This report has been produced within the mandate given by the Ministers of Culture of the Baltic Sea States, by the Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic States with its Working Groups, with representation from Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation and Sweden.

The report has been prepared within the Monitoring group.
Editor Helena Edgren
Co-editor and co-ordinator Marianne Lehtimäki
Lay out Antero Airos

© 2008 National Board of Antiquities, Helsinki, Finland

ISBN 978-951-616-191-7 (pbk)

Print Kyriiri Oy
Helsinki, Finland

Cover photos ©
Front:
Restoration of a painting in the Wilanow Palace; Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway.
Landscape, Larvik Municipality; Norway.
Visiting game at Purmani manor school; Marju Reismaa, Estonian Ministry of Culture.
Back:
Wilanow Palace, Poland; photographer Marianne Lehtimäki.
Vrouw Maria-wreck; photographer Jouni Polkko, National Board of Antiquities, Finland.
Financing Regional Cooperation
   The diversity of European financial programmes 47
   EEA Grants – An important contribution to the protection of the European Cultural Heritage 49

Topical Fields for Cooperation
   Cultural heritage for all – digitization and the cultural heritage sector 51
   National examples 52
   Cultural Landscapes and Historic Gardens 57
   Historic Harbours: Gateways to the Future 61
   The 4th Baltic Sea States Cultural Heritage Forum:
   Cultural Heritage – Contemporary Challenge 63

Progress and Action Plans for the Thematic Working Groups
   Working Group on Coastal Culture and Maritime Heritage 66
   The Working Group on Underwater Heritage 67
   Working Group on Building Preservation and Maintenance in Practice 68
   Regional activities in urban heritage - The follow-up project on sustainable historic towns 69

Appendices of this Report

Appendix 1
   Statement on Heritage and Cultural Tourism in the Baltic Sea Region 71

Appendix 2
   Meetings, Participants and Publications 72

Appendix 3
   Presentations of the Monitoring Group Activities in other Regions and to
   Different Interest Groups by Invitation of the Organizers 76
Proposals for Ministerial Decisions

To promote and further develop the cultural heritage cooperation which for over 10 years has been successfully carried out in the Baltic Sea States, the Ministers of Culture are requested to take a stand on the following proposals:

- Cooperation concerning Baltic Sea cultural heritage shall be further developed under the guidance of a Monitoring Group with the following mandates:
  - Coordination of exchange and spread of information on cultural heritage through the national bodies to the Baltic Sea States to promote democracy, social welfare and cultural characteristics in all their regional diversity,
  - Linking national projects with the Baltic Sea cooperation and the harmonization of national management practices,
  - Initiating and supporting existing and upcoming networks,
  - Identifying new fields of cooperation and emerging tasks of regional concern,
  - Serving as a guiding body for the Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum,
  - Responsibility for the www.baltic-heritage.net website,
  - Responsibility for reporting to the Ministers regarding progress on cultural heritage cooperation.
- The Ministers are asked to support the Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region as a common ground for an understanding of the underwater cultural heritage in the region.
- Cooperation with the Council of the Baltic Sea States shall be further developed through the possibilities offered by the new structure of the CBSS.
- Opportunities for developing cooperation with neighbouring regions through the mechanisms offered by the Northern Dimension Policy and EU-Russia cultural cooperation shall be looked into.
Mandate

The cultural heritage cooperation in the Baltic Sea States initiated by their Ministers of Culture has been going on for some ten years now. Mandates have been announced in the Lübeck Declaration of 1997, the Declaration of Gdansk in 1999, the Copenhagen Declaration in 2001, the St. Petersburg Declaration of 2003, and the Bergen Declaration in 2005.

Results 2005–2008

The results of cooperation so far can be summarized as a growing networking of experts in different fields, theoretical discussions, practical training for craftsmen, problem-oriented projects financed by EU mechanisms and Nordic funds, publications and poster exhibitions highlighting important issues.

Two new countries, Iceland and Schleswig-Holstein, have joined and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern resumed cooperation during this mandate period. These and most of the other participating countries - Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland and Sweden - have been represented by one or more permanent members in the Monitoring Group. Russia has also welcomed cooperation but has not participated in practice in the monitoring work. The mandate period, having previously been two years, was prolonged in Bergen to three years.

The work of the Monitoring Group has also attracted growing interest outside the region, and the Group has been asked to present its activities to several organizations or networks both in Europe and elsewhere (further information in the Appendix).

The Monitoring Group has continued to fulfil the tasks assigned to it by the ministers in previous declarations:

- transmitting information on the continuously ongoing changes in the organization of the National Heritage Boards in the Baltic Sea area, on the changes to the legislation and policies of individual countries, and acting, where needed, as a source of information when such changes have been under preparation.
- gathering information on national initiatives, and using them to initiate broader Baltic Sea cooperation.
- discussing several new fields of action
- organizing the 3rd Baltic Sea Cultural Heritage Forum together with the Ministry of Culture of Lithuania in Vilnius in 2007
- informing about its activities at www.baltic-heritage.net.

During the mandate period, the Monitoring Group has devoted special effort to three different areas of work.

The 3rd Baltic Sea Cultural Heritage Forum

In September 2007 the Monitoring Group organized, together with the Ministry of Culture of Lithuania, the 3rd Cultural Heritage Forum 'Cultural heritage and tourism: potential, impact, partnership and governance'. Tourism is today one of the fastest growing industries. There is great potential for development within this field in the Baltic Sea countries, but with intensified use of the cultural heritage new threats also arise. The Forum was the first attempt to engage in deeper discussions among cultural heritage professionals, tourism operators and local municipalities concerning the question of how to organize sustainable cultural heritage protection and to provide intelligent use of heritage for tourism purposes.

The Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region

The Ministers of Culture have taken note of the need for joint efforts and policies for the protection and management of the underwater heritage in the Baltic Sea, and expressed their concern in two declarations. In the Bergen Declaration of 2005, the ministers explicitly supported the idea of strengthening cooperation through the development of a code of good practice on its protection.

The Working Group for Underwater Heritage, in cooperation with the Monitoring Group, has produced the Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (acronym COPUCH). It is a professional, non-controversial set of guidelines, a basis for further interregional cooperation for both experts and decision-making authorities. Hopefully,
COPUCH will promote a more sustainable and common management strategy for the underwater cultural heritage of the Baltic Sea region.

**Heritage crime: Illicit export and import and ‘black archaeology’**

The Monitoring Group has continued to work with illegal, black archaeology, as well as the illegal export and import of cultural objects, which are serious problems all over the world. Today, the use of metal detectors, and especially selling the finds through the Internet have caused an explosion in the volume of criminal activity.

Illegal archaeology was first taken up by the Monitoring Group in 2003. During the mandate period the issue was elaborated at a meeting held in March 2007 in Stockholm. This gathering of experts was inspired and the program supervised by the Monitoring Group and supported by the Council of Baltic Sea States as part of the Swedish CBSS Presidency program. The most effective projects for combating illegal archaeology being implemented in countries around the Baltic were discussed during a meeting in Frankfurt in November 2007 hosted by the Römisch-Germanische Kommission.

**The four Working Groups** have continued their activities, focusing on, among other issues, “Baltic Harbours” in a poster exhibition, presenting the so-called 100 list containing brief descriptions of the 100 most valuable underwater sites in the Baltic Sea, organizing the “Communicating Heritage in Urban Development Processes” project, and forming a “Baltic Sea Region Network on Indoor Climate in Churches”.

**Future activities**

**The Baltic Sea**

A major challenge is to protect the cultural heritage of the Baltic Sea itself. Growing commercial activities threaten underwater heritage, especially since 40% of the Baltic is not protected by any national legislation. It will be an important task to monitor the situation and take action when needed, at the same time as the general public must be given better access to the underwater heritage and made aware of its unique nature.

**Historic harbours** have made a great contribution to the development of coastal culture in the Baltic Sea countries. In the past, almost each capital on the coasts of the Baltic Sea played an important role in maritime trade or the shipyard industry. Today, the number of working ports is steadily decreasing. Buildings, quays, cranes and other structures are being demolished and are disappearing.

There is an urgent need to document Baltic coastal heritage before it either disappears or becomes completely transformed, focusing on recording the remains of harbours. The results can be used as a basis e.g. for cultural tourism that can offer a new chance for devastated harbour areas to become actively involved in new uses.

**Access to cultural heritage for everyone**

During the ten years of Baltic Sea heritage cooperation it has become clear that ignorance is one of the worst threats to the heritage. Not knowing means not participating, and hence not taking care. Cultural heritage needs to be used, and the managers of cultural heritage need to improve their skills in opening up the heritage to everybody, in order to generate interest in it and willingness to protect it. Giving citizens easier access to cultural heritage is a top priority in all the participating countries.

The Monitoring Group intends to focus on two new themes promoting accessibility: children and cultural heritage education and the digitization of the cultural heritage.

Among the new themes are also historic parks and gardens. The Monitoring Group intends to build up a Baltic network of specialists, linking it to a wider European context. The outcome of the cooperation could be an “action plan” for the sharing of good practices in protecting and maintaining historic parks and gardens across the entire region.

**Changing climate**

Throughout Europe cultural heritage specialists are viewing with anxiety climate changes and the problem of environmental pollution. Europe’s historical buildings are likely to suffer greatly from the effects of climate change over the coming century. This is one of the topical issues that will be taken up to common discussion at the 4th Cultural Heritage Forum which will be organized in the autumn of 2009 in Riga in cooperation with Latvia.
Introduction

Those who have the right to define the past, also have power over the future. The choice of the features of our past we decide to protect is therefore a highly political issue, not a neutral “aesthetic” one.

Cultural heritage, as defined by the Monitoring Group, is everything that is formed by the hand of human beings, tangible things that together with intangible traditions tell the history of mankind. It is taken as a very wide concept, and it could, in brief, be called the “historic environment”.

Cultural heritage protection – a national and regional task

In the Nordic countries in particular, the importance of protecting the cultural heritage has been stated very early, the first act on ancient monuments being issued in Sweden already around 1660. In all the Baltic Sea countries, protection of the cultural heritage is the responsibility of the state, and the countries have found different organizational models to give authority to this work.

Today, however, no country can close itself within its own borders, and even within the field of cultural heritage, protection is possible only in cooperation with others. The Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea States is an instrument created to develop and guide this work in the Baltic Sea region.


Organization of the work

Responsible for the heritage cooperation is a working group of senior heritage experts, with 1-3 members from each country, mainly from National Heritage Boards and museum authorities. The Monitoring Group holds 2-3 meetings each year and has a rotating chairmanship. Finland was chosen to be the chair of the ongoing three-year mandate.

The Monitoring Group has initiated four permanent Working Groups: ‘Underwater Heritage’, ‘Coastal Culture and Maritime Heritage’, ‘Building Preservation and Maintenance in Practice’, and ‘Sustainable Historic Towns’. Other important themes have been taken up by more ‘ad hoc’ working groups, or analysed by the Monitoring Group itself. The four Working Groups act rather independently under their own chairpersons, but report to the Monitoring group at common meetings.

Two new countries, Iceland and Schleswig-Holstein, have joined, and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern rejoined, cooperation during this mandate period. These, as well as most of the other participating countries – Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland and Sweden – have been represented by permanent members in the Monitoring Group. Russia has also welcomed cooperation but has not in practice taken part in the monitoring work. Russia, however, has participated in the activities of some of the working groups operating under the Monitoring Group. The mandate period, having previously been two years, was prolonged to three years in Bergen.

Financing cooperation

The Monitoring Group represents a very non-expensive form of cooperation. It has no budget of its own. Each participating institution covers the meeting costs of its own members. The Finnish Ministry of Culture has also covered the costs of a part-time Coordinator for the three years of the Finnish chairmanship. All other activities have been financed by external means. Financial support has been received from both EU Financial Mechanisms, and, for the time being, mainly from the Nordic Council of Ministers. Individual countries have also benefited greatly from the EEA grants, in which Norway is the main financing party.
Main Achievements of Cooperation 2005 –2008

The Monitoring Group has continued to carry out the tasks assigned to it by the ministers:

• Coordination of exchange and spread of information on cultural heritage through the national bodies to the Baltic Sea States.
  - The Monitoring Group has transmitted information on the continuously ongoing changes in the organization of National Heritage Boards in the Baltic Sea area, as well as on changes to legislation in the individual countries. The Group has also acted, where needed, as a source of information when such changes have been under preparation.

• Linking national projects to Baltic cooperation.
  - The Monitoring Group has gathered information on several national initiatives, concerning e.g. children and cultural heritage education, and has used them to launch broader Baltic Sea cooperation

• Identifying new fields of cooperation
  - The Monitoring Group has discussed several new fields of action, one of the most important being the digitization of the cultural heritage

• Serving as the guiding body for the Baltic Sea Cultural Heritage Forum
  - The 3rd Baltic Sea Cultural Heritage Forum was organized in Vilnius in 2007

• Responsibility for its website
  - The Monitoring Group reports on its activities at www.baltic-heritage.net.

• Responsibility for reporting to the ministers on progress in cultural heritage cooperation
  - The Monitoring Group has given a report of its work after each mandate period at the common meeting of the Ministers of Culture in Gdansk in 1999, in Copenhagen in 2001, in St. Petersburg in 2003, and in Bergen 2005.

The report given here to the ministers contains examples of all the activities carried out by the Monitoring Group over the past three years: projects in which the Monitoring Group itself has been directly responsible for the outcome, projects carried out in cooperation with the Working Groups, work done by different Working Groups independently, and examples of initiatives carried out by other parties, which the Monitoring Group has followed and brought to common attention.

The Monitoring Group would especially like to draw attention to three of these:

The 3rd Baltic Sea Cultural Heritage Forum ‘Cultural Heritage and Tourism: Potential, Impact, Partnership and Governance’
In September 2007 the Monitoring group organized together with the Ministry of Culture of Lithuania the 3rd Cultural Heritage Forum with cultural tourism as its theme, a question of topical importance in the Baltic Sea area. Tourism is one of today’s fastest growing industries, and cultural tourism is one of its major sectors. There are already many itineraries that take the common history of the Baltic Sea states as their starting point. There is great potential for development within this field in the Baltic Sea countries, but new threats also arise with the intensified use of the cultural heritage. The Forum was the first attempt to engage in deeper discussions between cultural heritage professionals, tourism operators and local municipalities concerning the question of how to organize sustainable cultural heritage protection and the intelligent use of heritage for tourism purposes.

The Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (UHC) in the Baltic Sea Region
The Baltic Sea has a unique underwater cultural heritage. Thus, in the Baltic Sea region, we see growing interest in joint efforts and policies for the protection and management of the underwater heritage. The Ministers of Culture have taken notice of the situation in two Declarations, in Copenhagen in 2001 and in Bergen in 2005. In the Bergen Declaration, the ministers explicitly emphasized “the importance of the underwater
heritage in the Baltic Sea and supported the idea of strengthening cooperation through the development of a code of good practice on its protection.”

In response to political will for improved and harmonized UCH management in the Baltic Sea region, the Working Group for Underwater Heritage, in cooperation with the Monitoring Group, has produced a Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (acronym COPUCH).

COPUCH is a professional, non-controversial set of guidelines, a basis for further interregional cooperation for both experts and decision-making authorities. It is a UNESCO “light” convention, but also a grassroots-level initiative. Hopefully, COPUCH will promote a more sustainable and common management strategy for the underwater cultural heritage in the Baltic Sea region.

Heritage crime: Illicit export and import and ‘black archaeology’

The Monitoring Group has continued to work with black archaeology as well as the illegal export and import of cultural objects, a serious problem all over the world. Black archaeology means illegal excavations and the sale of looted objects. This is nothing new, but today the use of metal detectors and especially the sale of finds through the Internet have caused an explosion in the volume of illegal activity. This is also a problem that cannot be solved without cooperation between the responsible national bodies.

The question of illegal archaeology was first taken up by the Monitoring Group in 2003. In March 2005 the first Baltic Sea Region seminar on this topic was organized by the Monitoring Group in cooperation with Archäologisches Landesamt Schleswig-Holstein. The issue was further elaborated at a meeting held in March 2007 in Stockholm. The gathering of experts was inspired and the program supervised by the Monitoring Group and supported by the Council of Baltic Sea States as part of the Swedish CBSS Presidency programme.

The most effective projects for combating illegal archaeology that are being implemented in countries around the Baltic were discussed during a meeting in Frankfurt in November 2007. The participants of the seminar represented heritage boards and it was hosted by the Römisch-Germanische Kommission.
Prospects for the Future

Constant change

The Monitoring Group continues its work in an environment that is both regional and global at the same time. Many of the cultural heritage authorities in the Baltic Sea region have faced and continue to face changes in their organizations and more or less heavy cuts in their budgets. The most profound changes are taking place in Sweden where part of the National Heritage Board is being relocated on the island of Gotland. All this has its effects on the cultural heritage cooperation. The Monitoring Group and its Working Groups have to adjust their activities to new conditions. This, however, will not diminish the will to continue cooperation.

The Baltic Sea

A major challenge is to protect the cultural heritage of the Baltic Sea itself. Growing commercial activities threaten underwater heritage, especially since 40% of the Baltic Sea is not protected by any national legislation. It will be an important task for future cooperation to monitor the situation and take action when needed, at the same time as the general public is given better access to the underwater heritage and made aware of its unique nature.

Linked to the sea itself are historic harbours. They have made a great contribution to the development of coastal culture in the Baltic Sea countries. In the past almost each capital on the coasts of the Baltic Sea played an important role in maritime trade or the shipyard industry.

Nowadays harbours are being transformed in many ways. The number of working ports is steadily decreasing. Buildings, quays, cranes and other structures are demolished and disappear.

In this situation the experts on coastal heritage would like to underline an urgent need to document Baltic coastal heritage before it either disappears or becomes completely transformed. International projects should be considered that will focus on the recording of harbour remains. Such case studies can, for example, be used for cultural tourism that can offer a new chance for devastated harbour areas to become actively involved in new uses.

Access to cultural heritage for everyone

During the 10 years of Baltic Sea heritage cooperation it has become increasingly clear that ignorance is one of the worst threats to heritage. As this report states elsewhere, not knowing means not participating and hence not taking care. Cultural heritage needs to be used, and the managers of cultural heritage need to improve their skills in opening up heritage to everyone, in order to
generate interest in it and willingness to protect it. Giving citizens easier access to cultural heritage is a top priority in all the participating countries.

