D2.1 Faro research and ICT recommendations

Deliverable number	**D2.1**
Deliverable title	**Faro research and ICT recommendations**
Nature[1]	**R**
Dissemination Level[2]	**PU**
Author (email) Institution	**Dr. Leonidas Argyros (leonidas@cliomuseapp.com), CLIO**
Editor (email) Institution	**Andreas Fatouros (andreas@cliomuseapp.com), CLIO**
Leading partner	**CLIO**
Participating partners	**CLIO**
Official submission date:	**31/5/2018**
Actual submission date:	**4/6/2018**

---

[1] **R**=Document, report; **DEM**=Demonstrator, pilot, prototype; **DEC**=website, patent fillings, videos, etc.; **OTHER**=other

[2] **PU**=Public, **CO**=Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services), **CI**=Classified, as referred to in Commission Decision 2001/844/EC

Modifications index	
8/9/2017	Initial Release
18/9/2017	Reviewed by Nikos Frangakis
1/5/2018	Final Release
20/5/2018	Updated based on the comments of the quality review from Luis Molina Tanco
30/5/2018	Final proof reading

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

D2.1 "Faro Convention realisation" is (a) an extensive literature review on the Faro Convention and accompanying material, (b) a review of interactions and social paradigms that follow and implement the principles of the Faro Convention and (c) a presentation of the main implementation guidelines so that PLUGGY can adhere to the principles of the Faro Convention.

D2.1 explores the relevant literature, scholarly publications, and project reports and guidelines originating from the implementation of Faro in order to ensure:

- That the project will demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the Faro Convention guiding principles.

- That the project's deliverables will adhere to the principles of the Faro Convention and will address the concerns of the final users in terms of inclusivity, flexibility, and adaptability to their ever-changing needs and demands.

- The proper use of PLUGGY's Social Platform and the accompanying Curatorial Tool to assist in the implementation of the Faro Convention's goals.

- That the project will reflect the latest and most current results of research in the field of cultural heritage, its impact on communities, and its potential for ameliorating the living conditions of individuals and communities.

To succeed in these goals a number of scholarly articles and project reviews have been studied in an effort to understand and appreciate how heritage partners and communities perceive Faro and attempt to implement its core principles. These have been identified and presented in a concise and comprehensive manner to allow all other partners to appreciate the innovative approach to culture introduced by the Faro Convention; thus it is hoped that the final tool and deliverables will correspond neatly and ingeniously to the demands introduced by the new and inclusive awareness of cultural heritage presented by the Faro Convention.

1   INTRODUCTION

This is deliverable D2.1 – Faro research and ICT recommendations, a work delivered through T2.1 "Faro Convention realisation" in WP2 "Social interaction design and specifications".

Within T2.1 an extensive literature review took place on the Faro convention and accompanying material and is presented in this deliverable.

A first draft of D2.1 was reviewed internally at the end of the first year of the project. This is the final release, delivered at M18.

1.1   FARO BACKGROUND

In 1764 the German art historian and archaeologist Johann Joachim Winckelmann published his Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums ("The History of Art in Antiquity"), a seminal analysis of ancient art that defined a process of organic growth, maturity, and decline in the art of any civilisation. He also established a connection between a civilisation's art and artifacts and other cultural factors such as the climate, the political and social conditions, the technical possibilities etc. [Haskell 1981]. In a contemplative section on his imaginary visit to the stadium of Ancient Olympia, Winckelmann describes his walk among the exemplary statues honouring gods, heroes, and athletes that once adorned the site. Only fragments survive but it is possible to "collect and unite in the mind all the statues mentioned by ancient authors," an exercise that resembles André Malraux's "musée imaginaire," a personal storehouse of images of cultural objects [Haley 2003, p. 13-16].

Winckelmann and Malraux's vision for the availability of a personal, individualised museum where people will be able to experience and share their perspectives on cultural heritage is now possible. The Pluggable Social Platform for Heritage Awareness and Participation (PLUGGY) will raise individuals and heritage communities to the role of creators, curators, advocates and users of heritage assets. PLUGGY will be web-based, accessible, and structured according to heritage consumers' values, aspirations and needs. It will be a flexible instrument that will enable citizens to share tangible and intangible heritage elements, build heritage communities, create distribution channels and interact with each other.

Heritage digital platforms, applications and repositories already exist (Europeana, Google Cultural Institute) and compile collections from museums, libraries and other institutions through virtualisation. Their approach is top-down and is mainly supported by institutions. The average citizen is not involved in their creation and they have failed to establish heritage communities around them. Social platforms, on the other hand, have proven remarkably successful at building networks based on the contributions of their users. However, their possibilities have not been fully exploited with regards to cultural heritage promotion and integration in people's everyday life. PLUGGY aims to plug this gap by providing the necessary tools to allow users to share their local knowledge and

everyday experience with others, together with the contribution of cultural institutions, as museums, building extensive networks around their common interest in connecting the past, the present and the future.

1.2   PLUGGY OPPORTUNITIES

Since there are no tools available to assist interested parties in their casual, everyday effort to shape and participate in their heritage, PLUGGY envisions the development of a social platform and a curatorial tool. The PLUGGY Social Platform will be the place where citizens, heritage communities, and professionals will be able to contribute their voices, images, ideas, emotions, and experiences regarding heritage assets. Users of the Social Platform will have the ability to upload, tag, categorise and describe assets in the form of high quality images and videos, text, 3D models and audio. The Social Platform will interface with Europeana, the British Museum's Collection Online and other existing online Digital Collections. Artificial intelligence methods will assist in the semantic tagging of its content and the Virtual Exhibitions. These methods will also facilitate an automated way of creating virtual museums by grouping virtual exhibitions.

The virtual exhibitions are a key PLUGGY component. This is the most distinctive element, the one that will set PLUGGY apart from other contemporary digital platforms, as it places citizens at the heart of the heritage community. PLUGGY will enable its users to put together components from different digital content to create a comprehensive story that will reflect their interests, topics, or heritage goals. These stories will form what we call a Virtual Exhibition that will be accessible by any user and application of the platform. Image annotation, video editing, subtitles, and captions will enhance the overall user experience and enrich the content of the Virtual Exhibitions, while automatic tools will be available to assist members of heritage communities to translate the content into other languages. PLUGGY users will become curators and set up their own virtual museums populated with their virtual exhibitions.

The Social Platform will enable them to share their experiences and views, but the Curatorial Tool will allow them to actively participate in the creation of a heritage community by curating virtual exhibitions, visiting virtual museums, and browsing digital collections organised by other users. There exhibitions will be hosted on the Social Platform. The Curatorial Tool will permit the users to become heritage curators who can access information available on the Social Platform and online digital collections to create new stories and highlight the connections between any materials they deem fit for their virtual exhibition. The content can be accessed through novel interfaces (Augmented Reality, Geolocation) and users will experience stories in new and fascinating ways. The Curatorial Tool has an open architecture that facilitates the future development of applications with interfaces not yet developed.

2 THE FARO CONVENTION

The theoretical underpinning for PLUGGY is provided by the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (widely known as the Faro Convention). This is an innovative approach to the issues arising from the multiple, and often contradictory, demands on culture and heritage. The convention's guiding principle is the belief on the existence of a common European heritage worthy of recognition, preservation, and communication. The quintessential difference of this convention, compared to previous instruments, is the emphasis on ways to capitalise on Europe's cultural heritage and an explicit concentration on why this heritage should be recognised as valuable. It is no longer a question of plain conservation or a quest for means to protect Europe's cultural heritage. It is, rather, an acknowledgement that we all share a valuable asset and a call to participate in its safeguarding and partaking to the extent of our abilities and concern.

The armed conflicts in former Yugoslavia in the early 1990s, caused considerable loss of life and devastation to basic infrastructure and private property. Regrettably, from a heritage perspective, all combatants participated in efforts to eradicate the cultural legacy of the other side. The Ministers responsible for the Cultural heritage' deputies instructed the Cultural Heritage Committee to formulate a number of protocols to the Granada Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (1985) and the Valletta Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (1992) to outline a principle for "protecting and enhancing the representative heritage of the various forms of cultural expression which have emerged in the course of history in a single territory, irrespective of the current political context of that territory."

The consultation process revealed the inadequacy of the protocol approach, it was, therefore, deemed essential to initiate the process for the creation of a legal instrument that would deal with cultural heritage as a comprehensive and vital aspect of contemporary life. In January 2003 the Ministers' Deputies established a select committee of experts to assist in drawing up a draft Framework Convention on cultural heritage with three specific aims:

a) To *assert* each individual's right of access to the cultural heritage of his or her choice, while respecting the corresponding and equal rights of every other person who wishes to have access to the same heritage;

b) To *confirm* the principle of fair treatment for all heritages that comprise the cultural mosaic of contemporary Europe;

c) To *commit* all Parties to introduce policies and educational initiatives that would promote the dialogue between cultures and faiths on the basis of mutual respect and understanding of differences.

The paramount goal should be the avoidance of conflict on the nature and scale of the atrocities committed during past struggles. The Council of Europe's approach was based on the idea that Europe has a common heritage founded on the principles of respect for

human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. It also recognised that states are no longer the only partners interested in or capable of preserving and promoting a cultural heritage that is often not limited by national borders and is frequently shared by groups of different backgrounds, capabilities, and aspirations. Such a globalised and fragmented context demanded the identification and adoption of a new set of tools and ideas that would best allow a multiplicity of voices to be heard without the need for an intermediary.

The Select Committee of experts drafted the Convention text over a period of months in 2003 and 2004 with contributions by other related committees. A Working Group of The Steering Committee for the Cultural Heritage finalised the text, that was subsequently amended by the enlarged Bureau of The Steering Committee for the Cultural Heritage. The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society was adopted by the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers on 13 October 2005 and the Convention was opened for signature by the member states of the Council of Europe on 27 October 2005 at Faro, Portugal.

The Convention consists of a preamble and twenty-three articles. It entered into force on 1 June 2011. As of today (May 2018) it has been ratified by seventeen States: Armenia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Norway, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. In addition, five States have signed the Convention (Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy, San Marino) but have not ratified it.

The Faro Convention offers a novel definition of cultural heritage and heritage communities. The former is identified as a "group of resources inherited from the past which people identify...as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions." as far as Faro is concerned, cultural heritage is not static and should be considered independently of ownership (Article 2a). There are, obviously, restrictions in the ability of people to use and enjoy it, arising from the need to respect the public interest and the rights and freedoms of others (Article 4c) but, overall, everyone is free to identify with the heritage of his or her choosing.

It is in this deliberate freedom of people to join and enjoy whichever aspect of culture they choose that one of Faro's greatest strengths lie. Everyone who freely chooses to value specific aspects of cultural heritage to sustain and transmit to future generations becomes a member of a heritage community (Article 2b). The Convention refrains from identifying the heritage community as something limited or bound by nationality, religion, or language. It opts for a broader and more flexible framework based on common interest. In fact, as noted in the Explanatory report to the Faro Convention, participation in a heritage community does not even require action, since someone can be a member simply by appreciating a piece of cultural heritage. A passion for the folk music traditions of the Celtic people of western Europe is enough to make a person part of the Celtic music heritage community, irrespective of their place of residence or individual ethnic background.

