH management, especially about financial issues, in Venice (MarcoPolo) in January, 2014.
- Course 3 (5.3.3.) about special management issues in CH management, especially about marketing, in Ravenna in March, 2014.
- Course 4 (5.3.4.) about collaborative management methods for stakeholders, in Regensburg, in June, 2014.

Ravenna and the LP will work on the clarification of the staff exchanges, since the structure of the events shall be defined soon as well.

Partners agreed on the following tasks and deadlines.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Those partners who have not sent yet the filled <b>questionnaires</b> : send it to Ravenna asap!	relevant partners	19 April, 2013
Based on the CHCU members' capacities and training needs, Ravenna prepares <b>the joint assessment</b>	Ravenna	3 May, 2013
Related partners <b>prepare curricula</b> based on the summary report led by Ravenna	IRM, Marco Polo, Ravenna, Regensburg	July, 2013

Define the final date of the <b>first training course</b> (at least the week)	Ravenna, IRM	3 May, 2013
<b>1<sup>st</sup> training</b> in Cracow	IRM	October, 2013
Short description about the staff exchanges	Ravenna, LP	26 April, 2013
Partners' 1 page summary about their offer for staff exchanges	relevant partners	3 May, 2013
The exact <b>schedule of the staff exchanges</b>	Ravenna	1 June, 2013

### **Summary for the 2nd Steering Group meeting**

Participating SG members listened the discussion during the 2<sup>nd</sup> WP Coordination meeting and they approved the above deadlines. Partners have to take into consideration that there is no possibility for postponement of the project, thus partners shall catch up themselves in the 2<sup>nd</sup> reporting period.

Besides, the Lead Partner summarized the most important steps made regarding the management of the project (see detailed presentation, also presented after the launching conference).

- After many clarification rounds, the JTS finally approved the Request for Change file and the modified AF on 25 March, 2013 (as for partner changes). The JTS sends out the request to CENTRAL MC Members for formal approval. Final decision is foreseen around beginning of May. Then a new Subsidy Contract and Partnership Agreement shall be signed.
  
- Start-up Report was approved on 13 March, 2013, and was shared with partners. LP is preparing the Preparation Costs Report and the 1<sup>st</sup> Progress Report with the deadline of 23 April, 2013. So far, the LP has only received FLC confirmations from Forster Centre, MarcoPolo and Treviso. IRM and Lublin is waiting for the FLC docs, Ravenna and Ferrara do not report costs now, Regensburg cannot report costs yet.