The Monitoring Group intends to focus on two new themes promoting accessibility to cultural heritage. One takes up the important task of cultural heritage education, working especially with children and young people. Although most countries already have ongoing projects within this field, some are more advanced than others, and all can benefit from closer cooperation. The work will therefore continue along the lines drawn up at the first meeting organized in Helsinki in October 2007. Lithuania has already invited participants to the second meeting on this theme.

The other major project is the digitization of the cultural heritage. Making national collective memory accessible nationally and globally via the Internet concerns the democratization and decentralization of knowledge sources. The digitization of cultural heritage will be a main challenge over the coming years in most European countries. The Monitoring Group has therefore chosen it to be one of its main priorities during the next mandate period. As we all face the same challenges nationally we believe that there are common grounds to be explored as well as useful experiences to be shared with other countries.

Historic parks and gardens form an important part of our common European culture, and their preservation calls for common action. The Monitoring Group intends to build a Baltic network of specialists also in this field, linking it to a wider European context. Parks and gardens in the Baltic Sea countries are the result of a constant exchange of ideas, plants, achievements, inventions, scientific discoveries and fashions. They are treasures that so far have been greatly neglected, and also need to be opened up and made more accessible to visitors from home and abroad. The outcome of cooperation could be an “action plan” for sharing good practices in protecting and maintaining historic parks and gardens throughout the entire region.

Changing climate

Not only in the Baltic Sea region but also throughout Europe cultural heritage specialists view with anxiety climate change and the problem of environmental pollution. Europe’s historical buildings are likely to suffer greatly from the effects of climate change over the coming century. This is one of the topical issues that will be taken up for joint discussion at the 4th Cultural Heritage Forum which will be organized in Riga in cooperation with Latvia in the autumn of 2009. The theme of the 4th Cultural Heritage Forum has been chosen to highlight the challenges that every cultural heritage expert faces in the Baltic Sea region, and to define the risks that can lead to the irretrievable loss of heritage values.

The four Working Groups will continue their activities.

The Strength of Working Together

The experiences of cultural heritage cooperation in the Baltic Sea area have thus far been highly positive. It has been extremely rewarding to notice that even when facing the most difficult challenges, we stand stronger and our voice is louder, when we take action together. Problems that seem insurmountable for an individual country find solutions, or can at least be made less severe, when dealt with collectively within the Baltic Sea region.

It has also been encouraging to observe that the model which we have developed – non-bureaucratic, rather inexpensive cooperation between heritage authorities – has aroused interest also in other parts of Europe. The Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea States warmly welcomes cooperation with other European regional bodies to share its experiences and to develop its work further.

Helena Edgren
Chair of the Monitoring Group 2006-08
Towards a Regional View of Cultural Heritage and Tourism Policies

The 3rd Baltic Sea States Cultural Heritage Forum

Cultural heritage should be integrated in the daily life of all society. Built heritage as well as historic gardens and parks are there to be used. It is in the interest of the cultural heritage sector to enhance their sustainable exploitation. The significance of cultural heritage needs to be interpreted and presented to the public.

National heritage boards are in charge of management practices of identifying, documenting and preserving heritage. It is the local authorities and inhabitants in general whose appreciation, use, management and maintenance of local cultural heritage keep it alive. Cultural heritage needs to be understood as a cultural, social and economical resource at all levels of political decision-making.

Tourism is an important way to reuse historic buildings and sites, raise appreciation and create resources.

The municipal level plays a key role in enhancing the sustainability in cultural tourism approaches. A clear cross-sector policy in this field is needed.

All the above-mentioned claims appear to be easy to understand, but it is not simple to put them into practice. Tourism is a complicated and rapidly growing sector where a great number of actors and interests interact.

Over the course of a decade of cultural heritage cooperation in the Baltic Sea States the Monitoring Group has followed several projects where cultural heritage has been used in the service of tourism. Analysing the interaction of cultural heritage protection and tourism shows that today the cultural heritage sector does not benefit from the growing number of tourists. In a way it is “used” by tourism.

Particularly in the southern part of the Baltic Sea Region the economics are growing rapidly, and investors are putting pressure on all levels of decision-making. The

The 3rd Baltic Sea States Cultural Heritage Forum in 2007 were announced at the national level in the first preparatory meeting in April 2005 in Vilnius. Regional key actors in the cultural heritage sector dealing with approaches to tourism were invited to deliberate the starting points of a joint regional approach.

The introductory panel included the Norwegian Monitoring Group member Randi Ertesvåg. Behind her is the Polish member Jerzy Litwin. Both acted as key persons in the arrangements of the 1st BSR Cultural Heritage Forum in 2003. Senior adviser Anne Päkkilä from the Ministry of Culture of Finland presented the ministerial level in the preparations of the 2nd BSR Cultural Heritage Forum in Helsinki in 2005. The Lithuanian member of the Monitoring Group Alfredas Jomantas was in charge of chairing the Task Force of the 3rd Baltic Sea Region Forum. The last person in the row is the Monitoring Group Chair 2003-05 Friedrich Lüth from Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Germany. Photo Marianne Lehtimäki.
The Task Force of the 3rd Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum was appointed by the Monitoring Group in 2006. It included experts on integrating cultural heritage and tourism from the Scandinavian countries and from outside the region. Together with the Lithuanian experts they planned the content and structure of the Forum.

In the photograph are the Task Force members and the Chair of the Monitoring Group being guided by the historian and Vilnius expert Andrius Zubavicius (middle). On the left, social anthropologist and tourism consultant Tomke Laske from Belgium, Chair of the Monitoring Group Helena Edgren, Finland, the Swedish Task Force expert Ewa Bergdahl, the guide, the Chair of the Task Force Alfredas Jomantas of Lithuania and the coordinator of both the Monitoring Group and Forum Task Force Marianne Lehtimäki of Finland. The photographer is Reidun Vea, the Norwegian expert of the Forum Task Force.

One of the keynote speakers was professor Mike Robinson, a world-famous expert and writer on cultural tourism. Professor Robinson holds the Chair of Tourism and Culture at Leeds Metropolitan University and has published several books on the subject. Photo Sigita Gaudeza, © Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture, Lithuania.
Mike Robinson advised the heritage sector to place heritage into a dynamic and cross-cultural context. He underlined the need to broaden the definitions of cultural heritage as well as its audiences, and the importance of understanding of how different types of audiences experience the cultural heritage. Ordinary life is an essential part of the interests and experiences of tourists, and cultural heritage offers should be linked to local everyday life, intangible heritage and culture in a wide sense. The photo from the Main Market Square in Krakow 2008 taken by Gisle Erlien illustrates this tourist’s multi-layered experience.

Public domain and the civic societies lack experiences and practices to ensure that common interests are not overrun by doubtful projects.

It is clear that what is needed is a balanced coexistence and cooperation between the heritage and tourism sectors.

The Forum focused on cultural heritage and tourism

During the 10 years of the Monitoring Group’s existence it has become evident that there is an urgent need to create a clearer overview of the problem of the interaction of cultural heritage and tourism in the Baltic Sea region.

The 3rd Baltic Sea States Cultural Heritage Forum “Cultural heritage and tourism: potential, impact, partnership and governance” took place in Vilnius on 25-28 September 2007. The main target groups were policymakers and practitioners. During three days more than 300 participants from the entire Baltic Sea region participated in the debates, discussions and case analyses.

The Forum was the first attempt to have deeper discussions between cultural heritage professionals, tourism operators and local municipalities concerning the crucial question of how to organize sustainable cultural heritage protection and an intelligent use of heritage for tourism purposes. One of the main goals of this Forum was to enhance the cooperation of cultural heritage and tourism sectors at all levels.

Plenary sessions with internationally known keynote speakers focused on the most challenging questions. Four workshops analysed tourism management and cultural heritage, the impact of cultural tourism on rural areas, how to establish cultural tourism in towns, and local, regional and interregional partnership, to present and discuss best practices in the Baltic Sea region.

The Baltic Sea States Working Groups organized four thematic seminars connected to their areas of expertise: reuse and maintenance of historic buildings, urban heritage, underwater heritage and coastal culture, focusing on the management of cultural tourism within these special fields.

Two exhibitions, one prepared by the Working Group on Underwater Heritage and one by the Working Group on Coastal Culture, were opened, highlighting the value of underwater heritage and the need of a “Code of best practice in Baltic Sea area” to protect this heritage, and giving an overview of historic harbours of the Baltic Sea region.

The Forum ended with a general agreement on a “Statement on Heritage and Cultural Tourism in the Baltic Sea Region” (included in the Appendix).

In order to make an impact on local level, the organizers of the Forum have published a book in English and Lithuanian. Entitled Cultural Heritage and Tourism: Potential, Impact, Partnership and Governance, the book is addressed to all who wish to be inspired by the best practices of the Baltic Sea region within this field. It includes a collection of the presentations given during the Forum that promote local initiatives and long-term policies. These approaches can be useful for all who are interested in heritage and tourism and need to improve their interaction in a practical way.

Contact person Alfredas Jomantas
Lithuanian member of the Monitoring Group, Chair of the 3rd Forum Task Force
Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture, Lithuania


Gregory Ashworth, Professor of Heritage Management and Urban Tourism at University of Groningen in the Netherlands is a highly estimated writer and member of several editorial boards and international academic research networks. In his Forum presentation he analysed assumptions about and interactions between the tourism market, tourist behaviour, heritage sites and local economics. He concluded that while each place is in potential competition with every other place, success will largely depend upon cooperation between places. Networking and packaging, joint promotion, the regionalization of place brands are among the policy solutions. Photo Sigitas Gaudeza, © Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture, Lithuania.

Senior adviser Dag Myklebust of the Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage confirmed that there is no inherent contradiction between the good protection of cultural heritage and its tourist-friendly presentation. He illustrated his argumentation with five case studies.

One of them was the bilateral project between Norway and Russia in Kenozero National Park in Arkhangelsk County. It indicated that the potential has to be recognized by understanding the nature of the local tourism product and the possible market. In Kenozero, the aim of the project is to encourage small-scale businesses based on local products. The visitor centre of the park is now selling dried mushrooms in birch bark baskets among other local products. © Dag Myklebust.

Researcher Torkel Molin from the Gotland University presented the Gold of Lapland process. The four Swedish municipalities in the Swedish Lapland made a joint approach in late 1980s to preserve some of the region’s mining facilities. The focus of politicians and entrepreneurs, however, was on tourism rather than on the museum aspects.

Torkel Molin underlined that it will be very hard for a region to promote its industrial history without any remains to show. The more expertise involved in the process the greater the number of remains will be preserved in a sustainable way. However, in the Gold of Lapland process situated in a remote area, nothing would have been spared and nothing would have remained for recognition as having heritage value without entrepreneurial decisions. The antiquarian can assist in refining the entrepreneur’s main resources, i.e. local history and the remains on-site.

The old cinema in Adak in the photo illustrates local engagement with expanded priorities in the processes of signifying the daily environment. Inhabitants established a cooperative society and launched repair work. They received advice and assistance from the heritage agency, which had previously recommended demolishing the cinema due to its poor condition. © Torkel Molin.
At the Forum, Anton Pärn of the Estonian Ministry of Culture presented the state programme “Schools in old manors: preservation of historic manor ensembles and renovation of the manors according to modern educational requirements”. The programme integrated three target areas: issues of construction and techniques including cultural heritage aspects, educational goal, and social and regional perspectives. At the beginning, repair and conservation were considered the most important, but before long the renovated school buildings developed into local centres of culture and education. Particularly during the summer, the manor schools are part of local tourist activities. The photo shows the annual exhibition of Estonian glass artists held in the summer of 2007 at the Albu Manor School. Photo: Anton Pärn © Estonian Ministry of Culture.

Tourism in towns was the theme of one of the Forum workshops. Case studies from Krakow and Klaipeda analysed the impacts of increased tourism on restricted historic centres. One of the solutions in both cities was to diversify interpretations of cultural heritage and cultural offerings.

Modern art studios, for example, are opened to locals and tourists in Klaipeda. They combine education and entertainment, where anyone interested can quickly learn about work with textiles, felt, ceramics, photography, assemblages, paper, kites and so on. In one hour the visitor can make his or her own product and enjoy interacting with others. At the same time the visitor gains insight on local culture and its values. Shown in the photo is an open dance workshop at the Communication Centre. © Liutauras Kraniauskas.

In addition, the Forum included four thematic seminars for experts and the public focusing on potentials of coastal culture and related threats, the reuse of historic buildings, underwater heritage in connection with tourism, and research and interpretation of the urban heritage.

The poster exhibition “Historic harbours” points out some aspects of tangible and intangible heritage that should be considered in these transformation processes. The poster exhibition was made by the Baltic Sea States Working Group on costal and maritime heritage, and launched at the Forum in Vilnius. It comprised 12 posters printed in 500 sets. They are distributed to museums, cultural institutions, schools, and libraries around the Baltic Sea. © Baltic Sea States Working Group on costal and maritime heritage.
Heritage Crime

At present trading in art historical, archaeological and ethnographic objects under the label of “art” is a business that is growing worldwide. The demand for such objects exceeds supply. Following the collapse of political barriers and the significant drop in travelling costs, many inaccessible places of the past have now become accessible and the geographical range of trade has thus expanded.

The ease of communication stimulates commerce at the global level. By selling objects on the Internet or in a foreign country, the seller reduces the risk of getting caught due to the difficulty of identifying the objects. The worldwide looting of antiquities causes a great loss of information and local identity.

Nordic collaboration and a joint study on cultural heritage crime

The Scandinavian states have established cooperation in this issue. These countries have a common export control and export licensing system. However, they still lack common import licences. There is a need for an import permit, whereby no passport means no entry. Lost goods can be registered by Interpol if they are known. However, looted archaeological remains cannot be registered because there is no longer any information on their origin.

In 2006 the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention issued a report based on the first Nordic study on “cultural heritage crimes”. It was a Nordic collaboration venture involving Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. A reference group, including representatives also from Estonia, Interpol and Europol, took part in the seminars. Questionnaires were sent to museums, antique dealers, libraries, churches, institutions and people to gather more accurate knowledge about the black market in antiquities.

The conclusions highlighted that most cultural heritage crimes are committed with the motivation of financial gain. The most probable targets are museums, churches, libraries, ancient monuments, antique dealers and second-hand bookshops. As not many of these crimes are spectacular, the mass media is not interested in arousing public attention to the issue. Apart from the targeted objects it is mainly a question of everyday objects that are not protected against visitors and therefore easy to steal. Poor security and poor inventory registration are common problems. Swedish churches have recently experienced a series of thefts where many unique cultural objects have disappeared due to the above-mentioned reasons. (Cultural Heritage Crime - the Nordic Dimension. Report 2006:2, the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention).

Contact person Anna-Gretha Eriksson
National Heritage Board, Sweden

The report can be found at the web address:
http://www.bra.se/extra/measurepoint/?module_instance=4&name=Cultural%20slutred.pdf&url=/dynamaster/file_archive/060215/1b85cf586706f62920437f5d35e386a0b/Cultural%2520slutred.pdf

Illegal archaeology in the Baltic Sea Region – analysing the problem and taking action

Illegal archaeology is currently one of the priority challenges of heritage protection policy, although many countries have not yet recognized the risks related to it. The damage done to archaeological heritage by illegal looting is irreversible since it is a non-renewable asset. Therefore the idea of sustainable protection is so crucial.

In the Baltic Sea Region, where the borders are in most cases open to people and goods, the archaeological heritage remains to a large extent still covered due to the sustainable protection policy that is actually implemented. However, the threat becomes especially prominent as access to metal detecting equipment is relatively easy, although such equipment is expensive.

Until recently only few people believed that the problem of illegal excavations and the sale of archaeological artefacts of unknown origin could be solved. Illegal excavations obviously damage archaeological sites, but we can acquire knowledge of such activity and related finds only when the crime has been committed. Over the years different countries have developed and implemented more or less strict legal solutions to this paradox.
The European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage signed in Valetta in 1992 provided general guidelines, but laws regulating amateur excavations are established on the national level. Knowledge about regulations in force in one country is very limited outside its borders. This is particularly difficult with the export and import of cultural goods. Nearly all countries have solved the question of the export of archaeological finds and other historic artefacts but only a few have legal solutions concerning the import of such items. This makes trafficking in this field relatively easy. Furthermore, since in most European countries archaeological finds by definition belong to the state, illegal finders smuggle them to those few countries where they can be legally sold.

The question of illegal archaeology, also known as “black archaeology”, was first taken up by the Monitoring Group in 2003. In March 2005 the first Baltic Sea Region seminar on this topic was organized by the Monitoring Group in cooperation with Archaeologisches Landesamt Schleswig-Holstein.

The issue was further elaborated in a meeting held in March 2007 in Stockholm. This gathering of experts was inspired and the program was supervised by the Monitoring Group and supported by the Council of Baltic Sea States as part of the Swedish CBSS Presidency programme.

The meeting resulted in some crucial conclusions. The representatives of heritage protection bodies, police and customs officers who attended explicitly concluded that archaeological objects deprived of their context lose most, if not all, of their scientific value. Therefore, the main argument of those praising the need for cooperation with amateur archaeologists or site looters was severely undermined. The question was raised whether such cooperation saves heritage or precisely the opposite, encouraging treasure hunters to look for more. In Gotland, for example, Viking Age sites were regularly robbed until legal restrictions were introduced.

It was agreed that apart from legal tools, education is the key to success. Civic society requires a convincing answer to the question of why the archaeological heritage should be preserved intact, police and prosecutors require constant reminder that crime against heritage is a serious issue, and some archaeologists must finally admit that wild chase for new artefacts for their collections does not have much do with scientific research. Educational initiatives should be highly diversified, aimed at raising awareness of the value of archaeological heritage and risks related to its uncontrolled discovery. They should be addressed to different target groups, such as police, customs, prosecutors, museum workers, the treasure hunters themselves and the general public, especially children and young people.

It was also stated that it can be difficult to convince prosecuting authorities to consider seriously crimes against archaeological heritage. One of the suggestions was, therefore, to calculate the financial loss caused by illegal excavation in relation to the costs of complex archaeological excavations needed to properly document the context of these finds - not just in terms of the market value of the finds themselves. It is worth noting that a few months after the Stockholm meeting this idea was recommended to a prosecutor in Poland and successfully applied in practice.

The most effective projects for combating illegal archaeology being implemented in countries around the Baltic Sea were discussed during the recent meeting in Frankfurt in November 2007. The participants of the seminar represented heritage boards and it was hosted by the Römisch-Germanische Kommission.

In Schleswig-Holstein, a successful programme of cooperation with amateur detectors is being implemented. Their skills are being used to conduct land survey and in exchange they are allowed to search in some other, strictly...
defined areas as well. They are however obliged to report all finds and document the locations of their discoveries. All archaeological relics belong to the state and are being turned in with no compensation.