Of equal importance is the acknowledgment of the environment's relevance to any discussion about cultural heritage. The Convention recognises that the cultural heritage includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the synergy between people and places. The historic environment is defined as all the surviving tangible remains of past human activity (buildings, artifacts etc.) whether visible or not, and landscaped and planted or managed flora. But it is impossible to separate the human factor from natural influences in the creation and shaping of the environment within which the cultural heritage appears and endures (Article 2a).

Articles 4 and 5 expand on the rights, responsibilities, laws, and policies relating to cultural heritage. Everyone "has the right to benefit from the cultural heritage and contribute towards its enrichment," either alone or in collaboration with others. This right comes with the responsibility to "respect the cultural heritage of others," an unequivocal statement of one of Faro's most far-reaching principles. The heritage of Europe is often claimed by more than one groups, resulting in tension, conflict, and the undermining of everyone's democratic right to participate and enjoy the tangible and intangible cultural products inherited from the past. The Faro Convention aims at an inclusive and egalitarian approach to cultural heritage that empowers people to become active custodians and owners of their past in collaboration with other individuals or groups.

Even though the Faro Convention is concerned with the rights and responsibilities of individuals, in regards to heritage, the comprehensive approach envisioned is almost impossible without the participation of the state. A key criterion for Faro's success is the level of citizen participation in the process of cultural appreciation and employment. It is often the case, though, that individuals and groups are (or feel they are) excluded from even the possibility of benefiting from the cultural heritage. Economic inequality, lack of physical access, educational obstacles, or language barriers can inhibit citizens' will or ability to engage with the past in a meaningful way.

Faro considers the states responsible for recognising the "public interest associated with elements of the cultural heritage" (Article 5a). It calls upon them to set in motion a series of policy proposals to raise awareness on the importance of cultural heritage and ensure the maximum level of citizen participation through the removal of hindrances. Even though Faro, by its very nature as a framework convention, is not a detailed road-map and presents rather general guidelines as opposed to concrete policy proposals, it is clear that it identifies a clear series of steps that will facilitate its successful implementation. The State must identify, study, interpret, protect, conserve, and present the cultural heritage within its area of responsibility (Article 5b). It should establish the appropriate legislative environment and remove all economic and social impediments to participation in cultural heritage activities (Article 5c, 5d).

The State is envisioned as a nonpartisan player in the process of cultural heritage enjoyment. It is there to provide the framework and remove the obstacles so that individuals and groups can explore and benefit from the elements of cultural heritage they want to use. States must "recognise the value of cultural heritage situated on

territories under their jurisdiction, regardless of its origin" (Article 5f). It is not the role of the State to rank cultural objects. It must offer the same level of protection and recognition to all, since cultural heritage is a paramount factor in "sustainable development, cultural diversity and contemporary creativity" (Article 5e).

At the same time the Faro Convention recognises the limits on the State's ability to protect all elements of cultural heritage within its territory. Since everything cannot be protected, there must be a proportionality principle [Explanatory Report, 2005] whereby the State and all parties interested and involved in cultural heritage can define the protective measures necessary for safeguarding as many tangible and intangible cultural products possible.

Since it is a given that the same aspect of cultural heritage may be claimed by competing groups, it is important to encourage dialogue among them. Section II of the Faro Convention (Contribution of cultural heritage to society and human development) offers a broad but comprehensive list of suggestions for negating conflict. The interpretation of cultural heritage is an area where conflict is possible. The same site may hold different meanings for different people or groups (a church turned into a mosque turned into a museum) and disagreements in its interpretation and/or use can be avoided through research and open debate (Article 7a). A dialogue with the participation of all interested parties is essential. This process should be open to all, experts and non-experts alike, if it is to foster a sense of equitable representation of all those who wish to be involved (Article 7b). More often than not misunderstandings and conflicts arise from the lack of knowledge among the parties regarding the site's significance or values for all those involved with it. Knowledge of cultural heritage is a resource and should be developed as such through lifelong education and training (Article 7c, 7d).

The Faro Convention is particularly concerned with the environment, built and natural, as a resource for territorial cohesion and quality of life [Explanatory Report, 2005]. Ecology, culture, the economy and the society at large are factors that contribute to the creation and protection of territorial cohesion. Their development has the potential to impact cultural heritage, especially when the various degrees of value, assigned to it by different groups, is not taken into consideration. Land use is a powerful tool for economic and social progress but when it occurs without the proper mitigation mechanisms it can have detrimental effects on a community's cultural heritage (Article 8b). A territory is a geographical and historical meeting place between cultures. The diversity inherent in such a territory requires policies and approaches that respect and promote its cultural, biological, geological and landscape diversity (Article 8b). In addition, a territory is a meeting place between people, who share responsibility for the cultural heritage in their area (however broadly this is defined) and can contribute to its preservation and promotion through their individual skills, experiences, positions, and interests (Article 8c).

Since culture and society are subject to continuous change, it is important to recognise the unavoidable influence of additions to the physical and cultural environment. The Faro Convention promotes the principle of ethical modification, in the sense that any changes

must be qualitatively in agreement with the pre-existing background (Article 8d). Contemporary cultural creations do not simply conform to or alter the heritage of the past but lay the foundations for the heritage of the future. This continuous process of transmitting to the future the products of the past through a living experience that affects the initial and the final product must ensure continuity (which should not be interpreted as encouraging a sterile and fossilised approach to culture but rather a process whereby the essentials of the heritage are preserved for the enjoyment of future generations).

The use of cultural heritage can and must be sustainable. Any changes must take into consideration the cultural values involved, meaning a thorough process of interpreting and respecting those values, while acknowledging that some of them may be contested by other actors. Change is not rejected but should be cautious and follow an inclusive consultation process that is open to all members of a heritage community with a stake in the issue at hand (Article 9a). Research, information and training should be the guiding tools of cultural heritage management, both in the theoretical level (identifying all competing values) and in the practical/technical approach to the conservation and/or development of cultural heritage (Article 9b, 9c, 9d). Traditional materials, techniques, and practices are key elements of heritage that should be encouraged, preserved, and employed wherever feasible. It is in the field of technical know-how that the state can play a constructive role by instituting and safeguarding systems of "professional qualifications and accreditation for individuals, businesses and institutions" (Article 9e).

Cultural heritage has economic aspects that can and should be utilised. But there are certain caveats. Economic activity must be sustainable and this presupposes a right to information. Parties responsible for the development of a site or region should possess a sound understanding of its whole cultural heritage. There are two reasons for this requirement. Such a degree of knowledge allows for the widest utilisation of available resources without neglecting any source of publicity or economic development. In addition, the sense that the actors in the development of a given asset know about and take into consideration all aspects of its heritage and its meaning to potentially competing heritage communities creates a feeling of trust and promotes the widest participation of individuals and groups in the process (Article 10a).

In the context of cultural heritage, the most obvious economic development and employment of available resources is in the tourist industry. Policies that aim at maximising the economic return of a site or region should take into account "*the specific character and interests of the cultural heritage*" because this multiplicity and variety of values increases a region's appeal and facilitates the local residents wish to support such developmental policies (Article 10b). The Faro Convention does not support unmitigated and uncontrollable development for its own sake. There should be checks in place to protect the heritage assets and preserve their value so that it can be useful and enjoyable by future generations and diverse communities (Article 10c).

The Faro Convention dedicates numerous articles on the role of citizens and groups in the conservation and transmission of cultural heritage. It also recognises, though, that

goodwill may not always be enough for a sustainable approach to heritage. Once again the state has the potential and the responsibility to intervene in its capacity as final arbiter between competing groups. All levels of public authority (local, regional, national) should cooperate in the management of cultural heritage(Article 11a). It is often the case that this collaboration will have to extend across national borders.

In addition to securing the legislative provisions that will allow all parties to engage with cultural heritage as defined in Article 5c, the state has the ability and the responsibility to create the "*legal, financial, and professional framework that will make possible joint action by public authorities, experts, owners, investors, businesses, non-governmental organisations and civil society*" (Article 11b). Heritage communities often have the passion and the expertise to engage meaningfully with cultural heritage, more often than not on a volunteer basis.

The volunteer ethos is widespread across Europe and offers an exciting array of ways by which citizens can engage heritage in meaningful and innovative ways. The Faro Convention recognises the contribution of volunteers and calls upon the state to "*respect and encourage*" such initiatives (Article 11d, 11e). Obviously volunteers cannot supplement the power and far-reaching influence of public authorities but the cooperation between all actors can produce exciting and appealing results. The states are, therefore, asked to encourage everyone to participate in the "*process of identification, study, interpretation, protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage*" (Article 12a). Their role is equally significant in the public debates that must accompany any effort to identify opportunities and challenges associated with any efforts to engage with heritage.

Voluntary organisations offer an alternative, less intimidating, approach to heritage. They allow the expression of views that may not be endorsed by the official state interpretation of culture and thus give voice to marginalised groups. Young people, elderly citizens, disadvantaged groups, minorities and alternative beliefs can find an outlet for their energies and opinions. Obviously it is not possible to satisfy everybody and the Faro Convention does not place any such demands on the parties. What is important is that all these groups are given a fair chance to express their views without intimidation (Article 12b, 12c, 12d). Improved access to heritage is, perhaps, the best way to "*raise awareness about its value, the need to maintain and preserve it, and the benefits which may be derived from it*" (Article 12d).

In Article 13 the Faro Convention returns to the issue of education and its close association with the concept of heritage as a "*fertile source for studies*" (Article 13a). The explanatory report makes it clear that the framework convention envisages the broadest possible integration of cultural heritage and education, not only in the most obvious fields (arts, architecture, archaeology, civil engineering, tourism, leisure, social, environmental and political studies) but also in courses where the cultural element is not as obvious. To the report's authors it is reasonable to incorporate cultural heritage to language teaching or

legal training, an exciting concept that broadens heritage's relevance and appeal to a wider new area [Explanatory Report, 2005]. Professional training and the exchange of knowledge and skills (Article 13d) are both areas where the state can play a meaningful role, ancillary to its responsibility to ensure the sustainable use of cultural heritage as defined in Article 9.

Digital technologies are the key tool to improve access to cultural heritage and enhance the benefits derived from it. The Faro Convention aims at "*encouraging initiatives which promote the quality of contents and endeavour to secure diversity of languages and cultures*" (Article 14a). This is a fundamental objective since it is closely associated with access to the cultural heritage by groups and individuals which do not belong to the dominant narrative. The people of Europe communicate in many languages but in the globalised context of 21st-century Europe there is a tendency for a few major languages to overshadow all others. The preservation of linguistic diversity is an admirable goal intertwined with the survival of cultural diversity.

On the other hand, the Convention promotes the uniformity of standards for the study, conservation and protection of cultural heritage. This is a field where international cooperation and dissemination of know-how and best practices can have tremendously positive results in the preservation of limited resources. Unlike cultural diversity, which enhances the quality of life, practical problems are fairly similar regardless of location. Mutual support among experts and sharing of knowledge and operating methods protects all parties from having to solve the same problems again and again (Article 14b, 17c). There are, though, two issues raised by the use of digital technologies. The first relates to the protection of intellectual property rights. The greatest possible free access to information is desirable for educational purposes but cannot be achieved without international agreements to address issues with the fair remuneration of the creators of digital content (Article 14c). The second issue concerns the tendency to focus on the digital element to the detriment of the original, physical object. As heritage moves online, older technologies and the objects associated with them become obsolete and inaccessible to the wider public. The balance between convenience and wide dissemination, on the one hand, and preservation of the tangible cultural object, on the other, is delicate but essential (Article 14d).

