

Evaluation of Euromed Heritage I

(ME8/B7 - 4100/IB/07/0353)

FINAL REPORT

Volume II - Evaluation of single projects

July 2004

Programme funded by
the European Union



Report produced by



A.R.S. Progetti S.r.l.
Ambiente Risorse Sviluppo

and



C. C. [Signature]

Foreword

The Barcelona Conference of 1996 initiated a new season of Euro-Mediterranean partnership. As part of this momentum the EC launched a programme aimed at conserving and enhancing the cultural heritage in the Mediterranean, which was named Euromed Heritage.

Euromed Heritage I was identified in 1996, started in 1998 and ended in 2001¹. A second phase was launched in 2001 and is now ongoing. The original financing decision requires a final evaluation of the programme.

In November 2003 the EC commissioned ARS Progetti, in association with its consortium member GHK, to carry out an independent ex post evaluation of the first phase of the programme.

This report presents the results of this evaluation, carried out by the team of experts mobilised by ARS Progetti and GHK, composed by Dr. June Taboroff, John Bowers, Gianmarco Scuppa and Pam Van de Bunt. The report is organized in two volumes: Vol. I "Programme evaluation" and Vol. II "Evaluation of single projects".

We wish here to thank Claire Kupper at the EC, the EC Meda delegations, the EC officers of the "Centralised Operations for the Mediterranean" Unit, the EC delegations in the Meda countries, the Lead Partners, project participants and cultural institutions in the Meda countries for their cooperation and assistance during the preparation of the report.

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not represent the official views of the EC.

The background of the cover page is an etching representing the map of the old city of Damascus, where we can see how the Islamic city developed on the old roman urban structure.

¹ Some projects however have been extended until 2002.

Table of Contents

CORPUS	6
Project description	6
Relevance	8
Efficiency.....	8
Effectiveness and Impact.....	9
Sustainability.....	10
Concluding points	11
Expo 2000 - Saving Cultural Heritage Exhibition	12
Project description	12
Relevance	13
Efficiency.....	13
Effectiveness and Impact.....	15
Sustainability.....	15
Conclusions	16
Fêtes du Soleil	17
Project identification.....	17
Relevance	18
Efficiency.....	18
Effectiveness.....	19
Impact and sustainability	20
Conclusions	20
IPAMED.....	21
Implementation of the project	21
Relevance	23
Efficiency.....	24
Effectiveness.....	25
Impact and sustainability	26
Conclusions	27
Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb.....	28
Project summary	28
Project implementation	29
Relevance	30
Efficiency.....	31
Effectiveness.....	33
Impact	33
Sustainability.....	34
MANUMED.....	35
Project description	35
Relevance	37
Efficiency.....	38
Effectiveness.....	39
Sustainability.....	40
Conclusions	41
ISLAMIC ART IN THE MEDITERRANEAN	Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.
Project Description.....	43
Relevance	45
Efficiency.....	45
Effectiveness.....	46
Impact and sustainability	47
Conclusions	47

PISA	49
Project description	49
Relevance	50
Efficiency.....	51
Effectiveness.....	53
Impact	53
Sustainability.....	54
Conclusions	54
RIAS - International Network of Marine Archeology	56
Project implementation	56
Relevance	57
Efficiency.....	59
Effectiveness.....	59
Impact and sustainability	60
Conclusions	60
Salambo.....	61
Project description	61
Relevance	62
Efficiency.....	63
Effectiveness and impact.....	64
Sustainability.....	64
Unimed Audit	66
Relevance	66
Efficiency.....	67
Effectiveness and impact.....	67
Sustainability.....	68
Unimed Herit	69
Project description	69
Relevance	71
Efficiency.....	71
Effectiveness.....	72
Impact	72
Unimed Symposium	73
Project description	73
Relevance	75
Efficiency.....	75
Effectiveness, impact and sustainability	76
Conclusions	76
Museomed.....	77
Description of the project	77
Relevance	78
Efficiency.....	79
Effectiveness.....	80
Impact and sustainability	80
Euro-Mediterranean Heritage Days.....	81
Description of the project	81
Relevance	82
Efficiency.....	82
Effectiveness.....	84
Impact and sustainability	84
Conclusions	84