In Poland, a well advanced monitoring of Internet sales is being carried out. Many attempts of illegally trading archaeological artefacts have been neutralized. In 2007 alone, well over a thousand suspicious transactions were recorded. Thanks to very good cooperation with the police, the National Heritage Board of Poland made its programme for combating illegal archaeology very successful. Due to the programme, launched as recently as 2007, in more than ten cases persons charged of selling stolen items or looting sites were found guilty.

Apart from legal tools, education is one of the main tools to raise awareness against cultural heritage crimes. Educational initiatives should be highly diversified for different target groups. The National Museum of Finland has arranged the popular workshop “A Day as An Archaeologist” for schoolchildren since 2004. These events include an excavation in the courtyard of the museum. Photo: Hanna Forssell, © National Board of Antiquities, Finland.

Imported Roman fibula with enamel from the 2nd century AD – a very rare find in Poland – was offered for sale on the Internet. The seller was unaware about legal regulations and after notification returned the fibula to the authorities upon his own initiative. © National Heritage Board, Poland.

A lot remains to be done. The common struggle against black archaeology, regardless of whether it refers to illegal excavations in the Baltic Sea region countries or anywhere else in the world, requires the joint efforts of all parties involved – archaeologists, heritage protection services, police, customs, prosecutors and society as a whole. Therefore, the issue of black archaeology will remain on the Monitoring Group's agenda over the years to come.

Contact person Paulina Florjanowicz Polish member of the Monitoring Group National Heritage Board of Poland
Underwater Cultural Heritage

From similar problems to a common solution

The Baltic Sea has a unique underwater cultural heritage, and accordingly, in the Baltic Sea region, we see increasing interest in joint efforts and policies for the protection and management of the underwater heritage. The ministers of culture of the region have taken note of the situation in two declarations, issued in Copenhagen in 2001 and at Bergen in 2005. In the Bergen Declaration, the ministers explicitly emphasized “the importance of the underwater heritage in the Baltic Sea and supported the idea of strengthening cooperation through the development of a code of good practice on its protection.” This also corresponds well to the European Maritime Strategy that foresees a regional approach to the protection of the marine environment.

An important but less-known fact is that some 40 percent of the Baltic Sea is not territorial, but EEZ (Exclusive Economic Zone) waters. No effective heritage legislation can be applied there, since neither national nor international law covers this vast area in any meaningful way. So far, only Lithuania of the Baltic Sea States has ratified the 2001 UNESCO convention. Presently, nothing indicates that the situation will change drastically within the next few years.

The Code of Good Practice

In order to respond to political will for improved and harmonized UCH management in the Baltic Sea region, the Working Group for Underwater Heritage, in cooperation with the Monitoring Group, has produced the a Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (COPUCH).

COPUCH is a professional, non-controversial set of guidelines, a basis for further interregional cooperation for both experts and decision-making authorities. It is a “light” UNESCO convention, while also a grass-roots level initiative. Hopefully, COPUCH, will promote a more sustainable and common management strategy for the underwater cultural heritage in the Baltic Sea region.

The 100 list

However, policies and guidelines are not enough. Initiatives must also be taken in order to create interest, to start a dialogue on the cultural values of and accessibility to the underwater cultural heritage. Both scuba divers and non-divers should be included in such efforts. A number of projects have already started and are in varying states of progress. It is evident that almost all Baltic Sea states experience underwater tourism to a greater or lesser degree, and there is the ambition to meet the growing interest in wreck diving and at the same time minimize the damages caused by an uncontrolled or careless diving.

In the Rutilus project, organised in 2004 –2006 within the Underwater Heritage Working Group and financed by the Nordic Council of Ministers, a list of the 100 most valuable underwater monuments and sites in the Baltic Sea was produced. The majority of the monuments and sites on the list are wrecks from historically recorded times, but there are also sites such as submerged settlements, harbour areas and defence structures.

The 100 list is important for several reasons. It reveals history and identity, and it is a tool for experts. The Rutilus project is the first project in which the whole Baltic Sea region co-operated with the explicit aim of visualizing and defining the scientific and cultural values of the underwater cultural heritage in the Baltic Sea. The 100 list is a potential branding tool and it highlights a common history; it spreads knowledge of the underwater heritage and how it is unrestricted by national borders. The list, however, also stresses the common responsibility to preserve it.

A strategy based on knowledge, management tools and accessibility

The Baltic Sea is a very special environment with a unique underwater cultural asset waiting to be revealed to a larger audience. But this asset must be exploited in a sustainable way. While it is everyone’s responsibility to protect and promote the underwater cultural heritage, a major part of this burden falls on politicians and decision-makers. COPUCH is a professional statement for improved management. We must bear in mind that the underwater cultural
heritage in the Baltic Sea region is of global importance and a great asset to the region.

A preservation strategy for the underwater cultural heritage should be based on three factors:
1. Knowledge (surveys, standards of documentation and databases).
2. Formal instruments (legislation, ratifying of international conventions and participation in Codes of Good Practice).
3. Communication and accessibility (digital registers, dive parks, etc.).

Ignorance is the worst threat to the heritage. Not knowing means not participating and hence not taking care. The professional managers of cultural heritage must improve their efforts to spread knowledge of underwater heritage and to create an opinion on regional and local interest to protect it.

Baltic Sea States Working Group on Underwater Heritage
Contact person Chair Björn Varenius
Swedish National Maritime Museums

During the course of hundreds of years navigation has generated common culture along the coasts, on islands and inland – as well as some 100,000 wrecks on the bottom of the sea. A cannon of the “Hedvig Sophia”, a Swedish warship, which was sunk on 24 April 1715 near Kiel bears witness to how the Baltic Sea has been a functioning channel for many kind of interaction, both peaceful and belligerent. © Gerald Lorenz.

With low water and good conditions for the preservation of wrecks, the Baltic Sea has great potential for maritime research and underwater tourism. The Code of Good Practice has been prepared and agreed to regionally by underwater heritage authorities. The Code established basic principles in underwater cultural heritage management. On photo, a few ship wrecks, a tug from the 2nd World War and remains of wooden boats, lay on the coast line at Ragaciems, Latvia. © Juris Urtans.

The Dalarö wreck was discovered in 2003 in the Stockholm archipelago, near the seaside resort of Dalarö, some 35 km south-east of Stockholm. One of the originally three masts is tilted, but otherwise the ship is structurally almost intact due to the very favourable preservation conditions of the Baltic Sea. It is approximately 20 metres long and is dated to the 17th century. Drawing by Niklas Eriksson, © Swedish National Maritime Museums.
Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (COPUCH)

Preamble

1. The overall objective of COPUCH is the management and preservation of the unique Underwater Cultural Heritage (UCH) in Baltic Sea. Therefore, the delimitation of the Baltic Sea is defined by the parallel of the Skaw in the Skagerrak at lat. 57 44.43’ N, which is in accordance with Article 1 of the Helsinki Convention (Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area, 1992).

2. COPUCH is an agreed set of principles that seeks to establish:

   a. a common ground for the protection, recognition, understanding and management of the UCH in the Baltic Sea Region,
   b. that archaeological surveying and excavation are undertaken in a scientific manner,
   c. the prevention of any unprofessional interference or excavation of the UCH.

Subsections

1. “Underwater cultural heritage” means all cultural, historical and/or archaeological traces of human existence which have been under water for at least 100 years, or which otherwise are regarded as historically significant or protected by heritage legislation.

2. COPUCH is applicable to the entire Baltic Sea, including internal and territorial waters.

3. The UCH in the Baltic Sea is recognised as an invaluable source for knowledge, experience and understanding.

4. Preservation in situ of the UCH shall be considered as the first option. Other alternatives shall be motivated and actions, if taken, professionally performed.

5. By professional performance is meant such action that is conducted and led by educated and trained underwater archaeologists.

6. Professional competence in the engagement with the UCH is essential to ensure the proper recording of its cultural, historical and archaeological information.

7. All professional action regarding the UCH shall be done within a proper project design. This project design may vary between nations, but should include research objectives, expected results, planned efforts, means of documentation, treatment of eventual artefacts and publication measures. It is also recommended that it should include a budget, the means of financing, a timetable and an occupational health and safety plan.

8. Activities directed at the UCH shall avoid physical interference that is not motivated by the research objectives. Non-destructive methods shall be preferred before actions that affect or disturb a site or an object and/or its context.

9. In the management of the UCH, preventive planning and other efforts shall aim at avoiding or minimizing destructive interference.

10. Public access to good and relevant information and experience of the UCH is an important goal and shall be promoted.

Monday, 10 March 2008

Helena Edgren
Chairman of the Monitoring group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea States

Björn Varenius
Chairman of the Working group on Underwater Heritage
The Context of the Code

The Task

In the Bergen Declaration of 2005, ministers of culture took note of the importance of the underwater heritage in the Baltic Sea and supported the idea of strengthening cooperation through the development of a code of good practice for its protection. This work has now been completed and is presented as the Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (COPUCH).

What is the situation in the Baltic Sea?

The underwater landscape of the Baltic Sea is a unique environmental and cultural-historical milieu due to the combination of its extremely good preservation conditions and its long and rich history of seafaring. Low salinity and low temperature have meant that the most aggressive wood-consuming organisms such as Teredo navalis have not been able to establish themselves here, as they have in ocean waters. As a result, tens of thousands of old wrecks and an unknown number of flooded Stone Age settlements, bridges, fishing installations etc. remain under the surface of the sea. It is of vital importance to protect this heritage for future generations to experience, enjoy and learn from them. Such objectives call for an international perspective.

The average depth in the Baltic Sea is only 54 metres, which makes large parts of it accessible for sport divers. New technology also enables divers to go deeper and remain submerged for longer periods, and modern GPS devices have also improved the accuracy of site location. This means that position data can be transmitted between teams in a simpler way and that wrecks can now be located much more quickly. The number of sport divers in the Baltic area is quite high, although no exact figures exist, but it is estimated that there may be some 250,000 divers in the area.

There are no international waters in the Baltic Sea. Approximately 60 percent are territorial waters under the jurisdiction of the nations surrounding the sea, while the remaining 40 percent are EEZ waters (Exclusive Economic Zones). Although most wrecks are known from near the coasts, new discoveries point to the fact that shipwrecks have also occurred in open water. For example, in the past few years at least two very well preserved wrecks from the 17th and 18th centuries have been encountered in or very near the Swedish EEZ. The Russian Coast Guard ship Russalka left Tallinn harbour in September 1893, but sank with its entire crew in what are now Finnish EEZ waters. The formal legal status of these wrecks and other cultural remains in the EEZ area is weak and unclear, which makes their protection a great problem for cultural heritage authorities.

Working group design

One of the most important steps towards sustainable management of the underwater cultural heritage in the Baltic Sea Region is a common perspective on the value of underwater cultural heritage. If protection of this unique cultural heritage is to be successful, the Baltic Sea States need to formulate and express the will to establish certain common principles for its exploration and protection. From the work done under the auspices of the ministers of culture of the Baltic Sea Region (BSR), the Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea States and its specially designated Working Group on Underwater Heritage have formed a statement of opinion on the necessity of action being taken in order to protect this hidden but invaluable heritage. The Code of Good Practice for the Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (COPUCH) is an attempt to establish certain basic principles in underwater cultural heritage management. Representatives from all states with a coastline on the Baltic Sea have participated in the work: Denmark, Estonia, Finland and the Åland Islands, Germany (Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and Schleswig-Holstein), Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Russian Federation and Sweden.

Background

There are several international conventions that are relevant to the protection of the underwater cultural heritage, such as the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea from 1982 (UNCLOS) and The Revised European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage from 1992 (the Valletta Convention). The UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage from 2001 is of course highly relevant, but is not yet in force. To some extent, COPUCH resembles the UNESCO convention, but it is limited to the Baltic Sea and has no legal effects. COPUCH is also much shorter and simpler. Moreover, it has a different background and arises from the needs of those who are set to work with these issues on a daily basis. Maritime archaeologists and museum officials from all sea states around the Baltic Sea have participated in the process to produce COPUCH. There has been a strong and unanimous ambition to contribute to the work, and a feeling that the underwater cultural
heritage deserves to be protected in a more adequate way than it is today.

With the aid of COPUCH, the Baltic Sea States can strengthen the idea of the underwater cultural heritage as a valuable asset, to be appreciated in its own right as a resource for future generations. Other conventions already ratified by many Baltic Sea States, such as the Valletta Convention, also include structures and monuments under water, but there is an obvious need to address specifically the underwater heritage. However, it is also important to note that the underwater heritage is not considered as something that should be kept away from divers and other users. On the contrary, cultural heritage management should have sustainable use as its guideline, and balance protection with public access. An important way to achieve such a balance is to integrate cultural heritage management in physical planning and to make it part of the development of the whole Baltic region.

Preamble part

A definition of the area for which COPUCH is considered applicable is necessary. The practical way to handle this issue has been to use an established and recognized definition, in this case the delimitation of the Baltic Sea used by the Helsinki Convention: lat. 57 44.43’ N. This area encompasses not only the entire Baltic Sea, but also the western Scandinavian waters as far as the parallel approximately between the tip of the Skaw and Gothenburg. Although this area of water was originally defined for other purposes, it is also relevant to COPUCH, since it roughly corresponds to the waters in which there are good preservation conditions for sunken wooden objects and structures. It is known, however, that *Teredo navalis* lives in the saltier waters in and north of the Öresund strait – and in some cases its effects have even been recorded south of the strait – but the chosen definition serves its purpose.

It should be noted that there are a number of general statements in COPUCH for the benefit of good underwater cultural heritage management, which means that nothing prevents other states than those directly bordering the Baltic Sea from adopting and following the principles of COPUCH. All initiatives to express and strengthen the status of the underwater cultural heritage should be welcomed.

Subsections part

A broad definition of what is considered “underwater cultural heritage” has been chosen. There are legislative differences among the Baltic Sea States, and the 100-year limit has been complemented with other criteria. It has also been important to find a way to include the whole Baltic Sea, since cultural heritage remains can occur almost anywhere.

Preservation in situ of the archaeological heritage is generally recommended as the first option to consider, and it may also be the only way to preserve the bulk of the underwater cultural heritage. Since wooden wrecks in the Baltic Sea can be structurally almost intact, other options will probably result in extensive and expensive underwater archaeological excavations, high conservation costs and future storage problems. Conserved waterlogged wood requires a special climate and constant attention, also in museum environments.

Although in situ preservation is the first option, the circumstances sometimes call for other strategies. Since archaeological excavations can only be done once as they are destructive by nature, it is of vital importance that they are performed in the best possible way. Subsections 3-9 discuss the need for professional competence and strategic planning in all action concerning the underwater cultural heritage.

Finally, there is the urge to promote public access to the underwater heritage. Since ignorance may be one of the worst threats to cultural heritage, good and easily accessible information may be one of the best ways to improve its preservation.

Summary

a. COPUCH is produced as a regional code of practice for underwater heritage protection and management specially adapted for the Baltic Sea Region.
b. It is non-binding and has no legal authority, but it can be regarded as an interpretation of the practical intentions and ideas of existing international conventions and declarations.
c. Generally, it seeks to guide the preservation and heritage management work in a more sustainable direction, but it is clear that this must be based on the acceptance of the value of the underwater cultural heritage.
d. Therefore, COPUCH wishes to promote the appreciation of the cultural and societal value of the underwater cultural heritage and the importance of the maritime history of the region.
e. Without the support of both the highest authorities and public opinion, it will be very difficult for professional heritage management institutions to be successful in their work.
The case of the wreck of Vrouw Maria illustrates the need of joined expertise and agreed regional practices on underwater heritage. The two-masted Dutch merchant vessel Vrouw Maria sank on her way from Amsterdam to St. Petersburg in 1771 in the outer archipelago in South western Finland. The wreck was found in 1999 by the Pro Vrouw Maria Association. Finland’s National Board of Antiquities examined the wreck in 2000–2004. The survey was partly financed within a European Community Programme called MoSS (Monitoring, Safeguarding and Visualizing North-European Shipwreck Sites).

The Vrouw Maria represents a typical rigged merchant vessel of the snow type from the end of the 18th century. These ships used to sail with cargoes of miscellaneous goods in the Baltic Sea. The wreck of the Vrouw Maria has been preserved extremely well. Approximately 90% of the hull still remains intact. The protection of the wreck is laid down by the Finnish Antiquities Act of 1963.

The Vrouw Maria has the reputation of a treasure ship because her cargo consisted partly of works of art bought by Russian aristocrats and Empress Catherine the Great. Among them were for instance Dutch paintings from the 17th century. According to the entries of the Sound Customs House in Denmark, the Vrouw Maria carried also cargo of sugar, dyes, zinc, cloths, and single items whose customs fee seems to have been unusually high. Part of the cargo was salvaged soon after the shipwreck, but the majority of it went down with the ship.

The survey of the Maritime Archaeology Unit of the Finnish National Board of Antiquities was concluded with the Vrouw Maria Report. It recommended the Vrouw Maria Underwater project that would keep the wreck of Vrouw Maria at the bottom of the sea for the time being and display her underwater world with the help of on-line cameras and virtual technologies.

The Vrouw Maria Underwater project includes four research areas: visualizing in situ, safeguarding in situ, monitoring the condition of the wreck, and the cultural-historical investigation of the wreck. In the course of the project, the aim is also to organize international seminars focusing on the in situ visualization and safeguarding of wrecks. The results of the project will be presented in publications and exhibitions.

The idea of keeping the wreck of Vrouw Maria in its current place is justified since there are no threats caused by human activities or the environment that would place the wreck at serious or immediate risk. The Vrouw Maria Underwater project can be seen as preliminary preparation for the possible raising of the wreck some time in the future. Once raised as a whole out of the sea, the wreck can be examined in laboratory conditions, then conserved, and put on display in a museum.

In 2007 the Russians contacted Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs to start negotiations concerning the possible raising of the Vrouw Maria or the cargo of the wreck. There have been two meetings concerning possible international cooperation. At a meeting on 9 June 2008 in Helsinki the Chair of the Baltic Sea States Working Group for underwater cultural heritage presented The Code of Good Practice as an example of how international cooperation in underwater archaeology could be done according to the best professional standards.

Photo of the bow of the wreck of Vrouw Maria by Jouni Polkko 2001, drawing of the wreck by Tiina Miettinen, copyright National Board of Antiquities, Finland
Urban Heritage Management

Urban heritage conservation – an act of communication

Urban heritage conservation is one of the fields where communication between stakeholders is an absolute prerequisite. It is mentioned already in the statements on integrated conservation in the Amsterdam declaration of the Council of Europe 1975. Still, it seems to be an area where the potential for development and improvements is quite substantial.