3 IMPLEMENTING FARO

3.1 FARO OBJECTIVES

The starting point for the interpretation of the Faro Convention and its application are three priorities, first elaborated in the brochure published by the Council of Europe in 2013. The first priority is the management of cultural diversity to establish cohesive societies. A cohesive society pursues the **prosperity** of all its members and eliminates marginalisation and exclusion. Its members have the opportunity of upward mobility and thrive in an environment of trust. Their sense of belonging is strong and enables them to participate in activities that reinforce the very cohesiveness that sustains their society. In the context of the first priority, the Council of Europe identifies two objectives:

Objective 1: To strengthen the public interest in heritage in order to stimulate investments preserving and enhancing the social and economic values of cultural heritage.

Objective 2: To promote conciliation and reconciliation in order to bring together within a community the divergent interests, and to allow dialogue to become one of the main forces for sustainable development.

The second priority is the improvement of the living environment and quality of life. Once again the Council of Europe presents two objectives:

Objective 3: To encourage a high quality architectural and urban design enriched by the cultural diversity of the territories and their traditions.

Objective 4: To bring together the objectives related to economic efficiency, social cohesion and ecological balance within heritage-led strategies that allow for the combined action of public authorities, investors and civil society.

The third priority is the development of the democratic participation of citizens. The Faro Convention is very explicit on the need to remove obstacles (economic, educational, political and legal) to the widest possible involvement of heritage communities and individuals with cultural heritage. A democratic environment, where all citizens feel freedom to express their views and participate in the decision-making process, is the best method whereby the Conventions' goals can achieve their maximum impact. The two objectives associated with this priority are:

Objective 5: To implement a "shared responsibility" involving citizens and civil society in mechanisms integrated with public action in order to identify values, define priorities and manage heritage-led projects.

Objective 6: To encourage a sense of responsibility in all social stakeholders so that they act on the basis of feeling they belong to a community which is enriched by its diversity.

The theoretical framework provided by the Faro Convention are translated into specific actions through the Faro Action Plan, a platform designed to display the diversity and flexibility of Faro's principles. The Plan offers member States the ability to access field based knowledge and expertise and allows the Secretariat to highlight and study specific cases.

3.2   HEREIN SYSTEM

The Faro initiatives can be registered on the HEREIN system. HEREIN is an initiative of the Council of Europe to monitor changes in legislation and practices in the participating countries and provide a forum that would allow member states to share information on cultural heritage. It supervises the implementation of the four Council of Europe Cultural Heritage Conventions:

- Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada, 1985)

- European Convention on the Protection of the Archeological Heritage –revised (La Valletta, 1992)

- European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2000)

- Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro, 2005)

HEREIN is therefore a convenient database of European heritage policies and a monitoring mechanism for trends and challenges affecting the heritage community. It enables public administrations and concerned institutions to access good practices and cooperate for their mutual benefits.

3.3   FARO PRIORITIES

The Faro Action Plan is comprised of five *priorities* where specific policies can be implemented to promote the Convention. Each of these priorities aims at creating and nurturing the heritage communities and ideas that will disseminate the Faro principles among those interested in preserving and promoting the cultural heritage at a local, regional, and international level.

3.3.1   The Faro Convention Promotion

takes place at all three levels (local, national, international). Member states can request a series of presentations through Faro Talks, Faro Meetings and Faro Labs that assist in the dissemination of good practices. The Faro Talks consist, basically, of inspirational talks at high political and/or local level, either in person or multimedia to introduce the spirit of the convention. It can be a useful first step in the effort to acquaint members of heritage communities to the wealth of ideas and possibilities introduced by the Faro Convention.

The Faro Meetings allow stakeholders to get together and become familiar with the Convention, its principles and possible actions for implementation. Finally, Faro Labs are a series of events focusing on specific actions of the Convention aimed at exhibiting and analysing the principles and criteria of Faro.

3.3.2 The Faro Community

consists of local heritage communities that join a pan-European network to share in a common pool of knowledge, expertise and tools in a spirit of effective and productive exchange of ideas. The Council of Europe defines these communities as self-organised and self-managed groups of individuals who are interested in progressive social transformation of relationships between peoples, places and stories with an inclusive approach and an enhanced definition of heritage.

The process of joining the Faro Community is pretty straight-forward. Self-identified heritage communities make themselves known to the Secretariat through their registration in the HEREIN system. The Secretariat conducts an initial assessment on principles and criteria and responds to the community's request within 4-6 weeks. The community submits its own feedback on the Secretariat's assessment, which then proceeds with the formulation and presentation of an official response that may be a formal invitation to join the Faro Community or a list of recommendations for improvements. In case of acceptance, the initiative is included in the Faro community. If improvements are recommended, the application will be reviewed at a later stage.

The element of self-identification is a useful tool that allows small heritage communities that may not feel adequately represented by larger cultural entities to make themselves known and express their viewpoints, ideas, and cultural identities at a European level. The Faro Community meetings are organised twice per year and evaluate new applications as well as good practices.

Acceptance to the Faro Community is not the final step though. It is followed by an appreciation, meaning an on-site visit to verify the effectiveness of a particular community initiative and institutional support for it in relation to the Faro principles. The visit is organised at the request of the community and are a useful tool that offers opportunities to better understand the modus operandi of good practices and to identify relevant practitioners and facilitators. Such visits to the first four communities that joined the Faro Community highlighted challenges and opportunities that should be taken into consideration in the future as they are useful reminders of the uniqueness of each place and each initiative.

The Appreciation is carried out by international experts appointed by the Council of Europe, in consultation with the applicant. The exercise lasts roughly a day and a half, and involves mainly field visits, interviews, discussions, etc. The applicants submit preliminary materials in advance: an outline of the issue at stake (as perceived by the local stakeholders/authorities requesting the appreciation), a list of participants/main

stakeholders and a list of reference documents. Interviewees include members of the heritage community, local elected representatives, central government officials, associations, organisations or individuals operating in the culture, cultural heritage and economy sectors. The Council of Europe also encourages the participation of its experts in heritage community initiatives.

3.3.3 Faro Research

is essential to the implementation of the Faro Convention. The progress and influence of the Faro Action Plan must be continuously assessed, especially during its early years when the Faro Community is established. Civil society organisations, research organisations and members of the academia are invited to study the Faro Action Plan and produce research papers, articles, reports, and documentaries. These publications should make sound recommendations and receive, consequently, the widest possible audience in the hope of inspiring new initiatives to demonstrate the role of heritage in addressing societal challenges. The final goal of Faro Research is to conduct periodic assessments on the outcomes of the Faro Action Plan and projects. Such an impact appraisal should be followed by detailed recommendations for further improvements in the field of cultural heritage management.

3.3.4 Faro Spotlights

focus on specific actions that explore the potential of cultural heritage to effect meaningful change and solve societal problems. The Secretariat is responsible for identifying specific areas and practices where action is required. Faro Spotlights is a priority intricately involved with the principles of the Faro Convention. The methodology employed for the creation and implementation of specific actions takes advantage of one of the convention's most innovative and momentous proposition; namely that any heritage asset can consist of diverse and contradictory narratives, all of which have the right to be heard. Different heritage communities should have the ability and the freedom to participate in a constructive dialogue where all the voices are heard and the importance of all the narratives is understood and articulated through various activities. This is a delicate process that requires the involvement of all stakeholders, even those whose opinions and ideas would be considered controversial by the majority culture.

The acknowledgement of the existence of heterogeneous narratives is only a crucial first step. For the Faro principles to be translated into action it is essential that the stakeholders agree on a common vision on the heritage asset. The identification of this common thread is a time-consuming process that may require the building of confidence measures, especially in cases where hostility and oppression of dissenting voices has been prolonged or particularly painful. A shared vision for action requires actions and maturity of self-evaluation, mutual understanding and willingness to participate in the process of establishing common ground.

The final step includes the organisation of all the identified points of commonality into an action plan (programme, project etc.) that is inspired by the principles of social inclusion, education, local economic development and anti-discrimination. It is hoped that such an action will have a positive impact on the heritage communities and may nourish additional narratives that will enrich the appropriation and enjoyment of the heritage asset by as many different heritage communities as possible.

The examples of Viscri, Frampol and Ostroh, as presented in Annex 8, are fine demonstrations of a fundamental principle of the Faro Convention, namely that "the value and potential of cultural heritage wisely used as a resource for sustainable development and quality of life" and "the need to involve everyone in society in the ongoing process of defining and managing cultural heritage". Heritage communities and individuals come together to create a new vision for their communities that takes into consideration what came before and the variety of heritage assets still remaining in place. The sites are renovated, protected, preserved and promoted in ingenious ways that enhance their value as a sustainable source of income and community pride. When people identify with an unfamiliar cultural heritage, Faro has laid the groundwork for peaceful coexistence and appreciation between communities that could not envision a common heritage narrative that can unite them and provide them with tools for a prosperous future.

3.3.5   Faro in Action

is an active learning platform where the Faro Community builds on its good practices, and generates dynamic dialogue among practitioners, facilitators and heritage actors. It offers a flexible tool for a continuous redefinition of the Faro principles and supports an improved understanding of its application at the local, national, and international level. Unlike Faro spotlights that present a top-down approach to the promotion of the Faro Convention, through the adoption of political priorities, Faro in Action are community-based initiatives that offer heritage communities a greater degree of freedom and flexibility to embark on intercommunal dialogue and the presentation of heritage assets with the maximum level of community input.

Faro in Action has two applications. The first one is the *Faro workshops*, community-based practical workshops to test, improve and promote specific actions in focus. At this stage these workshops are organised among the Faro Community members, including potential candidates. The second application is the *Faro good practices*, i.e. community-based initiatives, examined by the Faro community and endorsed by the Secretariat, aimed at progressively bringing these experiences from local to European level.

Faro good practices is a convenient and informative first-step towards understanding and appreciating the innovative methods through which the Faro Convention can influence civil agent participation in the promotion of cultural heritage. Two applications are of particular importance in the context of Pluggy: **Heritage walk** and **Metropolitan Trail**. Each of these two applications offers an example of how to organise a disparate group of voices and agencies to create a new heritage asset in the spirit of Faro i.e. an asset that

allows marginalised or invisible heritage communities to tell their stories. More detailed examples are given in section Faro applications of the Annex.

4 FARO LITERATURE

A number of authors have attempted to tackle issues arising from Faro's application to real-life problems. Graham Fairclough studied the implications of the Faro Convention for socially and culturally sustainable heritage action. He believes that heritage is "quintessentially and fundamentally about dialogue, discourse, debate, argument, persuasion. The process of heritage requires us to listen as well as to talk, an important duality that mirrors that other duality of heritage which is crucially at the heart of the Faro Convention - that heritage is simultaneously a right and a responsibility" [Fairclough 2014, p. 17-18]. He argues that heritage must be treated as a complicated, long, and arduous process and not as a final simple product. He rejects the paramount importance of the heritage fabric (the buildings, the statues, the concrete objects) and promotes the significance of "the new understandings, the shared experience, the lessons and mistakes, the exchange of personal knowledge, the seeing of another person's viewpoint that formed the process itself" [Fairclough 2014, p. 18]. The perfectly preserved and restored edifice is as important as the neglected ruin that suddenly becomes significant on the verge of being demolished when heritage communities realize its value in the fabric of their daily lives.