Acronyms

International institutions

CE	Commission Européenne
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
UNESCO	United Nation Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation

Institutions of EU countries

FEMP	Foundation Europeene des Metiers du Patimoine	Council of Europe
ICR	Istituto Centrale per il Restauro	Italy

Institutions

AMVPPC	Agence de Mise en Valeur du Patrimoine et de Promotion Culturelle	Tunisia
ANAPSMH	Agence Nationale d'Archéologie et de Protections des Sites et Monuments Historiques	Algeria
ASM	Association pour la Sauvegarde de la Médina	Tunisia
CCL	Centre de Conservation du Livre	Lebanon
DGA	Direction Générale des Antiquités	Lebanon
DGAM	Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums	Syria
DPCA	Direction du Patrimoine Culturel du Ministère de la Communication et de la Culture d'Algérie	Algeria
DPCM	Direction du Patrimoine Culturel du Ministère des Affaires Culturelles du Maroc	Morocco
EC	European Commission	International
ENAU	Ecole Nationale d'Architecture et d'Urbanisme	Tunisia
EPAU	Ecole Polytechnique d'Architecture et d'Urbanisme	Algeria
FEMP	Foundation Européenne des Métiers du Patrimoine	Council of Europe
IAA	Israel Antiquities Authority	Israel
ICR	Istituto Centrale per il Restauro	Italy
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property	International
INP	Institut National du Patrimoine	Tunisia
INSAP	Institut National des Sciences de l'Archéologie et du Patrimoine	Morocco
KBF	King Baudoin Foundation	International
UNESCO	United Nation Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation	International

General terms

COREMA	Séminaire de préparation à la formation : Conservateurs et Restaurateurs du Maghreb (Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb)
DESS	Diplôme d'Etudes Supérieures Spécialisées
MSF	Musées Sans Frontières
NAMEC	Programme de soutien pour la conservation du patrimoine culturel dans les pays de l'Afrique du Nord et du Proche et Moyen-Orient

CORPUS

Project Title : CORPUS – Traditional architecture in the Mediterranean

Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-01

Signature Grant Contract: 24.08.1998

Original Expiry Grant Contract: 24.02.2001 (30 months)

Final Expiry Grant contract : 24.06.01

EU Grant: 1,041,050 Euros

Lead partner: ECOLE D'AVIGNON – France

Partners:

- **Algeria**/ Ministry of Communication and Culture
- **Cyprus** /Ministry of Communications and Works/Department of Antiquities
- **Egypt**/ Ministry of Culture/Supreme Council of Antiquities
- **Israel**/ Mishkenot Sha'ananim
- **Jordan**/ Ministry of Culture/Yarmouk University
- **Morocco**/ Ministère des Affaires Culturelles/Direction du Patrimoine Culturel
- **Palestinian Authority**/ Ministry of Culture/Directorate of Cultural Heritage
- **Tunisia**/ Ministère de la Culture/Institut National du Patrimoine
- **Turkey**/ Ministry of Culture/General Directorate for the Preservation of the Natural and Cultural Heritage
- **Belgium**/ Ministère de la Région Wallonne
- **Spain**/ Col·legi d' Aparelladors i Arquitectes Tecnicos de Barcelona
- **Finland**/ Museovirasto National Board of Antiquities
- **Greece**/ Ministry of Culture-4th Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities of the Dodecanese
- **Portugal**/ Direction Générale des Edifices et Monuments Nationaux

Summary: Support for traditional Mediterranean architecture and building techniques through the creation of an inventory of examples and publications about the skills and techniques needed for their conservation

Project description

Project identification

The project concept was originated by the Ecole d'Avignon and the Col·legi d' Aparelladors i Arquitectes Tecnicos de Barcelona. The two organizations already had a set of Mediterranean wide connections, which they utilized in forming the CORPUS consortia. The Ecole d'Avignon was invited to participate in the Bologna meeting.

Project objectives

The proposal identified seven main objectives:

1. Improve knowledge of traditional architecture and construction practices in a way that is useful for those responsible for conservation and maintenance;

2. Create a database by documenting and analysing existing architectural and building elements;
3. Evaluate the current level of competence and skills in trades related to conservation;
4. Analyse architectural transformations in relation to the effectiveness of rehabilitation policies;
5. Design training for architectural heritage workers;
6. Raise the public awareness of this common culture;
7. Create a book Traditional Mediterranean Architecture, web site (www. Meda-corpus.net) and CD Rom

The project was intended as a knowledge programme, a first phase of knowledge gathering and analysis. Typologies, technologies and training were documented on the basis of existing knowledge and field work.