Research from recent years concludes that different aims and expectations are the main reason for conflicts in urban heritage management. Given such circumstances, a project Communicating heritage in urban development processes (Co-Herit) for the years 2006–08 was established. After gaining economic support from the Nordic Council of Ministers, the project was officially started with an international workshop in January 2007.

The Baltic Sea States Working Group on sustainable historic towns initiated in 2003–05 the project Sustainable Historic Towns – Urban Heritage as an Asset of Development, which focused on updating urban heritage management tools. It was partly funded by the Interreg III B programme. Within the project, a new set of tools called DIVE was developed focusing on the need to communicate understanding of urban heritage values. The Co-Herit project is a follow up project to this project, and tests the developed tools. The project includes several different approaches to the challenge of communication.

A dialogue with the inhabitants of Arboga in Sweden

The medieval town of Arboga with 14,000 inhabitants was about to start the development of a new master plan when the Co-Herit project started. Through cooperation with the National Heritage Board and the Royal Institute of Technology, an enquiry was made, aiming to give a picture of the significance of urban heritage among inhabitants and business enterprises. Especially the enquiry among inhabitants provided new information for local politicians and administration, proving that the historic environment of the town centre was even more important to people than previously known.

To elaborate on this general information, politicians and administration volunteered to meet people and discuss conservation and development in an information booth placed at the main market square of the town. Over a period of two weeks, they collected some 400 statements from people of all kinds who visited them in the town’s market square.

All this information is now used to discuss significance and values in the new master plan, which is expected to be approved by the town council in 2009.

New norms for discussion on urban heritage in project proposals in Tromsø, Norway

Tromsø is the functional regional capital of northern Norway, with more than 50,000 inhabitants and a booming construction business. Private developers present series of new project proposals, leading to frequent debates and conflicts related to urban transformation. The situation is a major challenge for local government. In the Co-Herit project, the local planning authorities aim to establish a norm for presenting and discussing urban heritage issues in urban development projects.

The city wants to make developers responsible for documentation. To facilitate discussion, the DIVE analysis is used as a standard for presentations and discussions. A block in the city centre is chosen as pilot project, because a current project proposal will transform major parts of it. The analysis is tested to develop functional levels of discussing tolerance for change related to the significance of the urban heritage that will be affected. Various techniques of visual presentation are used to illustrate situation, proposals and consequences of development.

Different tools applied in practical communication in Pietarsaari, Finland

The town of Pietarsaari (Jakobstad) in western Finland with 20,000 inhabitants is working on a town centre development plan. In this connection, aims and tools for cultural heritage management policies have been redefined. Through the BSR cooperation scheme, the new policies have been structured by means of the DIVE analysis. This has enabled municipal administration to present...
their policy as well as the justification for the policy on a
der, making it easy to read for everybody.

Parallel to the planning process, the town administration is developing a system to make digital map-based
information accessible through the Internet. This tool
will enable property owners, developers, architects and
other consultants to work on the same basis as the munic-
ipal administration, and submit material with a given
standard of quality. Even more important, it will make
these material accessible to the general public, enabling
people to make their own judgments on urban conserva-
tion and development issues based on yet another source
of factual information.

Dialogues to solve conflicts
in Odda, Norway

The small industrial town Odda in western Norway with
7,000 inhabitants is gradually entering the post-industrial
era. For a hundred years development has been propelled
by heavy industries based on hydroelectric power. Now
one of the production plants has been shut down, leaving
a major part of the town centre as a collection of huge
derelict constructions of concrete and steel. The local
community is split in the middle by a conflict between
those in favour of preserving major parts of the industrial
heritage as a basis for cultural development, and those
who want new commercial structures to replace the old
industrial ones. A referendum in connection with the
local elections in 2007 only revealed a divided commu-
nity, and solved no problems.

When the conflict also stopped the approval of the detail
plan for development of a former carbide production site,
the heritage authorities proposed the use of DIVE analysis
to find solutions. The Directorate for Cultural Heritage
provided guidance on the process, and a firm of consult-
ants was hired to produce the actual analysis. The process
was based on workshops following the four steps of the
DIVE analysis, starting with descriptions before moving
on to the interpretation and evaluation of the industrial
heritage. Through this process, the owners and the heritage
authorities came closer to an agreement. At the time of
writing of this report, the proposals produced through
the analysis are still being discussed by the municipal
council, but it seems the dialogue has made several of the
parties leave their entrenched position and move on to a
constructive discussion on alternative solutions.

Planned results and dissemination

The Co-Herit project will, in addition to the formal report
on the organisation and process, deliver as its main result
two practical manuals to guide local planners:
• On the use of enquiries as tools for public participa-
tion in discussion on heritage values,
• On DIVE analysis and how to apply this approach in
practical planning.
The project partners at the national level will distribute
the results in their respective countries. An English
version of the DIVE analysis will be published through
the Internet.

Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway
Contact person Dag Arne Reinar

Information on the SuHITo-project and DIVE:
WEB-adress: www.rba.fi/en/sustainablehistorictowns

Sustainable Historic Towns – Urban Heritage as an Asset
of Development Project Report, edited by Marianne
Lehtimäki, National Heritage Board, Finland, reports of the
Department of Monuments and Sites 16, 2006.
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The Finnish pilot town of Jakobstad (Finnish Pietarsaari) is situated on the west coast of Finland. This small wooden town has a majority population of Swedish-speakers. The Empire style predominates in the surroundings of the pilot quarter. Photo Ben Griep.

Core issues of urban heritage management are to define the significant characteristics of a place and to share understanding of continuity and changes of environment. A schematic drawing of the layers of built heritage after 1835 in the pilot quarter in Jakobstad. Demolished buildings are given in red. Drawing Mikael Ström.

The matrix gives an example of the DIVE approach that is developed within the Baltic Sea co-operation urban heritage. DIVE is a tool for use in urban planning and management, especially for situations requiring a systematic and transparent procedure through which to develop proposals and strategies. The approach is firmly rooted in the principles of integrated planning, cross-sector collaboration and public involvement, and has been designed to function as a four-step reasoning process.

Firstly there is a knowledge-building phase, which is followed by an interpretative phase focusing on the study area’s historic significance. This is followed by a value-based sequence of elaborations concerning the area’s historic development potential and capacities for change.

In the last phase conclusions are drawn regarding the question of how to enable, activate and safeguard defined and prioritized cultural heritage assets. Target groups are first and foremost urban planners, architects, consultants, as well as the heritage management sector itself. © Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway.
Tidsperioder definert av bydannelse og kvartalshistorikk

### Trinn 1: Kulturverns karakter
#### BYGÅRDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISERING OG FUNKsjON</th>
<th>VISUELL STRUKTUR</th>
<th>BESKRIVELSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1870</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1880</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1890</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1900</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fikk betydning som eksempel på omforming fra boliger til kontor og museum. Meierigården var et viktig byrom.

- **1870**: Storgata 30 og 34 ble nye bygårder i perioden.
- **1880**: Meierigården ble nye bygårder.
- **1890**: Nybygårder i byen.
- **1900**: Bygårder i byen.

### Trinn 2: Kulturverns betydning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BYGÅRDERENS BETYDNING OG TILSTAND</th>
<th>TIDSPERIODEN</th>
<th>BETYDNING</th>
<th>TILSTAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1870 - 1906</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1906 - 1960</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1960 - 2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **1870 - 1906**: Bygårder i perioden.
- **1906 - 1960**: Bygårder i perioden.
- **1960 - 2008**: Bygårder i perioden.

Storgata 30 har kulturhistorisk betydning som eksempel på 1900-tallet omformning av en bygård.

- **1870**: Tabernaklet og Smiths Hotell ble oppført.
- **1880**: De første tinglysinger i Grønnegata.
- **1890**: Storgata 34, 38 og 40 ble nye bygårder.
- **1900**: Alle opprinnelige vinduer og ytterdører ble plassert på huset.
- **1910**: Storgata 34, 38 og 40 ble nye bygårder.

- **1920**: Storgata 30 har nye bygårder.
- **1930**: Storgata 30 ble nye bygårder.
- **1940**: Storgata 30 ble nye bygårder.
- **1950**: Storgata 30 ble nye bygårder.
- **1960**: Storgata 30 ble nye bygårder.
- **1970**: Storgata 30 ble nye bygårder.
- **1980**: Storgata 30 ble nye bygårder.
- **1990**: Storgata 30 ble nye bygårder.

### Tidsperioder definert av bydannelse og kvartalshistorikk

- **1870-1906**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1906-1960**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1960-2008**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.

Kulturverns karakter definert av bydannelse og kvartalshistorikk.

- **1870**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1880**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1890**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1900**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1910**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1920**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1930**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1940**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1950**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1960**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1970**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1980**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1990**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.

Rommelig dimensjon. Uregulert bebyggelse langs sjøfronten.

- **1870-1906**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1906-1960**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.
- **1960-2008**: Bygårder med nye bygårder.

### Tidsdimensjon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tidsdimensjon</th>
<th>Bylandskapet</th>
<th>Bydelen</th>
<th>Strandskillet</th>
<th>Kvartalet</th>
<th>By-gårder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1960 - 2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1906 - 1960</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1870 - 1906</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban Heritage Management
Lokalt perspektiv
Kvartalet har stor verdi som referanse til tre ulike perioder i byens utvikling:
- den opprinnelige kvartaletstruktur fra ca. 1870
- fremveksten av industri, tidlig 1900
- den sterke ekspansjonen innenfor handel og næring på 1960- og 70-tallet

Igen andre kvartalet skrene doku-
mentasjoner disse tre grundigge
ned i byens historre.

Nasjonalt perspektiv
Kvartaletstruktur fra 1800-talls
tromsø har nasjonale
kulturminneinteresser.

Eksempler fra denne veker er
sterkt under-representert i det nas-
jonale antikvariske arkiv.

Lokalt perspektiv
Viktige referanser og dokumentas-
jon er knyttet til gårds-strukturen:
- bygårder fra ca. 1870 med
hovedhus langs gata og gårdsrom
med plass for sjåer, verksted, etc.
- det tidligere meieriet med hoved-
bygning og driftstun
- eksempel på tidlig transformer-
ning av bygård i forbindelse med
næringsevnen i etterkrigsen

Nasjonalt perspektiv
Gårds-struktur fra 1800-talls
tromsø har nasjonale
kulturminneinteresser. Resten etter
industri- og kystkulturen
tidlig 1900 er det lite igjen av på
landsbasis.

Eksempler fra denne kulturen er
sterkt under-representert i det nas-
jonale antikvariske arkiv.

Gårds-strukturens
utviklingspotensial
Åpne gårdsrom kan gjenoppta og
forsterke tidligere bevegelsesmøn-
ster i kvartalet. Dette gir en tilbun-
gings-mønster som tidlig varias-
jon, åpne plasser og grønne rom.

I en slik "åpne rom strategi" oppnåes
først byrom-kvaliteter:
- reparasjon av gateveggen mot
Grønnegata
- opprettholde og videreutvikle
bevegelses gjennom kvartalet
- tilgjengelighet inne i kvartalet,
med mulighet for differensierte
virksomheter og opplevelser
- beholde og forsterke "småttet"
as del av det offentlige rom.

En tilbakeføring av adkomsten fra
Stranda til meierets tidligere
driftstun, vil styrke gårds-strukturen
og peke på den tidligere interak-
tions mellom Stranda og-
kvartalet.

Kvartalet-strukturens
utviklingspotensial
En mulig utvikling er å beholde og
forsterke kvartalets historiske karakter.
Dette åpner for at gårdsrom kan
bygges igjen.

I eksempel om nødvendigheter
vill med den kulturhistoriske
bebyggelsen, volume
refleksioner og
stor opprinnelig
bebyggelse i kvartalet

I begge alternativ ekompis-
neres handlingsnummer
volumet. Vi opprør,
- en skala som hadelu-
nerer med den kulturhis-
toriske bebyggelsen,
volume refleksioner og

dere opprinnelige
bebyggelsen i kvartalet.

I begge alternativ
ekompisserer handlingsnummer
volumet. Vi opprør,
- en skala som hadel-
nerer med den kulturhis-
toriske bebyggelsen,
volume refleksioner og
tokker den opprinnelige
bebyggelsen i kvartalet

Reguleringsbestemmel-
ser skal i kommunikationen
i kvartalet.

Dette gjelder i
- et kulturmessig
- inne i nærmest
bebyggelse.


det som

bebyggelse.

bebyggelse.

bebyggelse.

bebyggelse.

bebyggelse.

bebyggelse.

bebyggelse.

bebyggelse.
Children, Heritage and Education

Baltic Cooperation

Over the years, long-term cultural heritage cooperation among the countries surrounding the Baltic Sea has covered a broad spectrum of fields. One of the more recent areas of cooperation is “Children and Cultural Heritage Education”.

A seminar on this theme was arranged at the National Board of Antiquities in Helsinki October 2007 with participants from Norway, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Lecturers from Poland and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern were also invited to give their views in order to achieve a more comprehensive regional view.

To launch this cooperation a working group was created in 2006 with representatives from heritage authorities in Finland, Norway, Sweden and Estonia. Norway was responsible for the chairmanship. Finland announced possibilities to host a Baltic Sea area seminar in 2007 in order to make a survey of each country’s definitions of cultural heritage education, the national status of education in the field of heritage interpretation and strategies/structures/action plans of the responsible authorities in each country.

The seminar’s conclusions highlighted both similarities and the differences among the Baltic Sea countries. The need to focus on heritage education and interpretation is a matter that has been more obvious over the past three years in all the participating countries due to the growing European community and the increasing importance of regions in Europe.

Recent international conventions referring to the impact of cultural heritage (The European Landscape Convention and the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on the Value of Culture Heritage for Society i.a.) also enhance the importance of cultural heritage education for both adults and young people.

“We need to raise the value of cultural heritage education, make it more visible, more concrete and give it more international support” summarized one representative in the meeting. There is strong willingness to continue the work of creating a platform for sharing experiences in the field of children, heritage and education within cooperation in the Baltic Sea area. A common conclusion from the seminar in Helsinki was the obvious need to highlight the importance of the work of the educators and interpreters.

The network has decided to arrange the second meeting on cultural heritage education on a regional basis to be hosted by Lithuania.
The regional seminar on cultural heritage education for children and young people held in 2007 in Helsinki focused on three areas as the main starting points for a regional approach: national policies, education and good practices. What are the definitions and status of cultural heritage education in the strategies, structures and action plans of the organizations and in the goals of the responsible ministries or government departments in the Baltic Sea States? How is cultural heritage included in the work of schools, in their educational plans and in teacher training? What kind of special education is there for people working with cultural heritage education or museum pedagogy?

We need to disseminate information on successful projects in the region concerning cooperation between cultural heritage organizations and schools, or examples of financing. We need to analyse what makes them successful. One example of such is the Polish NGO programme “Traces of the Past” where young people adopt a monument and undertake its care and maintenance. © Foundation Centre for Citizenship Education.

The cultural rucksack – in Norwegian Den kulturelle skolesekken – is one of the largest cultural projects ever held in the country. It is a regional example of a noteworthy national investment in children’s cultural capital to last a whole lifetime. It is the joint initiative of Norway’s Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs and Ministry of Education and Research, being funded by profits from Norway’s state-owned lottery company.

The cultural rucksack project emphasizes quality and is meant for everyone. In this project, the art and cultural sector must cooperate with the school system. Art and culture are considered in the long term and in broad perspective. Cultural diversity and regularity are requirements, and children are expected to meet professional artists and experts; learning about history or archaeology is more exciting if you can meet an archaeologist. Sometimes children need to be active in the process, while on other occasions it is enough just to enjoy a concert or play or see an exhibition. Shown in the photo are schoolchildren visiting the Whaling Museum in Sandefjord. Photo © Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway.

In Estonia, the “Schools in Old Manors” government programme has generated different kinds of cultural activities for inhabitants and visitors. Pupils are engaged in activities in these cultural centres of villages that contribute to their enriched informal learning. The visitor game “Forgotten Manors” takes place during the summer. The game assists in public access and recognition of the unique environment of manor schools, in addition to the preservation of architectural heritage and the teaching of skilled maintenance. Teachers and pupils are obliged to guide visitors and facilitate the game in different ways. Here a teacher and a pupil are dressed as ladies of the manor. Photo: Marju Reismaa © Estonian Ministry of Culture.
National Policies and Interesting Examples

SWEDEN

New initiatives on cooperation

In Sweden access to culture for children and young people is a field of priority in the Department of Culture. In the annual state budget for 2008, €5.5 million was dedicated to be used by schools to permit pupils to take part in cultural events and activities. The reference is the Norwegian model known as the cultural rucksack.

The Council of Culture is the central authority in the field of museums, which are the most active interpreters of heritage. Their continuous work at the local, regional and national levels in cooperation with educational institutions has been carried out for decades.

Since 2001 a three-year special mission in the field of cultural heritage education has been dedicated to an institution. (2001-2004 Kalmar Region museum, 2005-2008 Jämtli, Östersund and 2008-2011 Swedish Travelling exhibitions). In 2008 the Swedish Travelling Exhibitions were given the mission to maintain and develop the network between museums and their staff of education and interpretation.

The FUISM network (Association of Educational Staff in Swedish Museums) has been active since the early 1980s and arranges annual meetings and seminars. The NCK network (Nordiskt Centrum för Kulturarvspedagogik) was launched in 2006 as a Scandinavian initiative by the county museum in Östersund (Jämtli). It has now gathered members from all over the Nordic countries. The Kalmar Region museum has an international operative network (Bridging Ages), which is concentrated on spreading knowledge about the educational method of time travel.

Educational programmes at universities specializing in cultural heritage outdoor education and interpretation are lacking in Sweden today, as in many of the Baltic countries. There are parts of heritage educational training in tourism programmes and in programmes for teachers at elementary schools. There are also opportunities for students to take part in courses in museum pedagogy at the universities of Malmö, Växjö, Linköping, Stockholm and Umeå.

The National Heritage Board of Sweden has been committed by the Ministry of Culture to fulfil the mission of engaging children and young people in the care of the cultural heritage. A child perspective is to be integrated in the authority’s actions. Activities at three national sites, Glimmingehus, the World Heritage site of Birka and Hovgården, and the Old Uppsala museum, are directed towards children and young people as target groups. The number of school visits to these sites has increased significantly over the past two years. Today there is a wide range of both indoor and outdoor pedagogical offerings to engage and activate pupils at all levels. In cooperation with the Skåne Regional Council, an educational specialist on cultural heritage has been based since 2005 at Glimmingehus with the eastern part of Skåne as his field of work.