Fairclough raises some important questions regarding the ways in which heritage sustains societies, the relationship between heritage and memory, the process whereby different and often conflicting perceptions related to heritage can be recognised and accommodated. His point about Faro not being "concerned with how to protect heritage but why" [Fairclough 2014, p. 10] encapsulates in a handful of words the Convention's spirit. He rightly argues that Faro takes "the broadest possible definition of cultural heritage: intangible as well as tangible, perceptual as well as physical, action, performance, custom and behaviour as well as objects and buildings." Heritage is central to daily life and only incidentally a tourist product. As such, the Faro Convention focuses on the people who "construct, use and celebrate (or oppose) heritage. It reminds us forcefully of every citizen's right (a human right) to their own heritage and to participation in cultural life. It is equally forceful in asserting that these rights are balanced by responsibilities at individual and collective level to respect and protect the cultural heritage and the cultural memory of other groups" [Fairclough 2014, p. 11].

Fairclough also concerns himself with the issue of democratic participation. The Faro Convention endorses the notion that Europe's democratic roots and the respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law are the cornerstones of a stable society that can nurtured the development of a common heritage (Article 3). Cultural heritage is not the responsibility of experts alone but is in the hands of individuals and heritage communities. Everyone is (or should be) allowed to be involved in the definition and management of the continent's cultural assets. But the purpose of these efforts is not the preservation of the heritage as a means unto itself. Rather the goal is the accruement of "explicit and broad social benefits" [Fairclough 2014, p. 12].

It is at this point that Fairclough states in the clearest terms the marginal role of tourism: "in the traditional view, material things were privileged, and values were based on supposedly-intrinsic properties or represented a national history. This was a paradigm that encouraged the reduction of heritage to tourism and consumption. In contrast, the emerging new paradigm puts the production of heritage in the foreground, and aims to encompass greater democratic participative action, with greater concern for the local and the everyday" [Fairclough 2014, p. 12].

It would be fair to claim that, for most people, heritage is more often than not associated with tangible assets that attract (for whatever reason) a lot of scholarly attention and are widely believed to be unique or exceedingly beautiful. This is cultural heritage as a tourist attraction, often totally disconnected from the residents' daily lives. Faro offers a new paradigm and Fairclough is quick to point it out. He presents a number of examples where municipalities have associated themselves with efforts to promote social cohesion and sense of place based on a novel interpretation of heritage. The towns of Athis Mons and Fresnes, south of Paris, are two communities burdened with negative images (Orly Airport and an expansive prison are located within their municipal boundaries) and an absence of what could be described as widely known and respected heritage. There are no famous buildings or tourist attractions. The local authorities decided, nevertheless, to promote what is important for the local inhabitants, tangible and intangible assets that valorise the ordinary heritage. Old town centres, high-rise buildings, individual edifices with gardens, abandoned industrial sites, family gardens, agriculture and nature areas are combined with stories, memories, traditions, and social practices to create a map of local heritage that gives meaning to the lives of the residents [Fairclough 2014, p. 16].

Alessandra Sciurba explores the chances of improving the possibilities of the Faro Convention by associating it with the paradigm of the "commons." She underlines the convention's main elements of innovation and the diverse risks which can affect the "patrimonialisation of cultural heritage." Her main concerns are the process of identitarian instrumentalisation, the folklorisation and museification, as well as the dangers of urban and social disaggregation. Her analysis is concerned primarily with intangible heritage but there is no reason to believe that her far-reaching conclusions cannot be applied as well to tangible heritage.

Sciurba begins her analysis by presenting some key concepts and ideas promoted by Faro. Since the Convention concerns itself both with tangible and intangible resources, what is important is the process whereby people assign value to cultural assets. Cultural heritage is not an end in itself but serves the needs and expectations of individuals and the society at large [Therond 2009, p. 10]. She highlights the importance of not assigning local or social criteria of membership in the establishment of a heritage community. The Faro Convention is, as previously stated, rather inclusive in its definition of what constitutes a heritage community. A heritage community is a voluntary and public association of similar-minded people or groups who share common values and objectives regarding the perpetuation of heritage. Such communities can grow and evolve perpetually and flexibly.

Their membership is not exclusive and everyone "can belong to different heritage communities at the same time" [Sciurba 2015, p. 459].

Equally significant is Sciurba's discussion of Faro's references to human rights in relation to the common heritage of Europe. The Convention argues that the first cultural asset which is in common among all heritage communities in Europe is the continent's democratic roots and protection of human rights. This heritage is to be found in all national constitutions, as well as the international conventions and regulations devoted to the recognition and protection of human rights [Sciurba 2015, p. 459].

Sciurba also brings our attention to the dangers of what she calls "cultural reification" i.e. the transformation of human actions and relations, thoughts, concepts and knowledge to "things." This is but one of the many dangers associated with the process of patrimonialisation i.e. the transformation of tangible and intangible assets into a defined heritage which is usually differentiated in a defined space such as a museum or a natural park. Assets in differentiated spaces are usually treated as exhibits that lack any other kind of function. This "setting-aside" can result in a negative relationship between heritage assets and people [Sciurba 2015, p. 460].

Patrimonialisation can have other negative effects that need to be avoided. Economic globalisation and geographic displacement of peoples in a context of increasing poverty and precariousness can result in fear and alienation for large groups of people. The reaction is the emergence of xenophobic ideologies and the rejection of the possibility of peaceful and fruitful connection between different groups or populations in the future. The communities receiving the displaced groups and those most affected by economic upheavals, deindustrialisation, employment loss, and widespread social instability can react with an identitarian enclosing. Imagined communities coalesce around tangible and intangible cultural assets they conceive as their own and refuse to recognise the value of anything that is different. In such a hostile and insecure environment, cultural heritage can become an instrument of oppression [Sciurba 2015, p. 460-461].

Sciurba identifies two additional risks: "folklorisation" and "museification." Tourism is an important industry and source of income for many communities in Europe. Cultural heritage is often employed in the service of the tourist industry and runs the risk of being separated from the communities that nurtured and employed it for their own needs and quality of life. The stereotyping of groups and assets disrupts the continuously evolving nature of cultural heritage. Tangible and intangible assets are no longer viewed as relevant to people's daily lives. There is a real threat to their survival as lived experiences and new generations may never receive them from their ancestors in a meaningful form but simply as an "evocation of a distant past" [Sciurba 2015, p. 462].

The final threat is gentrification and abandonment. The tendency to measure everything in terms of profit leads to a process whereby cultural assets can be discarded as profitless. If an asset retains its economic value, then there is the added risk of its exclusion from everyday life. This is nowhere more obvious than in the historical centres of many old

European towns. The architectural, historic, artistic and visual wealth of these town cores is usually intertwined with a complex network of social relationships between the local inhabitants. The pressure of the tourist industry and the rise of economic profit to an overpowering motive leads to the gentrification of these areas, as the original inhabitants are evicted and with them dies a whole way of living. The Resident's cooperative in Marseilles, with its aim of rediscovering the cultural wealth of neighbourhoods often totally ignored by tourists, is a fine example of an effort to regenerate urban areas that run the risk of abandonment and poverty. Participative urbanistic pathways bring together local residents and guests in projects that combine tangible and intangible assets that instil new meanings and uses to abandoned buildings and social, economic or cultural goods that are at risk since their main users are themselves threatened with poverty and involuntary departure in search of better lives elsewhere.

Rural zones are not immune to the devaluation of cultural practices that are not viewed as profitable. Whole communities have been shuttered by the absence of services and opportunities. Local residents are forced to abandon their familiar spaces of sociability and their traditional environment to seek employment in unfamiliar urban centres where it is almost impossible to preserve their heritage and social networks. Sciurba rightly points out the dissonance between **the Culture** which is protected because it represents the way of life and values of the middle and upper classes, and **the popular heritage** that is threatened with disappearance or its transformation into a sterile tourist product [Sciurba 2015, p. 462-464].

The solution proposed by Sciurba is the employment of the concept of the "commons" to promote the goals and values embodied in the Faro Convention. The Council of Europe defines Commons as "the particular kinds of resources that need to be protected from exploitation for private profit, because they are essential for ensuring a dignified life for each member of a human community" [Sciurba 2013, p. 48]. A dignified life depends on access to resources for surviving and the ability to share in the valorisation of histories, competences and human relationships with other members of a community and places. It is evident that cultural heritage is shared by everyone and is produced by the interaction between people, places and history. It is therefore impossible for any single individual or group to possess this heritage and appropriate it for their own purposes [Sciurba 2015, p. 465].

Sciurba makes a distinction between "non-places" and "places" i.e. sites where business and economic production is based and sites where cultural heritage takes shape (historical town centres, close-knit neighborhoods etc.). Sher calls for the encouragement and support of self-recovery efforts for urban spaces and traditional crafts through participatory forms of joint management between private enterprises, institutions and citizens. Sciurba acknowledges the need for new fiscal systems that would encourage initiatives based on the "common pooling of resources which valorise the sharing of cultural heritage" [Sciurba 2015, p. 467].

She offers a prime example of such an effort where tourism, rather than being a threat to the survival of heritage communities and assets becomes a means of preserving them and bequeathing them to future generations endowed with a new meaning that can ensure its contribution to a better quality of life. In Palermo old handcrafts in the historical centre of the city (potters, weavers, tinsmiths etc.) collaborate with the expanding street-food sector (which is itself an essential part of the local cultural heritage) to supply the tourist market. The transmission of ancient artisanal competences will support the local economy. CLAC, the cultural association in charge of the Palermo project, is also working on an effort to use auto-narration for discovering local cultural heritage in Sicilian zones where memories are an essential element of urban regeneration. The aim is not simply to preserve but to bring memories back to life [Sciurba 2015, p. 470-471].

The Commons approach "valorises differences and mixtures within a common view of interaction and mutual respect". It can implement the Faro definition of cultural heritage and heritage communities by "making them interact with a complex cluster of rights which are the essential requisites of a dignified life for all people. From this viewpoint, the rediscovery of a cultural heritage as a common can give shape to new collective, dynamic and open identities with enormous advantages for the territory in which they are expressed...the Commons approach can come to the rescue against the processes of identitarian closure associated to some ideas of cultural heritage" [Sciurba 2015, p. 474-475].

A Common can assist local or regional or even national communities to discover (again or for the first time) the potential for empowerment that will allow them to experience their cultural heritage as a common, something that can improve their quality of life in the present and acquire value that will justify its passing on to the future generations.

Sarah Wolferstan and Graham Fairclough begin their analysis on the significance of landscape and heritage in the process of establishing a common European heritage with a comparison of the Faro Convention to previous European protocols. The Council of Europe's Granada and Valetta conventions on Architectural and Archaeological Heritage respectively and the World Heritage Convention, were concerned with the fabric of heritage. The Faro Convention, on the other hand, "considers heritage from the viewpoint of the (living) people who construct and make, use and celebrate (or oppose) heritage. It is the values that they hold to be important that is heritage, rather than the fabric itself, and their human right to have such a value recognised that are key" [Wolferstan 2013, p.43].

The two authors claim that Faro is calling for a new use of the past where heritage is no longer a limited list of assets in need of protection but something that is "universal and ubiquitous." Their argument is compelling. Most people do not reside near to what are traditionally considered cultural monuments. Their daily lives take place in mundane environments that retain, despite their prosaic nature, a social and psychological importance for the members of the community. Wolferstan and Fairclough argue that "if

we accept that the past is omnipresent, and that 'landscape' (townscape) is how people relate to their world, then it would seem to be vital to help people understand the historic dimension of their environment not least due to their potential as an instrument of democratic engagement, one of the Council of Europe's central missions" [Wolferstan 2013, p.46-49]. Over the past two decades, as a result of the bloody conflicts in former Yugoslavia, the Council of Europe has sought to understand and define what it means to be European. In the process it has altered the notion of what is desirable as heritage "from the monumental to the everyday, from national glories to diverse multiple cultures." [Wolferstan 2013, p.44].