Implementation of the project

The project had 14 partners, 9 of which were MEDA partners and 5 EU partners. They represented for all MEDA countries Ministries of Culture and their Department of Antiquities or Directorate of Cultural Heritage. Only in Spain was the partner a university. In practice the partners then subcontracted the research work to universities (as in the case of Turkey, Jordan and Egypt).

The project combined research with the creation of a network of on-site research assistance. There were three strands of research:

- Architectural building forms, led by the Ecole d'Avignon;
- Construction techniques, led by the Collegi d'Aparelladors i Arquitectes Tecnicos de Barcelona;
- Training, led by the Ecole d'Avignon and by the Ecole des Arts et Métiers, Tétouan.

In parallel a network was created and on-site assistance given to partners. Research findings were based on: 7 questionnaires completed by all participating countries; 23 field missions in 13 countries; 200 interviews with those working in the field; a bibliography; 16 seminars; an expert advisory committee.

The three scientific institutions, the Ecole d'Avignon, Collegi d'Aparelladors and the Ecole des Arts et Métiers of Tétouan collaborated on the project design and took responsibility for assuring research standards were met. They divided responsibilities, with the Moroccans taking part in the definition of the project, Avignon taking the lead in training. Tétouan also organized a plenary meeting, one of three that was planned. A fourth meeting was added; it was held in Marseilles to discuss the book and CD Rom, and was supported by the French regional government.

Three researchers were selected in each of the Meda countries in charge, respectively, of training in traditional building techniques, building arts, and typologies.

Selected Materials produced by the project include a book, posters, a CD Rom and web site:

- Book: "Traditional Mediterranean Architecture";
- CD ROM with extensive project documentation;
- Internet site;
- Posters;
- Exhibition, lectures and meetings.

Relevance

The project was highly relevant to the Euromed programme in that it closely matched programme objectives: CORPUS created an inventory, highlighted an undervalued form of cultural heritage, exchanged know how in regard to architectural building forms and construction techniques and attempted to raise public awareness.

CORPUS addressed a common problem throughout the region, which is only beginning to be recognized at the national level.

“CORPUS sees a serious problem of rich architecture which is not protected legally and without national guidelines of how to deal with conservation and reuse. Most is demolished and concrete buildings are built instead.”

Comment from a Jordanian participant

Target groups

The target groups were those responsible for conservation and maintenance, architectural workers, and the general public. A second target group were faculties of architecture including staff and students.

Partner selection

CORPUS comprised 9 MEDA partners (including 2 in Jordan) and 5 EC countries. In some cases CORPUS approached the Ministry of Culture inviting them to be a partner (as in Turkey). The first approach was by letter, and it was followed up at the meetings. Most of the MEDA countries were active partners, with a few partners who did not follow through.

The participants welcomed the opportunity to contribute to a regional project on the subject of vernacular architecture. CORPUS succeeded in tapping into a rich vein of expertise. In the case of Turkey, Jordan and Egypt, the participants were high-level university professors and practicing architects who had been studying the subject for some 15 years.

Participants remarked that CORPUS was “a labor of love” and that they received very little financial compensation.

Efficiency

Project Management

CORPUS was a well-run project, with an attentive Lead Partner and support system. Avignon was reinforced by Barcelona and Tétouan. Communication was via Email, face to face meetings and site visits by the Lead Partner. In all the MEDA countries the national teams worked together with experts from the Lead Partner.

Operations and organization. CORPUS was a centralized operation, with the project design and procedures determined by Avignon. Questionnaires were sent by Avignon to the various partners for completion. Avignon also gave a calendar for the project. The participants commented that there were no problems during implementation, “the organization was smooth and there were no administrative problems.”

All of the project administration and financial transactions were carried out by Avignon. Avignon also took responsibilities for coordinating all aspects of the project: contracts; finance and budgets; communications; organization of plenary meetings. In addition they did training and had an

important quality control role. When one Meda partner had difficulty in reaching acceptable standards, Avignon sent an expert to provide necessary support.