Focus has been laid on new initiatives, on cooperation with schoolteachers and artists, performers and musicians. The dramatization of historical events and histor-
Denmark

Children and young people and access to heritage

Access to culture for children and young people is a high priority for the Danish government. All children in Denmark should have access to the experiences and knowledge offered by museums and other cultural institutions. This aim is followed up by the interdepartmental agency Network for Children and Culture.

The Heritage Agency of Denmark is also implementing a four-year Dissemination Plan for Danish museums. This Dissemination Plan includes seven action points to promote the dissemination of heritage in Denmark. A central point is museums and education. It is the Heritage Agency’s aim that all children and young people in Denmark should participate in educational programmes in Danish museums in the primary, secondary and upper secondary school.

To develop and qualify educational activities in Danish museums the Heritage Agency has set up funding to develop both educational programmes and research in educational programmes in museums and funding for international experience exchange. The Heritage Agency has also completed a national survey on the educational activities of Danish museums and is preparing to establish a national network for the educational activities of museums.

The objectives of the national network are to qualify and develop educational programmes in Danish museums and to strengthen collaboration between museums and educational institutions. Together with the Ministry of
Education the Agency has set up a national platform for teachers, www.e-museum.dk, providing access to educational material and programmes in Danish museums. Qualifying and developing educational activities in Danish museums are a key to the establishment of cultural democracy in Denmark and to turning culture into an active resource in contemporary society.

**Museums and lifelong learning**

In a rapidly expanding, changing and increasingly diverse world lifelong learning is more important than ever. There is a basic need for cultural competences in a lifelong learning perspective in the globalized and culturally diverse knowledge society of the 21st century.

At the heart of this museums are facing new challenges and opportunities - to stimulate learning and personal development, and to explore and rediscover issues of identity and, indeed, the value of culture itself. In today's society there is no consensus about the meaning and value of culture. The public prefers user-generated content to material written by experts, and more and more citizens interface digitally with the world rather than through direct experience.

Lifelong learning highlights the importance and significance of learning throughout life, while also emphasizing the active participation of recipients. Museums have special potential for self-directed, free-choice learning, respecting diversity and multiple viewpoints to take full advantage of culture in a democratic society.

Museums are in a unique position to facilitate lifelong learning by developing multiple narratives about what culture means in contemporary society, thereby encouraging active cultural citizenship. Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific progress and its benefits.

The Lisbon Declaration of March 2000 set an ambitious goal for Europe: to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater cohesion. Museums can support these goals by developing innovative access services, and they can play a key role in bringing these about through formal, non-formal and informal quality learning opportunities.

**The Danish life-long learning perspective**

The Danish government has a strong focus on access and learning opportunities in Danish museums. The government has decided to invest DKK 35.5 million annually on free admission to Danish state and state-subsidized museums for children and young people under the age of eighteen and on free admission to the permanent collections of the Danish National Museum and the Danish National Gallery.

The Dissemination Plan for Danish Museums, which is being implemented over a four-year period from 2007 to 2011, has an overall life-long learning perspective. The Dissemination Plan is followed up by annual budget allocations of DKK 40.5 million. The action points of the Plan are: funds for the development of dissemination in
The Danish approach to educational quality of museums is a topical question in whole region. Museums need to take into consideration the expectations and capacities of different audiences. Museums should stimulate learning and personal development, to explore imagination and rediscover issues of identity.

As one successful example of these principles is the Settlement Exhibition of the 871 ±2 Reykjavik City Museum. The exhibition is based on the archaeological excavation of the ruins of one of the first houses in Iceland in situ and finds from other excavations in the city centre. The exhibition includes a great deal of information that is presented by using mixed media in an imaginative way, taking into consideration the different levels of interest and preferences of the visitors. Photo of an exhibition panel by Jarmo Mattila.

Beginning in 2008 the Heritage Agency will implement a national user survey in all state museums and state-subsidized museums in Denmark. The survey is an important strategic tool for working with access and lifelong learning facilities in Danish museums. The Plan aims to raise the standards of access and dissemination to a significantly higher level during the four-year period. The lifelong learning perspective is a key issue in making heritage an active resource in society.

Contact person Ida Brundholdt
National Heritage Agency, Denmark

POLAND

Traces of the Past - a non-governmental programme in heritage education for children

Children and teenagers participating in the educational programme "Traces of the Past" search for a historical monument in their region, learn about its history and take care of it. They try to restore memories of the place and the people connected with it.

The educational programme "Traces of the Past - Students Adopt Historical Monuments" started in 2001. Its main goal is to inspire students to explore their own village, town or city in order to discover interesting, though often neglected, traces of the past. The programme is implemented in cooperation with the Leopold Kronenberg Foundation and the National Centre for Culture within the framework of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage Programme - Patriotism of Tomorrow. The National Heritage Board of Poland actively promotes it.

Students “adopt” a chosen object - they dedicate themselves to taking care of it. Next, in cooperation with local government and local cultural institutions, they strive to restore the monument they have adopted. These activities serve to promote the cultural heritage of a particular town and region. While taking part in the project, young people discover the history of the place where they live. Searching for historical traces influences the imagination of students more strongly than even the best lecture.

“Traces of the Past" is intended for schoolchildren aged 7-18. The programme can be implemented in civic education, history, literature, art classes as well as after-school programmes. Teachers assist children and students in their activities of choosing, adopting and looking after the monument. © Foundation Centre for Citizenship Education.
and high schools (ages 16 to 18). The programme can be implemented during civic education, history, literature, art classes and after-school programmes. “Traces of the Past” is becoming more and more popular. So far around 1,000 schools, 1,500 teachers and over 20,000 pupils have participated in it. The idea appealed both to students and their teachers. Regardless of skills, interests or age, everyone can find something valuable. Students carry out most activities on their own. Teachers assist them, inspiring, stimulating, encouraging, empowering, giving them support in essential matters, and helping them plan their actions. Tasks, which are undertaken by students build their sense of identity, strengthen their bond with their birthplace and also foster a sense of civic duty. Taking care of the adopted monuments becomes a lasting element of school tradition.

The project is implemented in several steps. Students start by choosing the monument they want to adopt. They prepare documentation of the monument and organize a ceremony of adoption. After the students have acted, the process and output is evaluated.

The Centre for Citizenship Education organizes and conducts workshops for teachers and students. It prepares and distributes a manual for teachers to permit them to work with their students more effectively. The Centre trains selected teachers to become regional coordinators of the project and organizes national and regional showcases. It also creates and moderates the website of the programme.

More information: [www.ceo.org.pl/slady](http://www.ceo.org.pl/slady)

**LATVIA**

**New methods for promoting urban heritage**

Kuldiga was recorded in the UNESCO World Heritage Tentative List as “Kuldiga Old City in the primeval hollow of the River Venta” in 2004. The local municipality is convinced that Kuldiga’s way towards the UNESCO World Heritage List is possible only in direct cooperation with citizens.

The UNESCO City Game in Kuldiga has started a completely new tradition in the field of studying the history of the town. Taking place in the labyrinths of the old town, the game has gathered a large number of school children.

The aim of the game is to focus the attention of citizens, especially young people, on the cultural heritage of Kuldiga as an important part of the world heritage. The idea was to find new methods to promote interest in history and cultural heritage. By using the elements of the game, the urban heritage of the town can be experienced in an attractive and relevant way by the target group.

The main target groups are school children of Kuldiga, families with children from all over the country and school children from Latvia. The game consists of three parts. Participants use the map of the town to find control points according to ancient and contemporary photos. They have to find answers to the research questions and the right answers in a “know or guess” cycle.

Contact person **Katrina Kukaine**

Latvian member of the Monitoring Group Inspection for Heritage Protection, Latvia
GERMANY

Exploring religious monuments with all the senses

The ACCU project studied different ways of improving access to the cultural heritage. This took place in 2004 - 2006, and was partly financed by the Culture Programme of the European Union.

The German pilot project focused on the history and current use of three medieval religious monuments. The aim was to develop better ways of presenting these sites to young people and blind and partially sighted people. The aim was to enhance accessibility by means of better presentation, without any renovation work or other major changes to the buildings. The second aim was to initiate cooperation between the pupils and to learn about different perceptions.

After a common Project Day, 22 pupils from both schools met again for a joint “Action Weekend” to explore together Schwerin Cathedral and the medieval village church and reconstructed Slavic temple in Groß Raden. The basic idea was that all pupils should have the same possibilities to gather information and to contribute to shared success. Details and parts of the cathedral were chosen which could be explored by touching as well as by viewing. The more complex background information was presented by volunteers acting as medieval persons, giving their specific views on the building. They were identified by costumes and typical objects and could be interviewed by the young “researchers”.

The cathedral being open to tourists at the same time, other visitors quickly discovered the medieval persons as extraordinary sources of information. The very positive comments of these guests shed light on the aspect of inclusive design in the action.

The next morning, all pupils received information about the medieval village church of Groß Raden. The pupils took part in a guided tour and enjoyed presentations of original materials such as decorated bricks and methods of medieval masonry in a reconstructed scaffold.
The reconstructed temple site in the Groß Raden Archaeological Park illustrates the non-Christian religion of the Slavic tribes of this region. It is part of a completely excavated and reconstructed settlement on a lakeshore, dominated by an impressive ring-wall fortress. The pupils learned about the function of the temple by working out a temple ceremony for an imaginary documentary film. This should provide the pupils with a motive to gather and to select information in the museum. The ceremony also served as an unusual way of conveying this new knowledge to all the participants.

Another pilot action was a Project Seminar for experienced tour guides of the Schwerin Cathedral. The seminar sought to spread knowledge about guiding blind and visually impaired visitors through the Schwerin Cathedral, how to move around in them and to give sensible explanations and descriptions of the artwork and other aspects of the building.

The aim of the seminar was to develop a standard guided tour for blind visitors together with the guides. The permanent help of a professional audio describer of the Association of German Film Describers, blind herself, of an orientation and mobility trainer and an experienced guide for the blind ensured that the needs of the blind and visually impaired guests were present in every phase of the seminar.

The tactile book for blind and visually impaired visitors of the Cathedral supports the guided tours as an alternative source of information. The book will also be available for individual visitors not taking part in a tour. There will be several copies to be lent out to guests during their visit.

**Learning attitude and commitment**

The School Project was evaluated among participating pupils and teachers by using questionnaires and through discussions and interviews. Both able and disabled pupils similarly assessed the actions as successful. The pupils gained a more historical attitude to monuments. Before the actions, aesthetics and feelings governed interest in historic monuments. After the weekend, the pupils saw the monuments also as sources of historical knowledge. The practical efforts also illustrated the special needs of visually impaired people. The pupils gave many useful hints in written comments, which also demonstrated their commitment.

The project seminar for the guides of Schwerin Cathedral produced an exemplary tour for blind and partially sighted visitors through the church. This tour includes the sensory description of visual impressions and artwork. But the seminar also brought out the problems of working with seasoned guides, who had difficulties in adopting new ways of explaining and new guiding techniques. One cannot overestimate the amount of communication and practice needed when people, staff or freelancers, have to act on new guidelines.

Contact person **Eeva Rantamo**
Landesamt für Kultur und Denkmalpflege in Schwerin
Cultural Heritage as an Asset – Examples of National Initiatives

Cultural heritage as the basis for creating new assets – Norway

“Creating New Assets in the Cultural Heritage Sphere” is a programme initiated by the Directorate for Cultural Heritage in Norway and the Ministry for the Environment in 2006. The background to this programme has been the desire for cultural heritage and the cultural environment to be used to a greater extent as resources in the development of vibrant local communities and as a basis for new economic activities.

Nationally and internationally, more and more attention has been focused on how cultural heritage and the cultural environment can contribute to social, cultural and economic development. This interaction represents great potential for employment and settlement in many towns and villages, both along the coast and inland.

This programme of creating new assets will contribute towards cultural heritage being used as a resource in societal development by using cultural heritage for the maximum benefit of the population, business and industry, the local community and the regions. It aims at taking better care of the cultural heritage and developing and spreading knowledge about the cultural heritage as a resource.

Pilot projects in different environments

The Directorate for Cultural Heritage selected ten pilot projects from among seventy applications. Moreover, a trial project was started in Nordland, initiated by the Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Nordland County in 2005. “The Value of the Coastal Culture” has the same aims as the projects in the new assets programme and is categorized as a pilot project in the same way as the other ten. In these projects, cultural heritage will be integrated in different contexts, including the identification of good models of cooperation, methods and procedures.

The projects will trigger engagement and resources from the population, business and industry and the authorities at all levels and in different sectors. They work towards the sustainable use of the cultural heritage and cultural environment that will also take note of the limits of their endurance. The projects will develop further and spread knowledge about the cultural heritage as a resource, amongst other things through research and development work, with the help of different networks.

In the selection of these projects there has been special emphasis on finding good projects from the coastal zone, from towns and centres of population as well as projects linked to the agrarian cultural landscape. The link with outdoor-life-based initiatives plays a further major role in many of these projects.

The programme will be carried out in two phases. The first phase lasts for four years, from 2006 to 2010. What will happen in the second phase depends on the results and experiences gained in the course of the first phase.

Obtaining knowledge and exchanging experiences

The programme consists of two principal elements: the pilot projects and a network to obtain knowledge, as well as exchanging experiences. The pilot projects form part of a local and/or regional strategy of creating new assets and innovation. While the county or municipal council is the regional development actor and central to several of the projects, also the owners, business partners, other private and public actors and volunteer organizations are all important.

There is a clear intention that the projects should establish a sense of community among the different actors, right across the traditional specialist and sector boundaries. The aim is to create a “bring your own” atmosphere, where funds awarded by the Directorate for Cultural Heritage to the projects are part of cooperation with other public and private resources. In order to achieve greater results from the programme, follow-up research is initiated in connection with the pilot projects, and the programme will be evaluated.

Budget

In 2006, NOK 9.7 million (€ 1.2 M) were allocated for the programme. For 2007, NOK nine million (€ 1.1 M) were allocated from the Directorate for Cultural Heritage’s budget and the same amount from the Norwegian Cultural Heritage Fund (Norsk kulturminnefond). In 2008, the corresponding amounts are NOK 13.4 million (€ 1.6 M) and NOK 10 million (€ 1.2 M). Together with resources...
from private owners and different sectors, this funding is used to restore cultural monuments and prepare new cultural assets.

Networks and meeting places

Networks are established for the actors in the projects, and meeting places are set up where those taking part can meet others who are also interested in cultural heritage and in creating new assets. These networks lay the ground for learning and imparting knowledge, exchanging experiences between the pilot projects and other, similar projects, coordinating resource components and the use of effects and feedback from follow-up research.

Contact person Eva Camerer
Norwegian member of the Monitoring Group
National Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway
Cultural heritage and the cultural environment should be considered and used to a greater extent as resources in the development of vibrant local communities, and as the basis for new economic activities. Interaction between heritage resources and economic activities contributes great potential for employment and settlement in many towns and villages, both along the coast and inland. Down is one of local resources on the islands of Vega in Norway. Photo Siv Bente Grongstad.

The programme for creating new assets aims at taking better care of the cultural heritage and developing and spreading knowledge about the cultural heritage as a resource. The photos show Polaria Centre in Tromsø, Norway. Photo Siv Bente Grongstad.

Coastal culture is an essential aspect of Norwegian identity, integrating the landscape, people, resources and skills. Photo Siv Bente Grongstad, © Norwegian Ship Preservation Association.
In the pilot project “The Value of the Coastal Culture” cultural heritage will be integrated in various contexts, including the identification of good models of cooperation, methods and procedures. Shown in the photo is the Norwegian Waterpower and Industry Museum in Odda. Photo Harald Skeie.

National approaches to regard and enhance cultural heritage as the basis of potential assets take place elsewhere in the region, too. In Estonia, a proposal to draw up a Development Plan until 2030 for sustaining and valuing Estonian cultural heritage was approved by the Government on June 2008. It will cover all areas connected with preserving memory: archives, heritage conservation, museums, libraries and folk culture. These areas are in turn divided into three horizontal aspects: collection, research, and documentation; preservation; access and valuation. The day of Setu Kingdom in Meremäe (2007). Photo: Anton Pärn © Estonian Ministry of Culture.
New tools of economic argumentation – Finland

The Economics and Built Heritage project is based on the idea of sustainable development. Traditional buildings have always been by necessity ecological. Traditional building techniques fulfil the need to use renewable resources, the durability of building products, and the reuse, recycling and the reparable of building materials.

The “Economics and Built Heritage” network raises public awareness of the value-adding potential of heritage, prepares a comparative program and supports researcher networking. Cooperation within the network is coordinated by the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies at the Helsinki University of Technology. The Nordic Council of Ministers has supported the project along with the Finnish and other Nordic Heritage Boards.

The website of the network is the ‘base camp’ of the initiative, providing information for researchers and other interested actors, access to relevant contact and funding information and a publication channel for working papers and articles. The Built Heritage Network has produced two publications: Built Heritage – Value Adding Sector in 2007 and Economics and Built Heritage – Towards New European Initiatives in 2008.

To measure the public good

There are many points of view on studying economics. Interesting examples can be found on how results may differ depending on whether the benefits of private owners are calculated or results are considered from the point of view of the public good or society as a whole.

It is important to distinguish direct and indirect impacts. They are both important for society. Use values can be defined in three categories. There are those which are directly usable and easy to measure and secondly those which are non-extractive use values and difficult to measure. The third category is non-use value, such as evidential or option value. They are most difficult to measure, but as a value they are really important.

Estimating value is a difficult task, but there are already some tested mathematical methods and tools. Of course, the problem is that it will never be possible to measure all the values with traditional methods.

The aim is to show that the relationship between economics and built heritage is not one-dimensional but manifold. The Economics and Built Heritage project has identified three basic approaches to the economic dimension of built heritage, while acknowledging that clear boundaries between them cannot be drawn:

1. Built heritage as a subject of economic planning – The economic (e.g. cost-benefit) analysis and evaluation of built heritage as a type of information used in the planning process,

2. Built heritage as a property in the urban and real-estate market – The market value of built heritage in property development and its role in the public organizations’ estate property management,

3. Built heritage as a resource (capital) for the economic livelihood of regions (cultural tourism, brands, image of cities etc.).
New tools of economic argumentation

The Centre for Urban and Regional Studies at the Helsinki University of Technology has prepared a programme called “Towards New European Initiatives”. The idea of the project is to develop EBH study and related methods. There is a shared need for new tools of economic argumentation that would provide decision makers with a broader view of the existing and potential economic impacts of built heritage sites for local and regional economies, both directly and indirectly. The indirect economic impacts in particular are crucial when built heritage is concerned but these are also difficult to calculate and thus difficult to use as a basis for convincing argumentation.