Peter Turner writes as an outsider to the field of cultural heritage. He identifies two goals of the field of cultural heritage: cultural diversity and human rights. He is concerned with the conflict that arises when diversity clashes with rights as he views the former as a flawed goal that can create worse problems than it solves. In face of this conflict, he opts to promote rights as the fundamental goal of cultural heritage.

There are two theories of culture: the positivist and the constructivist. The former is the oldest and views culture as a collection of objects that must be preserved and protected, thus prejudicing the public towards tangible heritage. The constructivist approach, on the other hand, rejects the notion that culture can be owned. Culture is to be found in the thoughts and practices of a group and everything people do is Culture.

It is not possible to valorise one example of Culture over another and, since Culture exists dynamically in the evolving actions and ideas of people, culture-holders are subjects with important human rights. This view reinforces the neutrality on the content of cultural practices (Turner, pp. 352-353).

Turner proceeds to discuss a frequent analogy made to support cultural diversity with arguments reminiscent of the discourse on biological diversity. The desire and effort to preserve a culture is based on human rights and the idea of fairness. We believe that individuals and groups have a right to remain as they choose to be and we reject the notion that they should be forced to change or adapt to the will of the majority.

Turner then proceeds to reject two of the most popular and often invoked threats to cultural heritage. The preservation of culture as a means to learn from it about patterns of human behaviour can be achieved in a museum display or academic documentation. But preservation *per se* only makes sense when we view cultural practices of a specific kind as having value as such. If we accept the constructivist notion that culture is going on all around us, then even the destruction of culture is an act of culture. Why should we prefer one set of cultural actions over the other? (Turner, p. 355). The threat of cultural homogeneity in a globalised world is also problematic because it is difficult to identify cultural diversity and the process of specifying examples of diversity can speed cultural extinction and homogenisation in a process described by Turner as *inflation in heritage* (Turner, p.356).

Preservation practices can often deny culture-holders autonomy. Cultural diversity is mostly attractive to those who belong to dominant cultural groups and the view from an endangered culture can be quite different. Members of such groups may resent their lack of access to resources and seek to change their cultural situation to improve their access to said resources. UNESCO conventions are often unable to provide a meaningful solution and may even cause more problems than they can solve. More often than not they fail to deal with the potential conflict between the rights to cultural expression and other human rights. There is also the problem of "unattractive heritage" which raises the question whether we protect a cultural practice that does harm (Turner, pp. 356-357). It should be noted that under the conventions member states have the responsibility to determine the practices that will promote heritage. The reason is that the structure and administration of heritage derives from the structure of the nation-state. Each state has developed a narrative around the historical remains contained within its borders but in almost every case "there is a contradiction between the nation-state's interest in an asserted homogeneity and the goal of cultural diversity." (Turner, p. 357-358).

For Turner, diversity *per se* should not be a fundamental goal. He believes that even people who need help to protect their heritage do so because they have joined the international community (no matter how involuntarily). This international community "possesses its own culture (internationalism) with its own practices and ideology that is worthy of respect" (Turner, p. 358). It is the engagement of states with international conventions that serves as a soft instrument and offers an incremental progress towards the goal of a world where disrespect is not acceptable. Cultures and people need a culture that serves them (Turner, pp. 359-360).

Stuart Hall explores the impact on heritage by the arrival of cultural diversity and difference, as well as the effects of nation building on the preservation of minority heritage assets and ideologies. His focus is Great Britain, a country where the idea of heritage is intertwined with preservation and conservation of works and artefacts that carry value only through their connection to the historical past. The British consider heritage as the "material embodiment of the spirit of the nation" (Hall, 21). Hall does not limit his own approach to the conservation of the past but accepts that the production of culture and artefacts can and should be a living activity.

Hall identifies the earlier (and perhaps still extant) uses of heritage as a means to classify and preserve objects of value or beauty as a means to amplify power and status, as well as an exercise in the "symbolic power to order knowledge…and thus to give meaning to objects and things through the imposition of interpretative schemas, scholarship and the authority of connoisseurship" (Hall, 22). Heritage is also an indirect method by which a state can educate the public and ensure the appropriate attitude and response from its citizens. Those who were knowledgeable and conversant with the state version of the past could be considered to belong to the said state. Similar to a person or a family, who construct their stories by selecting among the myriads of incidents and turning points in their lives, a nation constructs the identity of its members by creating a "national story"

based on the selection of key points from the seamless past. Eventually a dominant tradition obliterates many other episodes that do not fit with its narrative and heritage functions as a means to social incorporation (Hall, 22-23).

This process worked reasonably well for societies that could be considered relatively homogeneous and settled. It is obvious that no state has ever been able to completely eliminate dissonant voices, fissures and exclusion and no society has, so far, been able to express the totality of its members' lived experiences, ideas, notions and beliefs. There was, nevertheless, a higher degree of conformity based on national, religious, and social uniformity. In that context, heritage was intended for those who belonged.

Recent developments have dramatically altered the process of heritage construction. Hall enumerates a number of conceptual shifts including the awareness by the marginalised of the symbolic power involved in the activity of representation and a decline in the acceptance of traditional authority and the associated construction of a dominant and exclusive heritage discourse. The most obvious consequences of these shifts appear in the relationship between cultural institutions and their audience, a dialogue that becomes increasingly more open to reinterpretation and more transparent in terms of recognising and addressing its particular perspectives, assumptions, and interpretations.

The incorporation of excluded voices in the dominant heritage discourse is possible but requires more than money and the existence of an adequate institutional framework. What is more urgently and imperatively called for is access of the younger generations to new cultural repertoires to escape the limitations of a "monolingual" culture. Contemporary popular culture is an excellent example of cooperation between the new and the traditional. It is a process of cultural production that freely selects and incorporates what it requires from the treasure chest of world heritage to create something new and far more inclusive than the individual heritages that supply the raw materials. The end result can be a new community that is more inclusive and welcoming to a broader range of voices and interpretations of heritage.

This brief literature review reveals a broad consensus in regards to Faro's novelty and contribution to the protection of cultural heritage. All authors agree that Faro presents a new way of dealing with heritage assets by relocating the emphasis from the fabric (monuments, buildings, objects) to the values attached by people and communities to the fabric. They also seem content with two important definitions, first proposed by the Convention authors, regarding heritage communities and the concept of common European heritage.

The former is now defined in such a way as to sidestep problems that could arise from a close association with ethnicity or other limited categories and promotes multiculturalism as against universalism. Migration and demography present challenges and affect the way host communities view their heritage assets. The Convention offers a flexible tool that deals with demographic issues (and coincidental economic issues) and makes heritage something portable, that can follow people and adjust to new circumstances, even

without the presence of cultural monuments. Reconciliation is important to Faro and in the flexible and novel concept of the common European heritage the Convention takes a stand against ethnic-nationalism, xenophobia, and cultural isolationism. There is no "unified identity, a particular period or type of heritage and this is a refreshing change from much discussion of the culture, geography or religion that should define Europe. [Faro] does something more sophisticated and nuanced: it proposes a common heritage of ideas, whether political or social, which can meet at the crossroads of several affiliations." [Wolferstan 2013, p.46].

5 GUIDELINES FOR PLUGGY

Based on the aforementioned analysis of the literature and the Faro Convention, it is now possible to establish some general guidelines and suggestions regarding the ways in which PLUGGY's Social Platform and the accompanying Curatorial Tool can assist in the implementation of the convention's goals.

- The most obvious conclusion is that PLUGGY must reflect the Convention's novel adaptability to an assortment of communities and cultural environments that, up to now, may not have been able to cooperate or communicate effectively in terms of managing and appropriating cultural heritage. The Faro Convention concerns itself with **tangible and intangible resources**. The former are easier to recognise and define but the latter are easier to instrumentalise. Since few things automatically have heritage value, it is far more useful to recognise that values are attributed to things by circumstance, fashion or need. "The conflicts that heritage provokes are therefore almost always about contested ways of valuing. Rarely is an historic building destroyed because its existence is denied; it is its value, meaning and significance to one or more groups or individuals that is argued over" [Wolferstan 2013, p.45]. Pluggy should be designed in such a way as to encompass both types of heritage resources (tangible and intangible) and since the Faro Convention does not provide precise typologies, **the widest possible flexibility should be shown** in what can be included in our social platform and curatorial tool.

- Article 2 of the Faro Convention defines cultural heritage as a group of resources which people identify as an expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It is not rigid but develops according to the needs of the community. It is essential that PLUGGY incorporates the same spirit of **innovation and ability to adjust** to ever-changing demands and requirements. This affirmation of adaptability will ensure that the social platform and the curatorial tool will be in a position to respond to the inconceivable challenges the future may present.

- The same article defines heritage community as a group of people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage which they wish to sustain and transmit. There is no reference to ethnicity, religion, social class, economic or educational level. In fact, as we saw earlier, there is not even any demand that members of the community should act on their particular values. For the purposes of PLUGGY though, it seems evident that user action is required. The platform and the curatorial tool must be **open to all** who wish to become members of the heritage community without any exclusions (with the caveat, elaborated further on, that participants must abide by the rule of recognising the right of other participants to promote their values and aspects of cultural heritage).

- The Faro Convention aims at an inclusive and egalitarian approach to cultural heritage that empowers people to become active custodians and owners of their past in collaboration with other individuals or groups (article 4). The caveat regarding each

heritage steward being responsible for taking into account other viewpoints, with which he or she may not agree, and respecting their right to be heard, is pertinent here. The Social Platform must provide a forum that will **nourish mutual respect and open discussion** without prejudice or hindrance. The possibility of abuse and the presence of xenophobic, racist, demeaning or threatening language, ideas, and attitudes cannot be discounted. Heritage is often a source of extreme pride for individuals or groups that do not look kindly upon opinions that seem to contradict their most deeply held beliefs. PLUGGY should be able to deal with such issues expeditiously and fairly. Certain **restrictions are unavoidable in terms of material** that may be presented in the platform. The **civility and decorum** expected for participation in a public setting **should be encouraged and enforced** either through the use of moderators or self-reporting mechanisms.

- Article 5 of the Faro Convention calls on all parties to recognise the public interest associated with elements of the cultural heritage in accordance with their importance to society. They are also encouraged to enhance the value of the cultural heritage through the identification, study, interpretation, protection and presentation. They must also recognise the value of cultural heritage situated on territories under their jurisdiction regardless of its origin. These are all admirable goals but it is often the case that limited funds or resources or time prevent even the most willing state party from carrying out all its obligations. It is frequently called upon to make quick decisions on inadequate information. The hierarchical approach to heritage according to the importance to society is fraught with problems regarding the exclusion of minority values or the elevation of economic considerations above more abstract values. PLUGGY could provide a beneficial service by **hosting and promoting alternative graduated value systems**. The participation of a diversified group of heritage communities and the diffusion of their values, beliefs and traditions among the broader heritage public can assist in the re-evaluation of particular heritage assets and encourage their conservation and presentation.