The Lead Partner commented that they received assistance from the Meda team to prepare a contract addendum, but their overall duty was not clear to them.

Communications were efficient. Several of the partners noted that “whenever they asked a question, they were sure to have a response” from the CORPUS team. In contrast CORPUS was not satisfied with the lack of feedback on the content of reports that they submitted to the EC.

Decision making. There was a degree of shared decision-making in the project in regard to the research methods. For example in the Morocco meeting the participants discussed criteria, and “there was a sharing of ideas and chance to discuss.” The Jordanian participants characterized the project as “a real joint project.”

Although there was no formalized scientific committee, the three head institutions of Avignon, Barcelona and Tétouan consulted on the scientific direction and content of the project. An internal evaluation process was put in place so that each survey was analyzed and evaluated.

Partner relations.

All of the Meda partners praised the project coordinator and stated that “they had very a good relationship.” The relationship between CORPUS staff and the individual country groups seems to have been stronger than that between MEDA country groups. One group commented that there were not enough meetings and during the meeting it would have been preferable to concentrate on technical issues rather than administrative matters.

Effectiveness and Impact

Objective achievements.

CORPUS accomplished serious research on architectural typologies and building techniques in most Mediterranean countries. The project “developed systematic procedures for the identification of condition and materials.” The research was directly carried out by the local project partners on the basis of a strict methodology developed by the Lead Partner. The result is a high quality and very detailed catalogue accessible on Internet and a publication. However this catalogue is mainly useful to researchers especially in the north, given that the catalogue has been published in French and English, but not in Arabic.

The work done by CORPUS could have been extremely useful if it had been used to produce handbooks to restore traditional structures safeguarding the traditional typologies and using compatible materials and techniques. However this approach was partially adopted during the second phase of the project, called CORPUS LEVANT. This phase, which focused on Lebanon and Syria, profited from the experience of the first phase. In fact documents were published also in Arabic and some "restoration fiches" were produced to train masons and other craftsmen in compatible restoration techniques. Each CORPUS partner now has a detailed database of architectural typologies and building techniques of their own territory, which can be used to design actions to preserve this endangered heritage.

Interestingly, training was not an explicit element of the project, but the field visits from the CORPUS team were in effect a sort of technical assistance to follow the work of the country teams. These field visits resulted in training of staff and students in the latest technologies of building and identification of building materials.

The Lead Partner commented that training was a difficult issue and one that the project did not fully succeed. "Training is one of the main problems as skills are disappearing and are held by older masons, carpenters, tillers etc. There is not transmission, as youth are not interested. Now it is difficult in some parts of the region to find skilled people." They noted that the time scale and means to do it well were not available in the CORPUS project.

One participating institution also remarked on the "transfer of know how" that took place. The opportunity to work with Spanish, French and Moroccan experts was particularly appreciated.

The Lead Partner summarized the value added of the project as follows: the transformation of paper files to CD Rom; the book that serves to raise awareness; the website and database; and the GIS maps. They also noted that the initial budget was not sufficient for all of the above and they succeeded in leveraging support from the French regional government and from Spain.

An unexpected outcome of the project was the action of the CORPUS network in Hebron (Palestinian Authority) that influenced a decision on street clearance. A petition was circulated through the whole CORPUS network.

Outreach.

The project made considerable effort at outreach. In Jordan the book was distributed widely to government and NGOs. In Turkey the participants made a radio program on national state radio showing how CORPUS can interest ordinary people. The purpose of the broadcast was to inform people how to use traditional houses. This was important because in many countries lack of awareness of the public poses a large obstacle. One Ministry representative noted, "Our problem is organisation. We have a legal system, skills, manpower plus some funds. We need a locomotive." To an extent CORPUS acted as a locomotive, but for short time only. The website is another feature of outreach.

University students benefited from CORPUS, as the participants were often university professors who used the results in teaching.

Sustainability

The sustainability of CORPUS depends in part on the continuance of the website and eventual updating of the database. The CORPUS budget, however, did not make provisions for future funding so this depends now on the Ecole d'Avignon that has succeeded in attracting additional funds from the French regional government and from Spain.