There is a need for theoretical work to grasp the essential features of built heritage in terms of economic conceptualization. Treatment of built heritage as a ‘common good’ is an important step in this direction. Cooperation between the few researchers specializing in this field is necessary. When new methods of recently conceptualized and broader economic analysis are created, they need to be tested through pilot projects with different types of heritage sites in various European contexts. Through comparative reflections conclusions can be made, whether such methods should be authorized at the EU policy level.

The commitment of owners and the local community makes all the difference in the maintenance of local built heritage. The heritage partnership approach is a way to commit both the public and private partners to the shared effort. But the ‘common good’ approach would open the partnership further to the ‘common economy’. This means that we would no longer be treating the given heritage project merely in terms of private economy, as a search for private profits for the selected public and private partners involved. Instead, the involvement of people in the partnership would be necessitated and also legitimized.

For more information, see www.ebheritage.fi

Contact person Maire Mattinen
The Finnish member of the Monitoring Group
National Board of Antiquities, Finland
The diversity of European financial programmes

There exist numerous regional and interregional financial programs with various - or no - references to cultural priorities. It takes considerable effort to get acquainted with them all to find out what programme would be best suited for a given project.

Regional financial programmes

The grants of the European Commission are channelled through several programmes including the Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013. The aim of the programme is to strengthen development towards a sustainable, competitive and territorially integrated Baltic Sea region. While the four prioritized thematic areas - generating innovations, improving the external and internal accessibility of the region, sustainable management of maritime resources, and cities and regions as more competitive engines for economic development – do not make any explicit mention of cultural heritage, the aspect of cultural heritage can nonetheless be found in each of them. They are, thus, of potential use also for regional cultural heritage cooperation.

Other programmes within the Baltic Sea region with partly similar themes are the Cross-border Cooperation Programmes, the ENPI Programmes, the Trans-national Cooperation programmes, the Inter-regional Cooperation Programme, ESPON and URBACT, the 7th Framework Programme for Research and the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme. The European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument finances cross-border cooperation with Russia.

All EU programmes have strict and detailed rules and mechanisms. The project partners face some bureaucracy in the practices of the project management. Many crucial, final decisions have to be made in the application phase while the financing, in turn, is received well afterwards. Managing an EU project is thus a time-consuming and demanding task, which limits the possibilities of smaller cultural heritage institutions to participate in cooperation.

Nordic cooperation has enlarged

In the recent restructuring of the Nordic Council of Ministers' support for culture, special mention is made of cultural heritage. The Nordic Cultural Fund also welcomes initiatives within the field of cultural heritage. Nordic funding can be approved for regional cooperation around the Baltic Sea with certain conditions. These Nordic programmes have a clear profile and favour trimmed projects. Although financial support is small in comparison with EU funding, information can be easily found through the related website, and funding is easy to apply for, quickly approved and simple to manage.

During the Finnish chairmanship, the Secretariat of the Monitoring Group has forwarded updated information about different EU, EEA and Nordic financial mechanisms to the Monitoring Group and the Working Group Chairs. The ongoing projects of the Monitoring Group and its Working Groups are financed by the Nordic Council of Ministers.

The public project financing in general

It is of crucial importance for the cultural heritage sector that the cultural heritage priorities are included in the financing programs as cultural, societal and/or economic targets.

The quality assessment of the projects should be professional and project outputs and best practices should be properly exploited in local and national policies.

Moreover, those projects of other sectors and priorities, whose activities have also impact to cultural heritage, should be estimated professionally and in advance also from the cultural heritage point of view.
Facilitating the use of different financial instruments in the future

We have several information desks on financing programmes in the region, such as the Nordic Culture Point in Helsinki, the INTERREG IIIa Joint Technical Secretariat in Vilnius, the INTERREG III B and Baltic Sea Region programme 2007 – 2013 Joint Secretariat in Rostock and the North Sea Programme Secretariat in Viborg, Denmark. It would be a great benefit for cultural heritage institutions if all relevant information on available financial instruments within the Baltic Sea region could be found at a single information desk. It is strongly to be hoped for that one of the central cooperation organizations, such as the Council of the Baltic Sea States, could find resources for establishing a “Financing Clinic” for this purpose.

Contact persons Chair Helena Edgren and Coordinator Marianne Lehtimäki
Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea States

Although EU financing includes occasionally laborious bureaucracy, it also offers reasonable resources. The “Sustainable Historic Towns – Urban Heritage as an Asset of Development” project of 2003 – 2005 was one of the approaches initiated by the Monitoring Group and the Baltic Sea States Working Group on sustainable historic towns. It was financed by the Interreg III B programme. Its activities created networks and practices that have lasted longer than the project. They enabled networking between expert bodies as well as cooperation between municipalities, universities and state bodies. The project offered resources for municipalities and research institutions to jointly develop models of best practices for urban heritage management. The project produced, apart of the several reports and websites, innovative management tools, such as the DIVE-method, the inhabitant inquiry model and the area building code. These tools are now being tested and used in the follow-up projects and in other municipalities. In addition, it contributed to three doctoral theses, several studies and urban heritage programmes in municipalities in Sweden, Norway, Finland and Lithuania. Shown in the photo is the first pilot town meeting of the project, held in Forssa, Finland. Photo Marianne Lehtimäki.
EEA Grants – An important contribution to the protection of the European Cultural Heritage

Through the EEA grants Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein provide substantial resources for the protection of cultural heritage. The new Baltic EU member states are all beneficiaries and a large number of projects are now in progress in Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia and Poland.

The EEA grants were established in 2004 when the European Economic Area was enlarged with 10 new member states. The grants are Norway’s contribution to social and economic cohesion in Europe. Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein will make available €1.3 billion to the beneficiary states. Norway – as the largest donor – is contributing with 97% of the total grants. All countries have now made the funds available and the donors are accepting new projects daily.

Large need

Cultural heritage is proving to become one of the most important priority sectors within the grants. Tentative numbers suggest that approximately twenty per cent of the grants will be allocated to the protection of cultural heritage. There is a substantial need for resources to this sector and the over-subscription is ten times the amount available.

Visible results

The results of this economic contribution are now beginning to emerge in the beneficiary states. One example of an important monument that is being restored is the Wilanow Palace outside Warsaw. The palace is an important part of Poland’s cultural heritage, being one of the few monuments that was left undamaged after the bombings in the Second World War. Wilanow has received €3.5 million from the EEA/Norway grants. This has a major impact on a building with vast needs for restoration.

Variety of projects

Granted projects vary greatly in type and content. In general, one can conclude that the majority of the projects include restoration of immovable cultural heritage, with monumental buildings such as castles, manor houses and fortresses predominating. In addition there are a number of projects that aim at the protection of movable cultural heritage, mostly documentation and digitization of archives and books as well as the restoration of paintings, sculptures and interiors. Another category is protection of intangible cultural heritage, such as craftsmanship and training and transmission of skills.

For example, the Norwegian Crafts Development is cooperating with Kuldiga City in Latvia on best prac-
tice and exchange of knowledge in wooden conservation and transmission of craftsman skills. In Norway, the wooden city of Drøbak is also a partner, facing many of the same challenges as Kuldiga. During the project, a large number of Latvian craftsmen will work in Norway and vice-versa.

The Polish Cultural Exchange Fund

In addition to the funds provided for individual projects a bilateral fund has been established in Poland focusing specifically on the cultural exchange of artists and knowledge between Poland and Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein.

Strengthening bilateral cooperation

Bilateral cooperation between the donors and beneficiary states is an important and cross-cutting aim for the EEA grants, and as a result doors have opened for stronger ties between the Norwegian cultural heritage sector and the Baltic States. A large number of Norwegian cultural heritage institutions, researchers, museums, municipalities and regions are now involved as partners in projects. This represents a unique opportunity for the exchange of knowledge and best practice within the Baltic region.

Contact person Eva Camerer,
Norwegian member of the Monitoring Group
National Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway
Cultural heritage for all – digitization and the cultural heritage sector

Making national collective memory accessible nationally and globally via the Internet is a question of democratization and decentralization of knowledge sources. The digitization of cultural heritage will be a main challenge over the next years in most European countries. The Monitoring Group has therefore chosen it as one of its main priorities during the next mandate period of Baltic Sea cultural heritage cooperation.

The effective accessibility to and dissemination of digitized materials by means of new technologies can prepare the way towards extensive democratization and increased use of cultural heritage material. Sources of knowledge, which until today have represented inert capital for most people, are now capable of being accessed by the public at large. Furthermore, digitization presents new opportunities for gathering materials and the development of services, which also applies across institutional and sector boundaries. An ever-increasing quantity of mate-
Materials from other specialist sectors is being made accessible through the Internet. If the use of the resources in the cultural heritage sector is to be commensurate with their potential, access to them must be correspondingly easy to obtain, which assumes that the materials exist in digital form.

Archives, libraries and museums manage knowledge sources and cultural heritage from a large spectrum of sources, types of content and media. There are several challenges related to digital services in the cultural heritage sector, both with regard to digitization of non-digital material, well-functioning cataloguing systems for the cultural heritage sector and user access to digitized cultural heritage material.

Given the extent of the use of web-based solutions, the preservation and presentation of cultural heritage become less and less of a national project, and instead present themselves to a large, world-wide public. Traditional ways of working within the cultural heritage sector are challenged with regard to organization, competence and dissemination methods. As we all face the same challenges nationally, we believe that there is common ground to be explored as well as useful experiences to be shared with other countries.

Within Baltic Sea cooperation there are numerous possible approaches to digitization and access as an area of cooperation. An initial task would be to identify cooperation themes for further exploration. This could, for example, be the creation of map locations, common entries in existing databases, and digital exhibitions. Also, as digitization projects are in progress to a large extent all over Europe, it is essential that projects within Baltic Sea cooperation are seen in context with other cooperation projects, such as the European Union’s Europeana initiative – Europe’s digital library, museum and archive.

Once the themes are identified, certain aspects would have to be decided upon before actual projects are ready to be carried through. Obviously, there is the question of languages. Also, a lot of items are set into a national context, but they would be even more interesting and take a different value in an international context. Digitized museum items from one country could be seen in context with similar items in other countries. Maybe there are common standards to be explored. Also, there may be examples from one country – best or worst practices – that can be instructive for other countries aiming at the same results.

In making digitization and access to cultural heritage a main priority for cultural heritage work within Baltic Sea cooperation, the Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage Cooperation aims to make use of this established network to find common standard solutions and to encourage the cultural heritage sector in the Member States to consider globalized solutions. Cultural heritage, whether digitized or not, is not only a matter for experts, but also for the general public. Using the Baltic Sea Network to promote digital access is one step on the way to make cultural heritage accessible for all.

National examples

The approaches to digitization presented below are some examples of initiatives introduced in countries around the Baltic Sea in recent years. They vary both in method and in content, some are at the level of designing the concept, some are already well advanced and are constantly being improved. All these, and other solutions not mentioned in this article, require common discussion and know-how exchange, and this is where the Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region comes in.

During the next mandate of the Monitoring Group we plan to collect best practices of these types of projects and discuss together the best evaluation criteria for these initiatives. Exchanging experiences should lead to establishing a network of institutions and experts that will effectively provide expertise to each other, thus leading to a truly open access to heritage for all.

NORWAY

Norway’s cultural heritage institutions have taken initiatives according to their own needs and plans, but without any integrated national strategy. The institutions’ flexibility and capacity of responding to new challenges vary and as a result the Norwegian cultural heritage digital landscape is fragmented. However, an overall strategy for digitization of the cultural heritage sector in Norway is expected to be presented in a white paper from the government this autumn.

Several important projects have been initiated and are under way in the larger cultural heritage institutions, such as the National Archival Services of Norway, the Norwegian National Library and some of the museums.

In 2003 the Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage launched a new database of legally protected Cultural Heritage sites in Norway. The database includes information on archaeological sites and monuments, Sámi cultural heritage, maritime heritage, as well as protected buildings and churches. One of the most important features of the database is the use of maps (GIS) in searching and maintaining data. The database is available over the Internet to management authorities and researchers. As the database is available over the Internet, and is easily accessible, it has contributed to better contact between cultural heritage managers, planners and developers. The ready availability of this data has also increased the visibility of cultural heritage within planning processes.

The Norwegian National Library has launched an initiative aimed at the digitization of its entire collection. The Norwegian Library, Archive and Museum Authority has initiated several projects aimed at enhancing the digital communication with end-users. The libraries’ catalogue systems have been accessible on the Internet for several years and are well adapted for web users.

All museums in Norway have their own web sites, and digital applications have grown in use as a means of presenting the institutions’ items and exhibitions. The main
cataloging system - originally developed for administrative purposes - was made accessible via the Internet earlier this year in a limited version. With regard to the university museums, a white paper presented by the Government earlier this year placed particular emphasis on the importance of developing a unified digitized presentation of the university museums of Norway. Furthermore, the white paper made a proposal for the establishment of a national digital university museum.

The National Archival Services of Norway has established a digital archive as a tool for making a wide spectrum of historical sources accessible on the Internet. This digital service covers a considerable request for censuses and church registers amongst other things. The County Archives of Sogn og Fjordane have had a leading role in the online dissemination of archival materials. As a result of their work, a shared technological infrastructure for the archives, libraries and museums has been established in this county.

Also worth mentioning is that in 2009, which has been declared a year of cultural heritage in Norway, the Norwegian Library, Archive and Museum Authority will provide a service aimed at encouraging archives, libraries and other bodies to create and present stories on the Internet. The purpose of this activity is on the one hand to enhance the interest for cultural heritage of the general public, and on the other hand to stimulate increased use of digital tools and Internet presentation in archives, libraries and museums.

Photography is an area that has proven successful in Norway with regard to cooperation across traditional sectors and institutions. This may also be a fruitful area to explore further within Baltic Sea cooperation. In Norway, the experience is that several institutions have given priority to digitization of photography. Also, the cataloguing and registration of photography have been relatively unified within the Norwegian national context and work related to a common standard for photo registration has been carried out by the Norwegian Library, Archive and Museum Authority. If this work is seen in context with similar work in the other Baltic Sea countries, it will improve possibilities for exchanging data and establishing common search services given standardized search criteria.

Contact person Britt Holtebekk
Norwegian member of the Monitoring Group
Norwegian Library, Archive and Museum Authority
The heritage assets of Poland are very rich and diversified but also dispersed due to turbulent history in the 20th century and the rather low priority of heritage protection during the first years of the political and economic transformation process.

All national institutions and agencies responsible for safeguarding heritage for future generations, as stated in the Polish Constitution, such as archives, libraries, museums and built heritage boards, have eagerly started to work on the digitization of their assets some years ago. These projects are not subject, however, to any common strategy and the level of their advancement varies greatly.

What seems right now the first priority in this field is a nationwide digital database of built heritage (including archaeological sites) that will allow better management of the heritage sites and provide easier access to heritage for all stakeholders, including the public.

The concepts of built heritage protection developed in Poland concurrently with similar activities in Europe in past centuries. The importance of heritage was recognized by the governments of the young Polish State during the interwar period. In the postwar era, despite the political changes, the work on documenting built heritage was to a certain extent continued. What is more, it was the time when Polish achievements in architectural conservation were widely recognized. The Heritage Act passed in 1962 preceded on many respects similar legislative solutions in other European countries (e.g. protection of the industrial heritage). During the next decades the built heritage sector, however, lost momentum due to growing overall economic and political difficulties. Therefore, although the documenting template (“white card”) has allowed collecting comprehensive information on historic buildings, a whole system of heritage protection has remained petrified until recently.

What is more, it is revealed that current documentation practice does not fit the present needs. The existing system of heritage recording and protection in Poland is predominately based on a database of paper fiches. The
### TABLE: Comparison of the European Core Data Index and Polish record standard (“white card”) for architectural heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>the CoE Recommendation no. R(95)3</th>
<th>Polish record of architectural monument (so-called ‘white card’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of building</td>
<td>1.1. (o)*</td>
<td>1.1. (m)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique reference number</td>
<td>1.2. (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of compilation</td>
<td>1.3. (m)</td>
<td>25. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording organisation</td>
<td>1.4. (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-reference to related building records</td>
<td>1.5. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifier of relationship</td>
<td>1.5.1. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-reference to records of fixtures and fittings</td>
<td>1.6. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic reference number(s)</td>
<td>1.7.1. (o)</td>
<td>23. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic reference number(s)</td>
<td>1.7.2. (o)</td>
<td>23. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual sources reference number(s)</td>
<td>1.7.3. (o)</td>
<td>21. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic reference number(s)</td>
<td>1.7.4. (o)</td>
<td>22. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-reference to archaeological records</td>
<td>1.8. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-reference to environmental records</td>
<td>1.9. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2.1.1. (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo-political unit</td>
<td>2.1.2. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State administrative division(s)</td>
<td>2.1.3. (o)</td>
<td>5. (m); 7. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative sub-division</td>
<td>2.1.4. (o)</td>
<td>5. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal name</td>
<td>2.2.1. (o)</td>
<td>4. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in the street/road</td>
<td>2.2.2. (o)</td>
<td>4. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of street/road</td>
<td>2.2.3. (o)</td>
<td>4. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality</td>
<td>2.2.4. (o)</td>
<td>3. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/city</td>
<td>2.2.5. (o)</td>
<td>3. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal code</td>
<td>2.2.6. (o)</td>
<td>4. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X spatial co-ordinates</td>
<td>2.3.1. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y spatial co-ordinates</td>
<td>2.3.2. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial referencing system employed</td>
<td>2.3.3. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral reference/land unit</td>
<td>2.4. (o)</td>
<td>4. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building type</td>
<td>3.1. (m)</td>
<td>1. (m); 16. (m); 17. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>3.1.1. (o)</td>
<td>16. (m); 17. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building category</td>
<td>3.2. (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>4.1. (o)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century</td>
<td>4.2. (o)</td>
<td>2. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Range (from … to)</td>
<td>4.3. (o)</td>
<td>2. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Date</td>
<td>4.4. (o)</td>
<td>2. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person or organisation</td>
<td>5.1. (o)</td>
<td>12. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in the history of the building</td>
<td>5.2. (o)</td>
<td>12. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>5.2.1. (o)</td>
<td>12. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main materials and structural techniques</td>
<td>6.1. (o)</td>
<td>13.2. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering materials</td>
<td>6.2. (o)</td>
<td>13.2. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General condition</td>
<td>7.1. (o)</td>
<td>19. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Protection</td>
<td>8.1. (o)</td>
<td>10. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade of Protection</td>
<td>8.2. (o)</td>
<td>10. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date at which protection was granted</td>
<td>8.3. (o)</td>
<td>10. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical summary</td>
<td>9.1. (o)</td>
<td>12. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner and his/her address</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>8. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User and his/her address</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>9. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs, location plan, floor plans</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>11. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style definition</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>12. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise location description</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>13.1. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor plan description</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>13.3. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape of the building</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>13.4. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facades description</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>13.5. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interiors description</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>13.6. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishing description</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>13.7. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>13.8. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building volume</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>14. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable floor-space</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>15. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and conservation works evidence</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>18. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent conservation requirements</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>20. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record’s author name</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>25. (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotations on inspections and changes</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>26. (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** (m) = mandatory; (o) = optional

The information on built heritage is dispersed, as at present a number of institutions, including museums, libraries, and universities, gather and process data concerning built heritage. As a result, persons requiring information on particular buildings have limited access to information on their heritage status, and related data.