- One of the Convention's key concepts is elaborated on in Article 7. The respect for diversity of interpretations and the equitable dealing with situations where contradictory values are placed on the same heritage asset by different communities form the backbone of Faro. The PLUGGY Social Platform should be an **open forum where discussion is actively encouraged**. Different heritage communities should have access to discussion panels where they can exchange ideas and present their particular values in a manner that will sustain a reasonable and unbiased debate. Different traditions and beliefs should be introduced and displayed to generate a meaningful discussion and allow all parties to reflect on the ethics and good practices for the preservation and enjoyment of any given heritage asset.

- Article 7 also calls for the development of knowledge of cultural heritage as a resource to facilitate peaceful co-existence by promoting trust and mutual understanding. Such approaches should be integrated into lifelong education and training. The Social

Platform and the Curatorial Tool could serve the role of a **knowledge depository**, not only for well-known and admired cultural monuments but for lesser known heritage assets that have value for relatively smaller communities. Since Faro does not prioritize between tangible and intangible monuments or between famous and unfamiliar resources, PLUGGY can host, gradually, an exciting wealth of material and knowledge supplied by the communities themselves, the best source of information on aspects of identity, remembrance, tradition, and memory.

- Article 8 of the Faro Convention develops the notion of an integrated approach to policies concerning cultural, biological, geological and landscape diversity. The places where people live carry particular significances for them, often distinctly different from more traditional, established heritage sites that can appear cut-off from the flow of daily life. The environment is worthy of protection and any contemporary additions to it must take into consideration the need for quality and respect for cultural values. Obviously a social platform or a curatorial tool cannot directly affect the environment. They can provide a meeting place where concerned individuals and groups can discuss issues arising from the development of sites or alteration to the environment (natural, rural or urban). The **provision of tools to investigate, explore, compare and study the environment**, both in its present condition and in its historic evolution through the ages would be a valuable addition. It is often difficult to differentiate or disassociate a heritage asset from the natural setting or landscape where it grew, prospered, or vanished. The Curatorial Tool would benefit greatly from the ability of its users to employ geographical devices to correlate and position their heritage assets in their original (or even contemporary) setting.

- The sustainable use of the cultural heritage requires an understanding of the cultural values involved, the sustainable management and maintenance of assets, knowledge of specific conservation requirements and the promotion of traditional materials, techniques and skills. A system of professional qualifications and accreditation for individuals, businesses and institutions is also of paramount importance. The Social Platform is an obvious meeting place for people and groups who possess or seek such traditional knowledge. The **availability of directories or databases** could be a useful addition or method of organisation. The **availability of visual or audio material that present traditional skills and methods** can encourage their propagation and the recruitment of new practitioners. The use of such material by the curators could enhance their digital museums with a more comprehensive presentation that includes not only the heritage asset but the materials and techniques employed in its creation. At the very least, the open exchange of ideas and information in the platform can disseminate information on traditional practitioners who possess the required accreditation and qualifications among the various communities and encourage comparison and hierarchisation.

- The connection between cultural heritage and economic activity is investigated in Article 10 of the Faro Convention. The essence of the article concerns the utilisation

of the economic potential of the cultural heritage, a development that necessitates information on the specific character and interests of the cultural heritage. Its inherent value should not be compromised. PLUGGY can provide interested parties and governmental agencies with the means to determine the relevant character and interests not only of the heritage asset but the heritage communities that endow it with value. It can serve as a safety valve to reduce tension that usually arises from the intentional or unintentional lack of knowledge regarding the opinions and values of groups that do not have access to mainstream or majority venues of communication and dissemination of information. The Social Platform, in particular, **should provide anyone interested in gaining an insight on the values and opinions of heritage communities with the ability to do so in a comprehensive manner**.

- Apart from access to community values and opinions, the Social Platform can allow public authorities to co-operate with other heritage actors. The proposed actions by public authorities could be discussed and elaborated on by members of heritage communities and voluntary initiatives undertaken by the latter can complement official policies and activities. The Platform should **allow all heritage actors** (i.e. public authorities, experts, owners, investors, businesses, NGO's and members of the civil society) **to come together and exchange knowledge, good practices and expectations**.

- Article 12 is very specific in the need for the democratic and uninhibited participation of everyone in the process of identification, study, interpretation, protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage. Each community must be able to present its values. The same applies to voluntary organisations that are often actively engaged in heritage issues and have extensive local knowledge. They are less intimidating and encourage the active participation of individuals and groups that normally feel marginalised by official policies and state actions. It is particularly important to strengthen the presence of young people and the disadvantaged, groups that are often at the periphery of economic and social activity and are constantly threatened with abandonment and isolation. PLUGGY must be **easily accessible, easy and friendly to use, with an appearance and operational capabilities that would make it attractive both to a younger audience and marginalised groups** that may not feel comfortable expressing their values and participating in joint actions. PLUGGY can assist or even substitute the state's role in ensuring that individuals and groups are not (or feel they are not) excluded from even the possibility of benefiting from their cultural heritage.

- Article 13 is concerned with the role of education. Cultural heritage should be included at all levels of education, either as a subject of study, or as a fertile source for studies in other subjects. The Curatorial Tool **should have an educational role and allow educators and students to take advantage of digital technologies to design or complement educational material.** This is applicable not only in heritage studies but in an exciting and broad assortment of study fields. It could provide visual and audio

material, reveal hidden meanings and connection between heritage assets, assist in eliminating xenophobia and encourage a more inclusive and accommodating approach towards what is foreign, unfamiliar or strange. As a forum where professionals and amateurs can come together, it can serve as source of information and material to strengthen the links between cultural heritage education and vocational training, **encourage interdisciplinary research and the continuous professional training and the exchange of knowledge and skills within and outside the educational system**.

- The final article that is relevant to the purposes of PLUGGY (Article 14) discusses the connection between cultural heritage and the information society. The parties to the Faro Convention are encouraged to use digital technology to enhance access to cultural heritage. PLUGGY's very nature seems to serve this specific purpose. But this is not enough. It is essential that both the Social Platform and the Curatorial Tool are **available in the greatest diversity of languages** that is feasible, to combat the linguistic hegemony that accompanies globalisation and that often leads to the marginalisation of entire groups of heritage communities. It should **promote and encourage the adherence to the highest standards of content quality** and employ methods to **combat illicit trafficking in cultural property.** Co-operation with databases that attempt to curb the trade in illicit cultural goods seems essential. The question of intellectual property rights is difficult to answer and all efforts should be made to **ensure proper protection where necessary, without hindering the versatility of the Curatorial Tool and the Social Platform for educational purposes**.

To ensure that Pluggy reflects the main principles of Faro and is inspired and defined by them, it is possible to summarise and simplify the Convention's purpose in fourteen objectives. In order to facilitate and expedite the work of the technical communities (current and future developers) we have created GitLab tags/labels in accordance with the Faro objectives identified in the previous paragraphs, and we have matched them with all the requirements/features of PLUGGY. Thus is it easy to determine which features correspond to which principle, an ingenious way to see if any FARO premises have not been adequately addressed at this stage, requiring therefore future implementation. These fourteen objectives are an easy way to ensure that all PLUGGY deliverables will not veer too far off the requirements of the FARO convention.

The following are the fourteen objectives identified:

1. **Flexibility of resources & content**
   PLUGGY will allow its users (whether developers or the general public) to take advantage and employ a diverse and adaptable array of resources and content to address their needs without undue limitations.

2. **Innovation and flexibility of tech**
   PLUGGY will employ cutting-edge technologies and innovations in such a way as not to preclude its connectivity to existing platforms.

3. **Inclusivity & openness**

    PLUGGY is designed as an inclusive and distributive platform that promotes openness and acceptability for various viewpoints and cultural experiences.

4. **Respectful dialogue**

    PLUGGY will support and promote an open dialogue among all cultural communities, enabling each one to participate in the intercultural debate in a respectful and accommodating environment.

5. **Supporting alternate graduated value systems**

    PLUGGY will provide for the reconciliation of different value systems by enabling all members of cultural communities to express their own perspective that may be alternative to the mainstream value system. It will also be an excellent platform for voices that hesitate to express their viewpoint, because it will give them access to cultural products that reflect their values but they did not know that they existed.

6. **Open forum**

    PLUGGY will be an open forum that will invite members of cultural communities to join an honest and participative dialogue for the mutual benefit of the wider public.

7. **Knowledge depository**

    PLUGGY will serve as a knowledge depository whereby all cultural aspects can be equally represented and highlighted.

8. **Multimedia content**

    PLUGGY is designed to incorporate all current and future forms of media.

9. **Fostering synergies**

    PLUGGY will combine flexibility of resources, content, and tech to foster synergies that can potentially result in new tools and cultural products to enrich European cultural heritage.

10. **Accessibility and user-friendliness**

    PLUGGY will take into account the needs and requirements of the wider public, ensuring that no disability will prevent a member of a cultural community from participating in the platform. On the contrary, PLUGGY will be easy, engaging, and user-friendly.

11. **Educational role**

    PLUGGY aspires to become the quintessential and indispensable educational tool for the future generations of Europeans, who are eager to engage with the continent's cultural heritage.

12. **Language diversity**

PLUGGY will integrate all European languages and provide appropriate functionality for a multilingual audience.

13. **Combat illicit trafficking**

PLUGGY acknowledges the detrimental role of illicit cultural trafficking to the preservation of cultural heritage and will be provided with security features to protect cultural products.

14. **Fair use**

PLUGGY will encourage the re-use of cultural products while ensuring maximum respect and protection of intellectual property.

6 CONCLUSION

"The gallery was a most magnificent sight. A vista of 1,300 feet, of pictures, pillars of precious marble, and massive gilding. The first sensation seemed to be the same to all spectators, a feeling of eager, uneasy wonder. It required days to be able to look upon this dazzling collection with the calmness necessary to enjoyment." This is how the Irish poet George Croly described his visit to the Louvre Museum in 1815, shortly after the British and Prussian armies had forced Napoleon out. The vast Gallery that run the whole length of the palace was full with almost two thousand paintings, arranged frame to frame and covering the walls from the floor to the ceiling [Alderson 1996]. The ground-floor halls housed a bewildering number of statues and statuary from all over the world. It was the result of a deliberate policy of thefts, that begun in 1794 (barely a year since the museum opened its doors to the public) with a consignment of works of European art, including Rubens's *Descent from the Cross* that originally adorned the Antwerp Cathedral [Haley 2003, p. 24-25]. Further expeditions during the Napoleonic Wars added numerous masterpieces to the Louvre's collections from Italy, Spain, Austria, the Netherlands, and Egypt.

The purpose of this majestic display was to supply a panorama of human achievement. The works of art had to be organised and presented in a way that would enable the public to understand their original purpose, to enjoy their aesthetic qualities, to restore as much as possible of their earlier effect and, finally, to rearrange history by placing the objects according to eras and periods, thus creating "stable chronological environments" [Focillon 1989, p. 139]. This kind of presentation is based on certain assumptions popularised by Winckelmann and the German poet August Wilhelm Schlegel. They both believed that the culture of the nation is best captured and presented by its most impressive and monumental works of art, which by definition would be comparatively few in number. There objects should be organised in a historical order to show the culture's true shape. And, finally, the presentation of these forms, whether tangibly or orally, would amount to teaching and promoting a nation's cultural history [Haley 2003, p. 29].