In some countries, CORPUS was seen as a pilot test for an inventory of traditional architecture. Importantly, the methodology used in CORPUS is considered as valid for other geographical areas. In some countries, such as Jordan, the material produced for CORPUS is used for training in conservation at the university level and has been made available to Government.

CORPUS has contributed to establishing professional cooperation in the region. Many of the participants maintain some sort of contact with other members of the consortia and with Avignon, for advice and exchange of experience. The web site is ongoing (now paid by Spain) and is another source of contact.

Other results/spin offs. CORPUS generated a number of spin offs. One of the project teams remarked that there was a need to do a similar project for rural architecture. A course in traditional architecture has been initiated in Yarmouk University in Jordan. In Algeria EPAU held a conference in which students were showed great interest.

The Government of Turkey demonstrated its understanding of how the project could be used to inform national policy. The Ministry of Culture in Turkey used the project to raise awareness of traditional architecture among Regional Directorates of Monuments. They sent catalogues and CD Roms to them and a letter describing the project results. At one of the meetings of the Directorates a briefing on the project was given and it is planned that at the next national meeting of museum directors and Directorates of Monuments a similar presentation will take place.

For some of the project groups, CORPUS was important exposure for Euromed Heritage II

CORPUS and the Barcelona Process

CORPUS was successful in the exchange of knowledge from north to south and from south to south. Whereas the North is more advanced in raising awareness and of techniques, the techniques themselves are more refined in the south, for example stone cutting in Lebanon and Syria.

Concluding points

CORPUS was an ambitious project that deals with an extremely important aspect of Mediterranean culture, vernacular architecture and traditional building techniques. It was helpful in raising interest in this subject and gave the participating countries the experience of documenting a fast disappearing part of their historic environment. This is a first step in a comprehensive database of traditional building forms and techniques, and only a small segment of the Mediterranean architectural heritage has been researched. The research findings point out how widespread various architectural forms and materials are, yet how varied these forms can be. As a middle size project (1.041.050), it presents satisfactory value for money. Project participants praised the project as “excellent with excellent results.”

Moreover, CORPUS provided an encouraging introduction to regional projects for many of the participants. It has been followed by CORPUS LEVANT, also funded by Euromed Heritage.

"CORPUS showed us that European projects can be done. We learned the procedures and now are in continuous contact with EC organizations"

A Meda participant

The Lead Partner recommended that the call for further proposals be more clear on objectives, criteria and selection; that the EC be more visible for project groups, not in the sense of control but of coordination; that reporting requirements be streamlined; that the EC provide feedback, especially on content; and that a mid-term review be carried out.

Expo 2000 - Saving Cultural Heritage Exhibition

Signature Grant contract: Expo 2000 budget approved on 29.07.98, the implementation contract was signed on 23.12.99 for a duration of 12 months – 23.12.2000.

Saving Cultural Heritage travelling exhibition contract budget was approved on 18.05.01, the implementation contract was signed on 17.01.02.

EU Grant: Expo 2000 Euromed Exhibition: €400,000

Saving Cultural Heritage Exhibition: €251,000

Lead Partner:

- Municipality of Hildesheim

MEDA Partners:

- Cyprus: Ministry of Communications and Works, Department of Antiquities
- Jordan: Ministry of Culture
- Morocco : Ministère de Enseignement Supérieur, de la Recherche Scientifique et de la culture, Direction du Patrimoine Culturel
- Syria : Ministère de la Culture, Direction Générale des Antiquités et des Musées
- Tunisia : Institut National du Patrimoine. Ministère de la Culture
- Turkey : Ministry of Culture and General Directorate for the Preservation of Natural and Cultural Heritage.

EU Partners :

- Germany : Roemer-Pelizaeus Museum Hildesheim
- Germany : Hornemenn Institute Centre for the Preservation of World Cultural Heritage.
- Greece : Ministry of Culture
- Spain : Ministry of Culture Madrid Department Museo arqueologico Nacional
- France : Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, Direction et de l'Architecture et du Patrimoine
- Italy: Ministry of Culture, Central Institute for Restoration
- Portugal : Instituto Portugues de Arqueologia

Project description

The Saving Cultural Heritage 'travelling' Exhibition was a direct follow-up to the Expo 2000 Exhibition on the overall Euromed programme. As a result of the relatively large participation of Euro Med partners and of the quality of documents and examples shown in the exhibition, it was suggested by several partners to have the exhibition accessible to all those who had not the opportunity to visit Hildesheim during Expo 2000.