The need for the use of ICT for built heritage documentation purposes has been noted in Poland since the mid-1980s. Unfortunately, none of the projects has been fully developed into practice. As a result there are many fragmented efforts, which due to the lack of harmonization and coordination by central bodies do not contribute to improved heritage information management. There clearly is an urgent need for new methods of preparation, storage and distribution of information about the historic environment. Particularly, as Poland has accessed the European Union with regard to rising awareness of heritage within the information society as one of key activities for strengthening local identities and diversity within Europe. Therefore, an internal organizational structure of the National Heritage Board has been recently changed to facilitate resource digitization and management, as well as the harmonization and coordination of database creation.

Taking the above into a consideration it was proposed that creation of a GIS-based multimedia databases holding information on the heritage of Poland would be one of the National Heritage Board priorities for the next few years. Dedicated databases for built heritage, movable objects, archaeological sites and cultural landscape should be interrelated at the object level and accessible through a common GIS platform. Spatial data will follow the principles set out in the INSPIRE initiative and the National Heritage Board has been involved at the national level from the beginning.

There are several issues that are crucial for the success of the project. Among these subjects it is necessary to stress the compatibility of Polish records with international standards, data retrieval (e.g.: metadata and thesauri) and storage (e.g.: digital preservation) - to name only a few. For example, the Polish recording system is far more extensive and detailed than the one proposed by the Council of Europe in Core Data Index standard, but there are also some mandatory Core Data Index data not included in the Polish record file. Therefore the mandatory built heritage recording system in Poland should be modified to comply with Core Data Index recommendations. The modified record should, however, maintain its specific information, including a historic outline and extensive description.

Contact person: Anetta Kepczynska-Walczyk
National Heritage Board of Poland

LATVIA

The overall digitization of cultural heritage in libraries, museums and archives has been launched in Latvia. Since 2006 the National Library of Latvia has been developing the Letonica national digital library with the aim of providing the digitization of the materials of the National Library and other related institutions, and to make them accessible for public on-line. The development of the digital library establishes common principles for the treatment, storage and accessibility of digitized resources.

The State Inspectorate for Heritage Protection (its Centre for Documentation of Monuments) is involved as a partner in the pilot project under the “Lost Latvia” national digital library project, seeking to unify and digitalize images of the lost cultural monuments and objects in Latvia in cooperation with research and public libraries as well as other cultural institutions and archives. This is the first step towards the digitization of the funds of the Centre for Documentation of Monuments and the development of the heritage information system in Latvia.

Contact person: Katrina Kukaine
Latvian member of the Monitoring Group
The State Inspection for Heritage Protection, Latvia

ESTONIA


The Estonian National Library is participating actively in the European Library (TEL) initiative. The Estonian Ministry of Culture joined the MICHAEL Plus project in 2007. Also, a central museum information system is being now completed in Estonia and this will, among other things, enable access to information on museum objects over the Internet.
To coordinate the digitization and digital preservation of cultural heritage in Estonia and to monitor progress in digitization, the Council for Digital Preservation of Cultural Heritage was affiliated with the Ministry of Culture of Estonia. The Council consists of representatives from the State Chancellery, the Ministry of Culture of Estonia, the Ministry of Education and Science, Estonian Public Broadcasting, the Estonian National Library, the “Kanut” State Conservation Centre, the National Archives of Estonia, the Estonian Literary Museum, the Institute of History, and the Estonian Film Foundation.

In Estonia, digitization is assembled to relevant competence centres such as the Estonian National Library, the Estonian National Archives, Estonian Public Broadcasting and the “Kanut” State Conservation Centre.

Contact person Marju Reismaa
Ministry of Culture, Estonia

Cultural Landscapes and Historic Gardens

“A historic garden is an architectural and horticultural composition of interest to the public from a historical point of view. As such, it is to be considered as a monument.” The Florence Charter, ICOMOS 1982

Cultural heritage cooperation between the Baltic Sea States has encompassed a wide range of themes from the underwater heritage to illegal excavations and heritage education. These have been the subjects for an in-depth study by international specialists around the Baltic Sea.

However, one very important theme, which in a sense links together the above-mentioned ones – that of historic landscapes and gardens – has not yet received our attention.

Parks and gardens in the Baltic Sea countries are the result of a constant exchange of ideas, plants, achievements, inventions, scientific discoveries and fashions. The treasures that resulted from this interaction should be protected and used in a sustainable way. As part of contemporary life, they should also serve as a bridge to our common European past, present and future.

In all contemporary cultures marked by the hectic lifestyle of a globalized world, the garden remains a place for contemplation and inspiration and a source of sustenance for our human condition. It is therefore a noble and morally rewarding task to preserve in a sustainable way our historic gardens and diverse cultural landscapes for the general well being of our societies and for individual enjoyment.

The garden art reflects the political, cultural and economic trends and movements of specific historical periods. Throughout the countries of the Baltic Sea region and around this area, we find a rich typology of gardens from the oldest sacred groves to ‘flower gardens’ adorning front windows with traditional species, from monastic gardens to botanical and elaborated formal gardens, landscape parks, cemeteries and contemporary landscape designs. They all depend on natural features, local climate, predominant types of soil and genius loci in particular.

All these together make up an incredible potential for cultural tourism, but are still not sufficiently valued on a regional scale. This work should be done in the nearest future to offer the Baltic Sea region for tourists as an authentic and interesting destination with a variety of historic parks and gardens and cultural landscapes. Furthermore, the history of gardens and parks illustrates our close European links and socio-cultural interactions within and outside the region.

These very complex and multifaceted examples of cultural heritage have to be carefully ‘reread’ and cross-culturally analysed in the entire region of the Baltic Sea in order to reveal our cultural idiosyncrasies. The iden-
tity that could be displayed thereafter would represent a much clearer and richer image and therefore should become a valuable asset. This is especially true of the southern Baltic Sea countries that are still struggling to define their distinctive cultural features in the context of Europe and the world. The need for clear identity is essential not so much for developing a more advanced market for tourism, as for positioning ourselves.

The countries in the southern part of the Baltic face a huge task in overcoming the heavy Soviet legacy that alienated man from his natural-cultural environment. Due to their recent past, these countries have become easy prey for aggressive capitalist developers rapidly destroying historic parks and greenways or menacing their origins. Therefore, an exchange of expertise with the northern countries of the Baltic Sea concerning rising awareness of the value that historic parks represent as national assets is of urgency.

Historic gardens have great potential to humanize the contemporary landscape and to keep our cities in satisfactory physical and spiritual health alike. Uncontrolled development in the cities threatens their green areas in centres as well as in suburbs. The measures that governmental institutions and non-governmental organizations are able to take at the moment are inadequate to stem legally the huge avalanche of shortsighted “enchanted” investment and “development”.

The majority of our historic parks and gardens are open to the public. Most historically, artistically or horticulturally important ones are listed in the respective national registers. In most of the historic gardens, listed buildings and follies add to overall value. The spaces around historic gardens are usually conservation areas, too. The tasks of protecting and restoring them to standard, interpreting them in a contemporary language, reopening them to the general public and maintaining them permanently create the need for a huge amount of hard work by a long list of different specialists: spatial planners, architects, designers, landscape architects, garden archaeologists, historians, specialists in antiquities, botanists, agronomists, craftsmen, engineers, managers and numerous other highly qualified specialists. All of them are involved in a “pursuit for paradise” for the benefit of our societies.

The legal framework of protection available for historic parks and gardens differs greatly among the Baltic countries. Some have developed highly detailed inventories and elaborated forms of legal protection, whereas others need to improve their legal tools. Still others are establishing their own methods of protection by resorting to a combination of territorial planning restrictions and nature conservation.

Some Baltic Sea region countries list their historic gardens alongside related buildings, while in others historic parks and gardens are listed in their own right as separate monuments. There are countries that divide this task among different organizations. In some of the countries it belongs to the competence of ministries of culture, while in others it is the responsibility of the ministries of the environment. This implies different attitudes towards the problem and the use of different methods.

To establish a clear picture of the protection system through the entire Baltic Sea area, we need to bring together all the stakeholders and to exchange information on existing protection systems, legal and register-building principles, planning documents and the methods of work. This should allow us to establish patterns and a common ground for joint projects such as an “action plan” for the sharing of good practices to protect and maintain historic parks and gardens throughout the entire region.

Contact person Alfredas Jomantas
Lithuanian member of the Monitoring Group
Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture, Lithuania
The Baltic Sea region includes a rich typology of historic gardens as well as modern and contemporary ones. They entail noteworthy potential for societies’ wellbeing as well as for cultural tourism, but still remain insufficiently valued at the regional level. In the following are a few examples:
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The Aspregren Garden in Jakobstad, Finland. © Municipality of Jakobstad.
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09
Park of the Birini Estate in Latvia. © State Inspection for heritage protection of Latvia.
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Kadriorg Park in Tallinn, Estonia. © Peeter Säre
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Oscarshall in Norway. © Synnove Haugen.

12 (Next page)
Arkadia Park, Poland. © National Heritage Board of Poland.

13 (Next page)
Ujazdowski Park, Poland. © National Heritage Board of Poland. A copy of a statue of Marie-Adelaide of Savoy as Diane by Antoine Coysevox was relocated at her original place in July 2008 after decades of absence. Uzutrakis gardens were designed by the French landscape architect Edouard André at the beginning of the 20th century. It was used during the Soviet era as a tourism centre for KGB officials and was “embellished” with squares and monuments in honour of Stalin and Lenin. Today Trakai Historical National Park is involved in managing EU-financed restoration works of the main villa and the grounds. Two other gardens designed by André, Traku Voke and Lentvaris near Vilnius, are still awaiting the opportunity for sustainable new function and restoration.

14 (Next page)
The Sangerhausen Park with its outstanding collection of roses was present in the context of German garden networks at the III Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum. Photo Chirsta Ringkamp.

15 (Next page)
The park in the campus area of the Århus University in Denmark. Photo Marianne Lehtimäki.

16 (Next page)
The moss-grown wall of the Reykjavik’s City Hall that is designed by the Icelandic Studio Granda. Photo Alfredas Jomantas.
Historic Harbours: Gateways to the Future

Historic harbours have made a great contribution to the development of coastal culture in the Baltic Sea countries. In the past almost each capital on the coasts of the Baltic Sea played an important role in maritime trade or the shipbuilding industry. Cities such as Stockholm, Gdansk, Copenhagen, Riga, Helsinki, Tallinn and many others developed thanks to their accessibility to the waterfront.

Nowadays harbours are being transformed in many ways. There seem to be fewer and fewer maritime activities in coastal towns. The number of working ports is steadily decreasing. The remaining commercial harbours are growing in terms of size and turnover, while redundant harbours have enormous potential for new uses, such as housing or shopping centres.

The rapid change of shipping, fishing and other maritime industries is leading to a complete change of the core areas of our towns. Harbour activities are being moved out of city centres. Redundant harbours have become attractive areas in the competition for access to waterfronts. Buildings, quays, cranes and other structures are being demolished and are disappearing. It is a challenge to find conservation guidelines and methods for the protection of wooden and stone coastal constructions. In many cases former harbour buildings have had to change their facades and functions in order to survive.

In this situation experts on coastal heritage would like to underline the urgent need to document Baltic coastal heritage before it either disappears or is completely transformed. International projects should be considered that will focus on the recording of harbour remains. Such case studies can be used, for example, for cultural tourism that can offer a new chance for devastated harbour areas to become actively involved in new uses. In many coastal towns different maritime festivals are organized annually and for a few days the former quaysides once again change into busy and lively places where thousands of people gather as fishermen and craftsmen sell their goods.

The Baltic Sea States Working Group on coastal culture and maritime heritage
Contact person: Chair Robert Domzal
Polish Maritime Museum, Gdansk
Nyhavn in Copenhagen is a historic harbour in active use for recreational activities. © Wonderful Copenhagen


The Sonwik project at the former naval wharf, Flensburg, Germany, 2006. How do we preserve the character and historic value of harbour areas in transformation processes? © Arne Biederbeck, www.alpha-f.de

For centuries lighthouses have assisted and guided mariners. Nowadays they are one of the most important features in the maritime cultural landscape. Not all of them are registered as monuments and protected by law. Some of buildings are used as museums, while some lighthouses still operate, being either in private hands or managed by associations.

The protection of these objects endangered by the harsh maritime environment is a highly important task. Thanks to international cooperation and the adoption of lighthouses for new uses – as holiday accommodation, nature centres or bird observation sites – these distinctive buildings can remain unique sources on the cultural history of the Baltic Sea. On photo the Söderskär lighthouse in Finland. © National Board of Antiquities, Finland.
The richness of cultural heritage lies in its diversity. Only true and authentic cultural heritage has any real value. The preservation of the cultural heritage is the shared responsibility of society as a whole.

The theme of the 4th Cultural Heritage Forum has been chosen to highlight the challenges that every cultural heritage expert faces in the Baltic Sea region, and to define the risks that can lead to the irretrievable loss of heritage values.

An international conference is intended as a central event of the Forum. Not only Baltic Sea region specialists but also experts from other European regions and international organizations will share their experiences. In this way, a view on these questions will be more extensive and will encourage the inter-regional cooperation. The thematic outline of the conference favours participation in discussions with experts from other fields and will encourage interdisciplinary dialogue.

The five sub-themes have been defined to take into account important questions related to the protection of cultural heritage and contemporary development:

1. Cultural heritage and contemporary architecture

High-quality contemporary architecture does not degrade cultural heritage, and good cultural heritage policy does not hinder the development of modern architecture. Good contemporary architecture and design constitute future cultural heritage - they correspond to the dominating level of quality in a particular environment, observe building scale and characteristics, and respect traditional materials and atmosphere created through architecture. High-quality contemporary architecture and design are an added value to the environment.
Restoration of cultural heritage and authenticity

Only original elements are of the highest value. By losing the original elements we lose part of the heritage that is impossible to recover. Therefore, it is very important to study the values to be preserved and problematic issues and then find a solution to ensure high-quality human living space. The sustainable development of cultural heritage can be provided by diversity, authenticity and quality.

Cultural heritage is a value for society

The encouragement of understanding within society of cultural and historical values and national heritage is very important for national identity. There are several aspects to promoting understanding: accessibility of cultural heritage – practical and intellectual through the digitization and modern technologies; funding and tax policy. Society’s point of view and understanding of common historical values and their preservation in the historical urban environment are also important in the town-planning process.

The Baltic Sea and coastal heritage

The Baltic Sea has always connected the people around it. Thus, coastal culture and maritime heritage reveal important similarities essential for understanding our common identity and history. However, our coastal culture and maritime heritage are threatened by both the crisis in traditional coastal and maritime industries and the pressures of recreational activities and urban development, as well as issues of ethical nature related to the protection of underwater heritage.

Pollution, climate change and the preservation of cultural heritage

Not only in the Baltic Sea region but also in Europe as a whole cultural heritage specialists view with anxiety climate change and the problem of environmental pollution. Europe’s historical buildings are likely to suffer greatly from the effects of climate change over the coming century. Changes in temperature and rainfall, increases in extreme climatic events and changes in soil conditions and water levels will affect the way ancient structures decay. It is necessary to raise awareness of this problem, evaluate the impact of climate change on cultural heritage and develop a common strategy for the Baltic Sea region to reduce risks to cultural heritage and to facilitate the adaptation of cultural heritage in the future.

Contact person Katrina Kukaine
Latvian member of the Monitoring Group
State Inspection for Heritage Protection, Latvia

The preservation of the cultural heritage is a challenge for professionals, the owners of monuments and society in general. How to keep the cultural heritage preserved for coming generations within the context of rapid economic development? We need to find the possibility to satisfy our needs and to raise the quality of life without negative impact on the cultural heritage and the environment, while bearing in mind the needs of other people in the future. Photo of the vanishing Vilnius by Alfredas Jomantas.

The relation between continuity and change is a crucial issue in global, rapidly changing milieus in which the public structures for local involvement and transparent decision-making need to be developed. © State Inspection for Heritage Protection, Latvia.

The cultural heritage also contains social and economic values that can be irreplaceable. © State Inspection for Heritage Protection, Latvia.

Cultural landscapes and historic buildings are likely to suffer greatly from the effects of climate change over the coming century. We need to raise awareness of this problem and to develop a common strategy for the Baltic Sea region to reduce risks to cultural heritage and to facilitate the adaptation of cultural heritage in the future. Landscape in Iceland, a result of long interaction between man and the environment. Photo Marianne Lehtimäki.
Progress and Action Plans for the Thematic Working Groups

**Working Group on Coastal Culture and Maritime Heritage**

The Working Group on Coastal Culture and Maritime Heritage works to raise awareness of Baltic coastal culture and maritime heritage. It was formally established in 2001 and involves members from maritime institutions in Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden. The Working Group has been chaired by Harald Hamre, Norway, in 2001-2007, and since 2007 by Robert Domzal, Poland.

The Working Group initiated the 1st Cultural Heritage Forum in Gdansk on April 3–6, 2003. For this occasion, it produced the poster exhibition 'Baltic Lights – a guarantee of safe passage', which was spread in several copies to the participating countries.

In 2007 the Working Group launched the “Baltic Harbours” exhibition. The exhibition presents the history of harbour development, expansion, efficiency and diversity. It comprised 12 posters, which were printed in 500 sets. They are distributed to museums, cultural institutions, schools and libraries around the Baltic Sea. Also an Internet version of the exhibition will be launched.