Winckelmann and Schlegel represent a *monumentalist approach* to cultural heritage. The emphasis is on select sculptures, paintings and other notable heritage assets that are best displayed in proper institutions following the careful work and study by accredited heritage professionals. But there is another way of appreciating culture and employing its assets. In 1819 the English writer and literary critic William Hazlitt argued that "a Grecian temple...is a classical object: it is beautiful in itself, and excites immediate admiration. But the ruins of a Gothic castle have no beauty or symmetry to attract the eye; yet they excite a more powerful and romantic interest, from the ideas with which they are habitually associated" [Haley 2003, p.33]. This is obviously not the place to debate the relative merits of Hazlitt's evaluation of the Greek and the Gothic period in art. What is fundamentally important in the context of the Faro Convention is the poet's recognition that it is the associated ideas that matter the most in the appropriation of a heritage asset. The Gothic castle may or may not be considered beautiful; the Greek temple may or may not be

deemed beautiful in itself. But in any case the ideas (and feelings) stirred by these buildings have value and significance.

The Faro Convention is primarily concerned with the appropriation of cultural heritage by self-established communities that recognise a common belief in its importance and wish to contribute to the level of their abilities towards its preservation and enjoyment by the society at large. It recognises the crucial role of alternative voices in creating an inclusive environment where all those who feel ignored or marginalised by the official cultural orthodoxies may find a channel to express themselves, reclaim part of their past, and employ it to improve their quality of life, the urban and natural landscape, and their sense of dignity and self-worth. The Convention also acknowledges the vital role of comprehensive and effective partnership and cooperation between private agents (groups or individuals) and public bodies with the expertise and the political/financial clout to bring about immediate change on a small or large scale.

These goals are commendable. They have the potential to restore a bilateral relationship between communities and their heritage, between individuals and monuments, between all members of society, and between the past, the present and the future. With the right set of tools, technological and legislative, it should be possible for every member of a heritage community to establish, curate, and promote a personal Louvre of a scale similar or even grander to that achieved in Napoleonic Paris. Such a museum, not restrained by location, budget limitations, lack of space, or acquisition policies, could become a true home for the muses, encompassing any heritage asset deemed significant by the community and present truly comprehensive panorama of human achievement in any chosen field. The Faro Convention was an essential first step. It is now time for another one.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alderson, William T.; Alexander, Edward (1996). *Museums in motion: an introduction to the history and functions of museums*. Walnut Creek, Calif: Published in cooperation with the American Association for State and Local History [by] AltaMira Press.

Council of Europe (2005a). Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society ["The Faro Convention"], Council of Europe Treaty Series 199.

Council of Europe (2005b). Explanatory Report to the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, Council of Europe Treaty Series 199.

Council of Europe (2014), AT(2014)510. *Action plan for the promotion of the Faro Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society 2013-2015: State of progress and perspectives*.

Focillon, Henri (1989). *The life of forms in art*. New York: Zone Books.

Haley, Bruce (2003). *Living Forms: Romantics and the Monumental Figure*. New York: SUNY Press.

Hall, Stuart (1999). "Whose Heritage? Un-settling 'The Heritage', re-imagining the post-nation." *Third text: Critical Perspectives on Contemporary Art and Culture*. 49: 3-13.

Haskell, Francis; Penny, Nicholas (1981). *Taste and the Antique*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sciurba, Alessandra (ed.) (2013). *Living in dignity in the XXIst century: Poverty and inequality, a paradox in societies of rights and democracy?*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Sciurba, Alessandra (2015). "Moving beyond the collateral effects of the Patrimonialisation: The Faro Convention and the 'Commonification' of Cultural Heritage." in Lauso Zagato, Lauso, Vecco, Marilena (eds.), *Citizens of Europe: Cultures and Rights.* Venice: Università Ca' Foscari, pp. 457-478.

Thérond, Daniel (2009). "Benefits and innovations of the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the value of cultural heritage for society." in: Therond, Daniel, Trigona, Anna (eds.), *Heritage and Beyond.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, pp. 9-12.

Turner, Peter (2006). "What is Heritage Good For? Report on the Pocantico Conference for the *International Journal of Cultural Property,* October, 19-21, 2005." *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 13: 351-360.

Wolferstan, Sarah and Fairclough, Graham (2013). "Common European Heritage: Reinventing Identity Through Landscape and Heritage?" in Callebaut, D. (ed.), *Heritage Reinvents Europe*, EAC Occasional Paper No 7: Proceedings of the International Conference Ename, Belgium 2011, pp. 43–54.

8 ANNEX

Demonstrations of a fundamental principle of the Faro Convention

8.1 FARO SPOTLIGHTS

In 2016 the spotlight was on Roma communities, migrant communities and Jewish heritage. Three locations were chosen to focus on one of the selected spotlight themes. Bilbao in northern Spain focused on migrant communities and heritage, Ostroh in western Ukraine tackled issues associated with its Jewish heritage, while Viscri, a commune in Brașov County, Romania, took up the theme of Roma communities and heritage.

Viscri is a village northwest of Rupea, in the Bunești commune in Brașov County, Romania. The first documentation of Viscri is a record of church taxes dated around 1400, in which the village is referred to as being part of the Rupea parish. The village is best known for the highly fortified Viscri Lutheran church, originally built around 1100 by the ethnic German Transylvanian Saxon community at a time when the area belonged to the Kingdom of Hungary. Together with the surrounding village, the church forms part of the *Villages with fortified churches in Transylvania* UNESCO World Heritage Site. Additionally, the church is listed as a historic monument by Romania's Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

The mass departure of Saxons to Germany between 1990 and 1995 emptied the village of Viscri of 80% of its population, leaving the Roma as the majority population. Carolina Fernolend, a member of the dwindling Saxon community, was determined to preserve the Saxon heritage and assist the local Roma to live a dignified existence. She collaborated with the Mihai Eminescu Trust, an organisation dedicated to the conservation and regeneration of villages and communes in Transylvania and the Maramureș, to establish the *Whole Village Project - Viscri*. The Whole Village Project is a program of sustainable rural development based on the implementation of three types of activities:

- The restoration of the cultural heritage: buildings, landscape, crafts and traditional farming.

- The development of the local entrepreneurial skills by supporting small rural businesses, the professional qualification of the locals and creating job opportunities.

- The development of sustainable cultural tourism by promoting the rural heritage, natural landscape exploration, traditional accommodation, ecological produce and the overall unique experience of country life.

The Whole Village Project is implemented by the locals with the use of local construction materials and techniques. The program creates new jobs while preserving traditional skills and breathing new life into handcrafts and small businesses. Traditional farms and farming methods are encouraged and preserved. The natural and cultural heritage is promoted

and advertised through the development of sustainable tourist activities. There is even an ongoing discussion about banning the use of motor vehicles, at least part of the year, to minimize their impact on the traditional character of the community.

The results of this project have been very encouraging. The vast majority of Roma families are meaningfully employed and independent of social welfare. All the children attend school. Tourist facilities and itineraries, and the promotion of traditional activities enable the villagers to assume control of their inheritance and profit from it in a responsible and sustainable fashion. The village's Saxon past has become an economic asset for a new community that experiences its surroundings as something worthy of protection. A sustainable water treatment system, access to safe water, and the shared use of municipal land improve the villagers quality of life and inspire confidence in the future.

The Faro Spotlight on Jewish heritage addresses the rise of anti-Semitism across Europe, where Jewish communities had an active presence for many centuries. As a result of a series of 20th century atrocities, most Jewish communities have disappeared, leaving behind them "orphaned" heritage assets that seem to linger on the sidelines, as other heritage communities ignore them or are completely unaware of their presence and significance. To ensure the sustainability of protection and promotion of Jewish cultural assets across European municipalities and territories, the Council of Europe aims to support communities that understand this heritage and wish to make it an integral part of their local narratives.

In 2012, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted a Resolution on Jewish cemeteries in which member states were invited to develop practical tools to promote the implementation of the Faro Convention. Heritage communities were encouraged to participate in the protection, restoration, maintenance and transmission of local cultural and religious heritage.

In this context, the Council of Europe supports to an ambitious project, run by the ESJF European Jewish Cemeteries Initiative and funded, in part, by the German Government, to protect the thousands of burial sites across central and eastern Europe through the delineation of cemetery boundaries, the construction of walls and locking gates, and the general cleaning of the site. There are approximately 10,000 known Jewish cemetery sites across the member states of the Council of Europe, with three-quarters located in Central and Eastern Europe.

Faro spotlight programs developed in two communities, Frampol in southeast Poland and Ostroh in the Ukraine.

Frampol is a town in Poland, in Biłgoraj County, Lublin Voivodeship. It was founded in 1717 and by 1735 the local Jewish community had its own cemetery. During the Second World War most of the town was destroyed during an air raid by the Luftwaffe on September 13, 1939. The Jewish community was also exterminated in the Holocaust, a blow from which

the town never fully recovered. Today Frampol's population is less than half the size it had attained before the war.

In the absence of a supportive community, the Jewish cemetery was completely neglected but after many decades there was a movement to restore it, a project that was finally completed successfully by the ESJF in collaboration with local partners. The local Christian school children are now in charge of caring for the abandoned Jewish cemetery. The project is supported by the Beilink Foundation and the local community that is now involved with protecting a small part of the Jewish culture.

A second example of Faro Spotlights initiatives is the community of Ostroh in the Rivne region, Ukraine. This case presented a different set of challenges compared to Frampol because Ostroh considers itself to be a multicultural town, home to disparate religious communities. There is also an element of modernity in the community's self=image that originates from its position as a regional centre for science and education.

The Council of Europe Secretariat carried out a mission to Ostroh in July 2016 with the aim of examining the situation of Jewish cemeteries in relation to surrounding communities, including anti-discrimination measures, social integration, migration, social exclusion and extremism. The Ostroh Jewish community was established more than a thousand years ago and there are some tombstones in the cemetery dated as far back as 1445. The Holocaust deeply affected the Jewish residents who suffered significant losses.

The outcome of this Council of Europe mission was the realisation that the dialogue among the local communities would enable them to become familiar with their stories and assist them in establishing a shared vision that would include the Jewish cemeteries and cultural heritage. This could be the only sustainable solution, far superior to the erection of a fence or a gate. Which could not protect the cemetery from acts of vandalism. A presentation to groups in Ostroh resulted in vivid discussions on some activities and the introduction of initiatives such as European Heritage Days and Cultural Routes, as well as Faro good practices. The inclusion of the Jewish cemetery in these programmes facilitates the promotion of the idea of the existence of common cultural elements shared by the vanished Jewish community and their existing heritage communities.

8.2   FARO APPLICATIONS

8.2.1   Heritage Walk

A Heritage walk combines the stories of all participants with research work based on academic and scientific resources, combined with the life experiences of local residents. These quintessential foundations are then added-on with the discovery of local points of interest and extraordinary stories, as well as large doses of the location's accumulated knowledge. The goal is to experience, document, and live a territory in innovative ways. The walk can take a variety of forms, ranging from guided tours offered by the heritage

community, walks headed by artists or authors, even visits to the neighbourhood homes run by the residents themselves.

The Council of Europe Faro Action Plan offers a very detailed guide on the implementation process and conditions for the successful establishment of a Heritage walk. There are six stages:

1. Stage one - theoretical discovery

The first stage takes advantage of expert knowledge for an initial study of possible themes selected by the Heritage walk author. A field trip can help map out a possible route. At this stage it is important to understand local priorities and conduct a thorough research on each possible theme.