Objectives

Planned results of Expo 2000 were:

- To focus on the historical heritage and to contribute to preserving it for the future.
- To create a forum of experience exchange between Euro-Med partners on preservation.
- Seventeen countries to present best practice in preservation.

Planned results of Saving Cultural Heritage were:

- Present the co-operation between countries around the Mediterranean and to contribute to the support of dialogue and exchange of experience and knowledge in the Mediterranean basin.
(Note: contractually the exhibition would travel by road in Europe and by airfreight to the Mediterranean countries where it shall be shown to at least 10 locations during 2001/02 – in actual fact it was shown in 5 locations)

Contract and budget

The contract provisions were concluded between the EU Commission and the Directorate of Cultural Affairs City of Hildesheim, Germany on 18.05.01. The EU contract for the travelling exhibition was signed on 17.01.02. The budget for the freighting and logistics in-country support of the exhibition accounted for 80% of the budget. No allocation was made to modify the exhibition from that designed for Expo 2000, i.e., it was the same exhibition.

Relevance

The process of creating and assembling the material for the exhibition(s) contributed to the cooperative spirit and common understanding between those participating from the various MEDA and EU partner countries in Expo 2000.

The content of the exhibition will have been more engaging for the ‘specialist interest’ visitor rather than the general public as its focus was on ‘restoration know-how in methods of documentation and presentation’ and not a more popular topic. This somewhat specialist interest focus and the fact that the material was only translated into English and French limited the scope of interest in the Arab speaking countries.

Nevertheless, the travelling exhibition was very well received in both Morocco and Tunisia [ref. Effectiveness and Impact below].

Efficiency

For the original Expo 2000 exhibition, the location of the Saving Cultural Heritage component was located in Hildesheim some distance from the main Expo 2000 exhibition in Hannover. It is likely that the number of visitors to the Saving Cultural Heritage exhibition was significantly reduced because of this physical separation. This was considered to be the case even though information on the on-going Saving Cultural Heritage exhibit was available at the EU Pavillion at Expo 2000, where a slide show was continuously shown and posters were on display at each of the Mediterranean national pavillions.

The subject of the exhibition fits well into the overall context of the Euromed Heritage programme and helped to bring to the public's eye the sense of cultural heritage as an instrument of common understanding and dialogue.

The cases presented were selected according to the following attributes:

- a representative preservation project that has already been successfully completed;
- either well-known or less well-known projects so as to achieve a large variety of scale and significance;
- a project that illustrates new and inventive methods and techniques.

The materials that were available at the end of the Expo 2000 exhibition (exhibition text and photo panels, videos/cd roms, computers, central exhibition object, slide show and catalogues), were assembled. The project coordinator with specialists having museum and mobile exhibition design experience were engaged to adapt this into a modular Saving Cultural Heritage mobile system that could be flexibly re-assembled in different host locations.

The regional programme was planned on the basis of demand from the country partners and Delegations and according to a schedule to minimise the cost of transport from one location to another. The local organiser, based on instructions given by the coordinator, was responsible for the final layout and assembly of the exhibition at each destination.

The assumptions for the local costs included for assembling and dismantling, specialist electrician and EDV services, organisation of a section and the forwarding of the exhibition, local costs of custodians to take daily care of the equipment, and the advance promotion of the event through the media.

The coordinators were tasked with the responsibility to attend the exhibition on all days, monitor events and report back on the results and success of the exhibition. Unfortunately no attendance statistics in the countries visited (Tunisia, Morocco and Turkey) were available.

The project lead partner did prepare a Logical Framework for the project.

Overall the project was very efficiently planned and managed throughout and the complex operational logistics were well managed.

Functioning of the partnership

The world Expo 2000 Euromed Heritage created a high profile context within which the related Saving Cultural Heritage exhibition in Hildesheim was nested. In effect, it was the Expo 2000 network of 17 Euro-Mediterranean countries that signed up to the agreed statement of commitment and formed the basis for the country contributions to the exhibition. The coordinator of the project, in the name of this network, was the Director of Cultural Affairs of the City of Hildesheim, supported by the Hornemann Institute.