**Action Plan**

For the 4th Forum in 2009 the Working Group will focus on the protection of floating heritage in the Baltic Sea. Each country has different priorities concerning the protection of historic ships. The regional analyses of these ships include:

- statistical information on historic vessels
- their protection status
- legal regulations
- possibilities for cooperation in maintaining and repairing wooden and steel vessels
- accessibility of infrastructure for historical ship preservation, such as shipyards, slipways, workshops etc.
- possibilities for international cooperation focused on cultural heritage programmes dedicated to ship protection.

Also a new poster exhibition on historic ships is planned in order to raise awareness of the preservation and protection of historic ships in the region, and their role in society both past and present. An important problem is the preservation and maintenance of valuable wooden and steel vessels.
The Working Group on Underwater Heritage

The Working Group for Underwater Heritage has been active since 2000. The participating countries are Denmark, Estonia, Finland (with the Åland Islands), Germany (Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and Schleswig-Holstein), Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Russian Federation and Sweden. The Group is chaired 2005-2008 by Björn Varenius, Sweden.

The group has organized its work in two ways – the formation of special projects and roundtable discussions. The last major project to be run by the WG was the Rutilus project (2004-2006), which was an effort to gain a grip of the whole underwater heritage sector, including legislation, management strategies, education and sport diving. Among other things, the project resulted in the 100 list, a list containing brief descriptions of the 100 most valuable underwater sites in the Baltic Sea.

In order to meet the request put forward in the Ministers Declaration in Bergen 2005, the working group has concentrated its efforts to produce a set of guidelines for decision-makers and others involved in underwater heritage management - The Code of Good Practice for the Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region (COPUCH). In this work, roundtable discussions have proved to be the most useful tool. Work has progressed step by step, with the code being a standing topic during meetings for a long time.

In August 29-31, 2006 at the working meeting of the Nordic Maritime Museums at Torshavn in the Faroe Islands, the Chair and Andreas Olsson from the Swedish Maritime Museums presented the work being done by the Underwater Heritage Working Group. The paper presented by the chair was later printed in Swedish in the publication from the meeting (Havets kulturarv. De nordiske maritime museers arbejdsmöte i Torshavn August 2006. Ed. Morten Hahn-Pedersen, Fiskeri- og Søfartsmuseets Studie-serie nr 24, Esbjerg).

In the 3rd Baltic Heritage Forum in Vilnius in September, 2007, the working group organized an Open Seminar on the Management of Cultural Tourism and Underwater Heritage. For the same occasion, the group had also produced the poster exhibition “A Future for Our Past” presenting underwater heritage in the Baltic Sea Region.

Future agenda

A future agenda has been discussed intensively by the group. In general terms, three major themes have been put forward:

1. Increased efforts for education and information on underwater archaeology to the public,
2. Better professional media and strategies for storage, exchange and presentation of data on underwater heritage,
3. More concentrated efforts on raising the status of underwater heritage, for example via the UNESCO World Heritage List.

Besides these major issues, also other issues may be put up on the agenda, such as looking into the consequences of climate change and how to prevent illicit trade in maritime archaeological objects.
Working Group on Building Preservation and Maintenance in Practice

Since 2000 the aim of the working group has been to promote good management of the built heritage. Participating countries are Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden and Poland. The Group has been chaired by Hans Sandstorm, National Heritage Board, Sweden till 2007, and by Elisa Heikkilä, National Board of Antiquities, Finland since 2007.

Expert seminars and workshops for craftsmen, researchers and civil servants organized by the working group have by now produced a common basis for restoration projects. The wide range of traditional building skills and materials in the countries around the Baltic are an invaluable resource. The workshops organized by the working group have demonstrated the importance of the practical exchange of intangible knowledge. Despite the time and resources required, this method is the most effective means of interaction.

Each country has its individual legislation and organizational structure for protecting cultural heritage. It is, however, extremely important to define the “Common Baltic Heritage” and the common means to protect it. The heritage organizations and NGOs of the Baltic Sea States should cooperate and exchange knowledge in order to ensure the future use of traditional materials in relation to EU legislation and directives (e.g. wood tar and volatile organic compounds).

A special project

The working group has initiated the separate project “Climate in Churches” which will facilitate an exchange of knowledge and know-how among professionals in the Baltic Sea Region. The knowledge will be available to the end-users, i.e. the parishes in the Baltic Sea states.

Action plan

A forthcoming event in 2008 is a workshop on the restoration and preservation of wooden buildings and defining roles between craftsmen and antiquarians in Röros, Norway. The workshop will be partly funded by the Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage and will take place on 6 – 10 October 2008.

Regional activities in urban heritage - The follow-up project on sustainable historic towns

The Baltic Sea States Working group Sustainable Historic Towns was established in 2000. During the initial phase the working group arranged meetings, workshops and a seminar. The activities and results of the working group from 2001-2002 were presented in the report “Baltic Sea Region Cooperation on Sustainable Urban Heritage Management”, disseminated in English in an electronic publication and in the reports series of the Nordic Council of Ministers (TemaNord 2003:565, ISBN 92-893-0964-4).

In 2002, the working group organized the project initiative “Sustainable Historic Towns – Urban Heritage as an Asset for Development” (SuHiTo). The main goal was enhanced management of cultural heritage through integrating heritage values in sustainable development and the policies of local communities. The desired results were professional tools for management. A total of 21 partners in eight countries were involved, including national and local authorities, universities and research institutes. Pilot projects in four towns formed the core of the project, developing new approaches to inventories, analyses and building codes. The EU granted co-financing through the Interreg III B programme for the Baltic Sea Region. The project officially started its work in January 2003 and was finalized in January 2006.

The project report of the same name can be ordered from the Finnish National Board of Antiquities (edited by Marianne Lehtimäki, ISBN 951-616-141-3). These project activities are presented on the website: http://www.nba.fi/en/sustainablehistorictowns.

In 2006, the project partners of the Suhi-to-project organized a follow-up project initiative, “Communicating Heritage in Urban Development Processes” (Co-Herit). The main goal was enhanced and strengthened awareness of the significance, attraction and use value of cultural heritage in urban development processes – including its capacity for change. Co-financing was granted by the Nordic Council of Ministers. The project started in January 2007 and will be finalized in 2008. Contact person Dag Arne Reinar, Directorate for the Cultural Heritage, Norway.

The project work is based on results from the SuHito project: Enquiries as tools for public participation, and the DIVE (Describe, Interpret, Valuate, Enable) heritage analysis as a planning tool. Nine partners in four countries are involved, with pilot activities in Pietarsaari (Sw. Jakobstad), Vilnius, Tromsø and Arboga. The final report will include manuals for planners and conservationists, guiding them in the practical use of DIVE analysis, and in using enquiries as tools for public participation.
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Appendix 1

Statement on Heritage and Cultural Tourism in the Baltic Sea Region

Vilnius 28 September 2007

Preamble

The Baltic Sea Heritage Cooperation was initiated in 1997 after a decision taken by the Ministers of Culture in the Region. The cooperation takes place in Working groups, which are organized by a Monitoring group, and in regularly gathered FORUMS, to enhance and develop the management of the Cultural Heritage in the Region in a fruitful and sustainable way.

The participants in the 3rd Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum that took place in Vilnius, Lithuania 25-28 September 2007, recognize;

• the importance of Cultural Heritage in generating a coherent society and as a vital resource for a prosperous local and regional development in the Baltic Sea Region, irrespective of its location on land, sea or underwater;
• that the diversity of Cultural Heritage of the Baltic Sea Region should be made available to all, and yet used in a sustainable way in order to preserve it for future generations;
• that the Cultural Heritage is an essential asset for Cultural Tourism;
• that the European Union emphasises on its agenda enhancement of sustainable European tourism policies;
• that the existence of international documents like International Cultural Tourism Charter (adopted by ICOMOS in Mexico, 1999) and Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro 2005) are to be looked upon as appropriate guidelines for sustainable Cultural Tourism management.

Underline;

• that in order to release the full potential for tourism based on the Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea region, joint strategies for better documentation and protection must be developed by national authorities;
• that cultural tourism activities should enhance living cultural traditions, genuine hand crafts and skills, local pride and public appreciation as well as understanding of cultural heritage sites, and at the same time avoid overexploitation;
• that Cultural Heritage management institutions and Tourism organizations need to develop mutual relations in order to share responsibilities and to enhance competent partnerships and governance.

Recommend;

• all States in the Baltic Sea Region to record their Cultural Heritage and make the documentation comprehensible to other Sectors of the society and to the Public at large,
• all States in the Baltic Sea Region to encourage the use of traditional skills and materials in preservation and restoration works, programming constant maintenance of the sites,
• that abandoned Monuments are given new functions for their survival with regard to their cultural values in order to be a resource also in Cultural Tourism,
• Cultural Heritage management and tourism organizations to engage and encourage the interest of the young and children in History and Cultural Heritage,
• creation of cross sector networks between Cultural Heritage and Tourism organizations for developing joint policies and strategies for a diverse, sustainable and prosperous Cultural Tourism and establishing regional cultural routes,
• that politicians at all levels in the Baltic Sea region to recognize the vital role of a well-preserved and diverse Cultural Heritage for prosperous tourism and consequently for the versatile development of the entire region.
Appendix 2

Meetings, Participants and Publications

Meetings since the 7th Conference of the Ministers of Culture of the Baltic Sea States in Bergen, Norway 26-27 September 2005

The Monitoring Group

Stockholm, Sweden, 2005, November 11-12
Gdansk, Poland, 2006, February 3-4 (2-3 the European Route on Brick Gothic-seminar)
Oslo, Norway, 2006, June 15-16
Warsaw, Poland, 2006, November 23-26
Vilnius, Lithuania, 2007, March 5-6
Vilnius, Lithuania, 2007, September 28 in connection with the III Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum
Brussels, Belgium, 2007, November 29-30
Kraków, Poland, 2008 March 9-11
Iceland, 2008, June 24-27

Working Groups

Coastal Culture and Maritime Heritage

Tallinn, Estonia, 2005 October 28-30
Gdansk, Poland, 2006 May 5-7
Kiel, Germany, 2006 November 17-18
Esbjerg, Denmark, 2007 March 16-17
Kristiansand, Norway, 2008 April 18-19

Underwater Heritage

Stockholm, Sweden, 2005 November 12
Wismar, Germany, 2006 April 21
Roskilde, Denmark, 2006 September 9
Schleswig, Germany, 2006 November 18
Stockholm, Sweden, 2007 March 16
Helsinki, Finland, 2007 June 15
Gdansk, Poland, 2007 November 23
Tallinn, Estonia, 2008 April 11
Schleswig, Germany, 2008 August 22

Building Preservation and Maintenance in Practice

Druskininkai, Lithuania, 2 March 2006
Stockholm, Sweden, May 2007
Vilnius, Lithuania, September 2007

Co-Herit-project meetings
Tromsø, Norway, 2007 February 1-2
Jakobstad, Finland, 2007 June 6-8
Oslo, Norway, 2007 November 14-15
Arboga, Sweden, 2008 May 21-23

Participants

Monitoring Group 2006-08

Secretariat in Finland 2006-08:
Chairperson Ms. Helena Edgren, National Board of Antiquities, Finland, www.nba.fi
Co-ordinator Ms. Marianne Lehtimäki, consultant for National Board of Antiquities, Finland, malehtimaki(at)yahoo.com

Denmark:
Mr. Jan Trane Hansen The Heritage Agency of Denmark, www.kulturarv.dk

Estonia:
Mr. Anton Pärn, Estonian Ministry of Culture, www.kul.ee
Ms. Anneli Randla, National Heritage Board of Estonia, www.muinas.ee

Finland:
Ms. Maire Mattinen, National Board of Antiquities, Department of Monuments and Sites, www.nba.fi

Germany, Schleswig-Holstein:

Germany, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern:
Ms. Ewa Prync-Pommerencke, 2007-, Department of Archaeology and Cultural Heritage, www.m-vp.de

Iceland:
Working Groups 2006-07

Coastal Culture and Maritime Heritage

- Denmark: Mr. Morten Hahn-Pedersen
- Estonia: Mr. Urmas Dresen
- Finland: Ms. Leena Koivisto and Mr. Hannu Matikka
- Germany, Schleswig-Holstein: Mr. Michael Paarmann
- Iceland: Mr. Magnus Skulason 2007-
- Latvia: Mr. Armands VIIups
- Lithuania: Mr. Jonas Genys and Mr. Laisvonas Kavalaiuskas
- Norway: Mr. Harald Hamre, Chair -2007, Ms. Kate Newland, Secretary, Mr. Eivind Lande -07, Mr. Sverre Nordmo
- Poland: Mr Jerzy Litwin, Mr. Robert Domzal, Chair 2007-, and Mr. Radoslaw Paternoga
- Russia: Ms. Larisa Zubina
- Sweden: Ms. Kersti Berggren and Mr. Claes Wollentz

Underwater Heritage

- Denmark: Mr. Morten Gøthche
- Estonia: Mr. Ants Kraut and Ms. Maili Roio
- Finland: Ms. Marja Pelanne and Ms. Sallamaria Tikkanen
- Germany: Mr. Friedrich Lüth, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern -2006
- Latvia: Mr. Ralf Bleile, Schleswig-Holstein
- Lithuania: Mr. Voldemars Rains and Mr. Juris Urtans
- Norway: Ms. Laris Zavilaus and Mr. Vladis Zulkus
- Åland Islands: Mr. Marcus Lindholm and Ms. Viveka Löndahl
- Poland: Ms. Iwona Pomian
- Russia: Mr. Dmitry Mazein and Petr Sorokin
- Sweden: Mr. Björn Varenius, Chair and Mr. Andreas Olsson
Building Preservation and Maintenance in Practice

Estonia   Ms. Anneli Randla
Finland   Ms. Elisa Heikkilä, Chair 2008-
Germany  Ms Sabine Horn
Latvia  Mr. Ilmars Dirveiks
Lithuania Ms. Dalia Lungevičienė and Mr. Kęstutis Jankauskas
Norway Mr. Kjell Andresen
Sweden  Mr. Hans Sandström, Chair -2007, Ms. Kaire Tooming

Co-herit-project
Norway  Project Manager - June 2008
Mr. Gisle Erlien
from June 2008 Mr. Dag Arne Reinar
/ Directorate for Cultural Heritage,
Norway, www.ra.no
Tromsø Municipality, Mr. Per Hareide,
www.tromso.kommune.no
Sweden  Ms. Ann-Mari Westerlind, National
Heritage Board, Sverige, www.raa.se
Arboga Municipality, Mr. Per Granlund,
www.arborga.se
KTH/ Royal Institute of Technology,
Mr. Krister Olsson, www.kth.se
Finland  Ms. Margaretha Ehrström, National
Board of Antiquities, www.nba.fi
City of Jakobstad, Mr. Ilmari Heinonen,
www.jakobstad.fi
Lithuania Ms. Jurate Jurevičienė, Gediminas Technical University Vilnius

The 3rd Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum Task Force 2006-07
Chair  Mr. Alfredas Jomantas,
Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture, Lithuania
Co-ordinator: Ms. Marianne Lehtimäki,
Monitoring Group Secretariat, Finland
Ms. Ewa Bergdahl,
National Heritage Board, Sweden
Ms. Tomke Laske,
Social Anthropologist and Tourism Consultant, Belgium
Ms. Loreta Skurvydaitė,
Vilnius University, Lithuania
Mr. Martynas Užpelkis,
consultant, Lithuania
Ms. Reidun Vea,
Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway
Monitoring Group Chair Helena Edgren participated in one meeting.

Publications

Earlier reports of the Monitoring Group
Safeguarding and developing the common cultural heritage in the Baltic Sea region,
Report 2 on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea States
Given by the Monitoring Group
Agreed upon by the Monitoring Group in Tallinn, Estonia 6-7 August 2001.
Cultural Heritage Co-operation in the Baltic Sea States, Report 3
Agreed upon by the Monitoring Group in Stockholm, Sweden the 1st of September 2003
ISBN 91-7209-319-6
Cultural Heritage Co-operation in the Baltic Sea States, Report 4
Agreed upon by the Monitoring Group, edited by Friedric Lüth

The electronic versions are available on the web address
www.baltic-heritage.net
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Presentations of the Monitoring Group Activities in other Regions and to Different Interest Groups by Invitation of the Organizers

Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS), meeting of the CSO (Committee of Senior Officials) 29.3.2006.
• The Chair presented the activities of the Monitoring Group and the Working Groups.

EU-Russia Expert-Meeting on the implementation of the Cultural aspects of the Road Map for the Fourth Common Space, Kajaani, Finland, 19.9.2006.
• The Chair presented the activities of the Monitoring Group and the Working Groups.

Seminar on “Enhancement of the cultural and natural heritage as a factor for sustainable development” arranged by the Council of Europe within the framework of the Regional Programme for Cultural and Natural Heritage in South-East Europe, Institutional Capacity Building Plan, Belgrade, Serbia, 27–29 September 2006.
• The Coordinator presented the activities of the Monitoring Group and the Working Groups.

Ashtarak workshop “Rehabilitation of the architectural and natural heritage in urban development policies in Armenia” arranged by the Council of Europe in the framework of the Regional programme for the cultural and natural heritage in South Caucasus / Institutional capacity building and management of historic cities, 9-10 November 2006.
• The Coordinator presented the activities and projects of the Baltic Sea States Working Group on sustainable historic towns.

Conference on the Northern Dimension and Culture organized by the Nordic Council of Ministers under the Finnish Chairmanship and the Finnish Ministry of Culture 8-9 October 2007, Kajaani, Finland.
• The Chair presented the activities of the Monitoring Group and the Working Groups.

“International Heritage Conventions and Other Major Texts, Current Situation and Prospects”, sub-arranged by the Council of Europe, Committee on the Cultural Heritage of the Parliamentary Assembly, Vilnius 12 October 2007.
• The Chair, Coordinator and the Chair of the Baltic Sea States Working Group on underwater heritage presented the activities of the Monitoring Group and the Working Groups.

• The Coordinator presented the output of the 3rd Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum.

• The Chair of the Monitoring Group and Working Group on underwater heritage presented the activities of the Monitoring Group and the Working Groups, especially the Code of Good Practice.

• The Coordinator presented the activities of the Monitoring Group and Working Groups activities as a good model of regional cooperation in cultural heritage.

Balticness seminar 2.6.2008 Riga, “Thinking regionally, acting globally – creating a brand image for the Baltic Sea region”, arranged by the CBSS Latvian Presidency.
• The Coordinator presented the cultural heritage perspective on regional branding.