2. Stage two - sensitive discovery

The second stage allows the author to explore the route in more detail and identify places that have strong emotional resonance and offer interesting or unexpected experiences. It may also be possible to discover sites that are usually off-limits or difficult to access. The author should try and establish contacts with local residents and users of the proposed route. They may be able to provide invaluable insight and local information, or facilitate visits to and presentations of private premises. At the end of this stage the author should be able to identify a handful (three or four) sites of particular importance, wealth of interesting information, and strong local affiliation.

A key development, at this stage, is the collection of testimonies that will unveil the pleasures of the route. These testimonies can be multifaceted and range from personal accounts and pictures of sites to sound recordings etc.

3. Stage three - deconstruction

The third stage requires that the author thoroughly understands the route and all its potential (and difficulties). The identified priorities are verified with people who have knowledge of the proposed sites e.g. users, officials, residents. This is a process where theory and lived experience come together to pinpoint what is important, both from the perspective of local users and residents as well as from the wider perspective of potential users who have no immediate knowledge of the sites. At this stage there is a lot of flexibility and the walk can be repeatedly deconstructed and reconstructed to maximize its integration to the local context.

4. Stage four - implementation

The fourth stage identifies the walk's key theme. A single walk cannot cover every possible aspect identified during the previous stages so it is better to focus one that resonates the most with the author and/or local residents. This is the point where all practical matters associated with the implementation of the Heritage walk need to be addressed. The

author must clarify the target audience, the number of participants, trace the route, identify key sites and persons who can intervene (preferably people who keep the heritage alive as part of their daily routine and not experts or specialists), calculate the duration, establish the points of passage and secure any authorisations needed. Time is of the essence here. The interventions should be time-limited and its content should be prepared in advance, always keeping in mind that this intervention is not a lecture but an informal discussion with someone who wishes to share a personal experience regarding a particular heritage asset. Ideally there will be time set aside at the end of the walk for another informal discussion among the participants or, perhaps, even a meal or a drink with all concerned.

5. Stage five - organisation

The fifth stage allows the author to prepare some material regarding the key sites (maps, photographs, floor plans etc.) and time the actual walk. A starting point, means of communication and a point of contact must be established. Ideally the participants will be able to provide feedback at the end of the walk.

6. Stage six - sustainability

The final stage ensures that the Heritage walk will be shared and disseminated to the widest audience possible. The testimonies should be recorded (video or sound recordings, written documents) while any information and material gathered can be classified and shared online using existing platforms (Google Earth to show the route, Wikipedia to put the information online) or through more traditional media (books, press articles etc.) Finally the author can take advantage of established European cultural events (such as European Heritage Days) to promote the walk and raise its profile as part of a wider European heritage asset.

The concept's success was established with a series of Heritage walks in Marseilles, beginning in the year 2000. The first walk was based on a series of workshops that made use of photos, documents, souvenirs and surveys to engage local residents and graduates of a girls' school in Saint-André, a working-class neighbourhood of Marseilles. The author was a heritage curator who worked with ten women, all former pupils of the school. The event was not advertised and at its first presentation there were only a handful of people at the starting point. As the group followed the route it grew in size to reach about fifty participants when they reached their destination. Word of mouth ensured that a motley assortment of people (neighbourhood women, former pupils who had moved elsewhere for various reasons, curious passersby etc.) followed the heritage curator despite whatever misgivings they might have had.

In the following years the walk's authors followed a well-established routine. The winter months were dedicated to collective workshops to identify the content. In the spring they would locate points to visit, while research and verifications would last through the summer. Finally, the heritage community would take advantage of the European Heritage

Days in the autumn to organise the walks at a time when maximum visibility was ensured. Christine Breton, honourary heritage curator and tutor for the Heritage walk application, believes that the Faro Convention offers marginalised voices a legal instrument and an integrated approach to heritage while eliminating the need to "invent the circle" each time. Faro good practices enables potential authors to follow a proven path towards achieving their goals of bringing to the foreground the neglected or forgotten heritage of a site.

8.2.2 Metropolitan Trail

The Metropolitan trail highlights a second approach to the question of heritage promotion. Unlike the Heritage walk, which was largely based on the contribution of individual heritage agents, the Metropolitan trail is a large multi-agency effort that explores an extensive peri-urban area that cuts across numerous municipal boundaries. The idea for the establishment of the trail originated in the selection of Marseilles as the European Capital of Culture in 2008. The association Marseille-Provence 2013 proposed the establishment of a hiking trail based on pre-existing urban walks in the greater Marseilles area.

In 2010 the association brought together a group of "artist-walkers" who were asked to devise an accredited long-distance hiking trail on the theme of the relationship between natural and urban spaces. Marseille-Provence 2013 then proceeded to obtain the agreement and support of a number of agencies that were associated with the trails in the greater Marseilles region. The French Hiking Federation, the Fédération Française de la Randonnée Pédestre-FFRP and the Comité Départemental de Randonnée Pédestre (the FFRP's local committee) agreed to cooperate to launch a 360-km trail and to draw up an official trail guide. All the municipalities through which the trail passed were involved and monitored the trail's development.

In 2012 the trail was accredited as a "Chemin de grande randonnée" (major footpath). Securing institutional endorsement is challenging but compliance with a set of specifications makes the trail more visible to the general public and improves the latter's ability to appreciate the sites and heritage assets included in the trail.

Unlike the Heritage walk, the Metropolitan trail required the active participation of municipalities and local authorities. There are many issues relating to authorisations, maintenance, promotion etc. Such governmental agencies can, obviously, solve a number of problems but there must an active monitoring process on behalf of the trail's authors to remove constraints imposed by the agencies' distance from the situation on the ground. In the case of the Marseilles Metropolitan trail, the project was completed in two years (as against an average of twelve years for the accreditation of a major footpath project).

There are certain advantages and disadvantages associated with the establishment of a major metropolitan trail. The basic infrastructure is there, in the pre-existing public road

network and short-distance trails. The right to walk is already well established in these routes and there are few highly regulated natural areas that must be dealt with. The basic idea is to avoid engaging with complicated authorisation processes and integrate extant paths to minimize the cost and reduce the time needed for the implementation of the idea.

The project demonstrated the desirability and applicability of some key concepts of the Faro Convention. The principle of communal contribution to the promotion of heritage assets by all the members of a heritage community finds its most comprehensive expression in large projects such as the Metropolitan trail. A wide combination of skills were required to organise the trail. Town-planners, urban designers, archivists, researchers, academics, map-makers, oral historians etc. came together to identify points of interests and design the optimal route. Municipal authorities had to cooperate at different levels (local and regional) since the trail cuts across 38 municipal boundaries. The walkers themselves also contributed their stories and experiences regarding the footpaths and the sites encountered along the way. They also highlighted the aesthetic, social and historical perspectives, a refreshing departure from the often mundane (though no less important) issues of security and public responsibility promoted by the governmental agencies.

The documentation process is critical to the success of such a project and the strict adherence to the principles of the Faro Convention is paramount, if the trail is to serve the intended purpose. Since the convention requires the provision of equal access for all heritage communities interested in the heritage asset, it is essential that their voices be heard, even if it is not possible to include all ideas and suggestions in the final product. Prejudice, ignorance, unfamiliarity or time pressures can result to a haphazard or simply convenient method of information gathering that will ultimately fail to deliver upon the promises of the Faro convention. In the case of the Marseilles Metropolitan walk, the authors decided to begin from the works for a general readership (tourism guides, road maps, hiking guides etc.) and progress towards more scientific sources of information. They created a list of points of interest and then invited anyone interested in the footpath to provide their point of view, knowledge and sentiments. It was important to comprehend the public's feel towards the route and its sites rather than restricting their research to maps, archives or literature.

The route was drawn in agreement with all the stakeholders i.e. the walkers, the footpath neighbours, and the public authorities. The locations were identified, the legal status of the surrounding areas and all the paths and roads was clarified (private or public ownership, areas of protected status etc.) and permissions were obtained to walk and to place markers and signs. The process included the clarification of the legal status of numerous types of locations: coastline, waterways, forests, pasture land, municipal property, private lanes and lots etc. The final step was the identification of accommodation possibilities at predetermined distances between them (20km) and of public transport facilities, since the main goal of the Metropolitan trail was to investigate

the relationship between urban and rural areas and offer the means to enjoy them both in a variety of ways.

8.2.3 Resident's Cooperative

Two further Faro applications provide good practices with some relevance to Pluggy, though both of them are of less immediate concern. The first one is the **Resident's cooperative**, a project designed to offer residents of heritage communities the opportunity to benefit financially from their heritage assets while preserving their quality of life and living conditions. This application brings together a long history of co-operative values with the spirit of the Faro Convention to establish a collective entity with a democratic decision-making structure: all the individuals concerned have a say in decisions that that binding for all members of the cooperative. The aspect of the Faro Convention that was particularly useful in the context of the cooperative was the clarification of the role distribution between public responsibility, individual rights and the democratic process. The cooperative worked with members of parliament and ministerial officials to obtain permission to market its services independently, enabling it to take charge of the promotion of its own services. The cooperation with public authorities is an ongoing process to ensure the greatest possible benefits for the members of the cooperative. Those who wish to participate receive training and educational opportunities, while there is great scope for the involvement of volunteers and the exchange of knowledge. There is also a link with the heritage walks organised in the area since members of the cooperative can participate in the walks.

8.2.4 Urban Revelation workshop

The last Faro application is the **Urban revelation workshop**, a method to devise routes linking sites with the participation of artists, businesses and people working and living in the area. Since it was conceived as a workshop, this project succeeded in bringing together people and groups that would not normally have the opportunity to meet (e.g. Business leaders and unemployed young adults). Their common goal was to make abandoned and forgotten sites accessible to visitors by mobilising all available resources. In accordance with the Faro principles, the workshops offer disadvantaged voices the opportunity to be heard and become active citizens in charge of presenting and preserving an important aspect of their heritage.

Young people play a pivotal role in the Urban revelation workshop. The initial goal is to restore or enhance a site in order to give it a fresh meaning by presenting its economic activities, its historical interest and the people who lived or worked in these abandoned locations. A new generation, often deprived of social and economic possibilities, is recruited and supervised by an educational team to enhance their perception of themselves and the way they are perceived by others through their work. They are thus able to identify with a different historical, generational and citizenship context. The educational supervision is constant, as is awareness-raising and access to training. The project organises encounters and trips to the site that enables the participants to discover

the cultural environment and engage with the local businesses, artists, cultural bodies or public facilities i.e. different players with varied skills and knowledge. Different life examples and forms of commitment aim at raising the young people's' interest and enlarge their social network through a form of mutual discovery that combats prejudice. It is a fine example of how the Faro principles of inclusion and acceptance of different voices can help a new generation find meaning and purpose through heritage activities.

The urban revelation workshop is based on self-defined heritage communities of businesses, groups of artists, residents' associations, social players or environmental protection associations who come together to address a heritage issue. There is an added artistic dimension since all forms of artistic expression are welcome (street theatre, photography, the plastic arts, contemporary dance, landscaping etc.) to allow the public to appropriate the sites. Publicity is essential to the success of this project. It presents stigmatised neighborhoods and their residents in a new, positive light and disseminates the program to a wide audience. Their participation and the project's success reinforces one of its main goals, i.e. raising the profile of young people and the local residents while simultaneously advertising and validating a different, new or unexpected heritage site or viewpoint.