This overarching event galvanised the partnership into a commitment from day one and ensured to a large degree that the partners fully participated in producing the 'content' of the exhibition.

On reflection, it was considered that the Expo 2000 platform meant that partners were selected through an somewhat official/bureaucratic network approach and it would have been better to have worked through a professional network system.

For the Hildesheim exhibition Italy was always an excellent partner. Spain initially had language problems but once these were resolved their participation was also excellent. Portugal also excellent but had some problems with members' hierarchy. Getting material from the various MEDA country partners was a mixed result. In particular Lebanon and Syria proved difficult to obtain material from.

However, though the Saving Cultural Heritage exhibition had its genesis in Expo 2000, the logistics of its implementation were considerable more complex and relied heavily on effective local coordinators for success. Strong support from Greece and Portugal was given as EU partners in this respect. From the MEDA partners, other than Algeria, Cyprus, Turkey, Tunisia and Morocco who put real energy into the project (i.e. the countries in which the exhibition was made), the lead partners were disappointed with the partnership member's involvement. However, it must be remembered that this was the time of the second 'intifada' and to a large extent this neutralised Israel and Palestine's involvement. Also, Malta at this time was going through a change of Government that was not pro-European.

Four of the 5 MEDA partners that hosted the exhibition actively promoted the event through media announcements and posters. Tunisia and Morocco were particularly active in this respect and

achieved extensive coverage. Turkey also made considerable effort and the exhibit was held in a prime location in Istanbul. There was some criticism among Turkish professionals of the choice of venue and a wish to have the exhibit circulate to cities such as Ankara, Izmir and Antalya. Cyprus was the exception.

Unfortunately it was intended that there should have been a meeting in Malta to make all the EU / MEDA partner arrangements but because of prevailing geo-political problems at the time, the meeting was cancelled.

Relations with EU Meda team

During Expo 2000 and the early stages of implementation of the Saving Cultural Heritage travelling exhibition, support from Meda team was very good. All the ground rules were established at the Hildesheim meeting

Again a Meda staff member was cited as been fully engaged and instrumental in helping to identify effective people from the partnership network. This staff person was also the main motor behind the project and gave excellent technical support including organising the Damascus and Tunis meetings. .At this stage the Meda teams involvement was particularly useful in understanding the political nuances of the project.

But towards the end of the project cycle MEDA was dissolved, all but one person in the original EDCO team survived and in effect no effective continuity and evaluation was undertaken: institutional recall/memory was lost.

Effectiveness and Impact

The exhibition was opened on the occasion of the international plenary meeting of Euromed Heritage partners in Hildesheim between 16 and 18 June 2000. This meeting was attended by 150 participants representing all the Mediterranean partners and nine EU countries. Statistics indicate that the exhibition was visited by in excess of 50,000. However this figure was probably exaggerated since venue was a new museum that was been inaugurated at this time and three other exhibitions were running in parallel with free entry. Therefore, a considerable amount of double counting may well have skewed the visitor statistics.

Three thousand copies catalogue illustrating the Euromed Heritage restoration projects displayed at the exhibition were published.

It was originally intended that up to ten countries would host the travelling exhibition. As it turned out only five made a request to do so. This resulted from the relatively poor organisational support we received from the MEDA team in working through the country Delegations. This was fortuitous since the costs became prohibitively high to organise the freighting and other logistics to set up the exhibition in the MEDA countries – much higher costs were incurred than had been planned for.

Perhaps one of the most significant outcomes was a clear indication that people across the regional territory were willing and able, in the main, to work together.

Sustainability

For the five MEDA countries that hosted the travelling exhibition the concept has been adopted on other occasions to promote different topics, in particular in Morocco and Tunisia.

Impact and in-turn, sustainability, would have been improved with more country site visits to prepare the ground. But the budget would have had to be significantly greater to support such activity.

Continuity between Hildesheim and the travelling exhibition broke down i.e., the MEDA person engaged was not involved in the travelling exhibition.

Conclusions

Overall the project was a reasonable success story and in particular for those countries that had the administrative and organisational capacities to take advantage of the travelling exhibition i.e., in particular Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey.

The project laid down a certain basis for cultural dialogue and the participants expressed some indicators of this – for example:

- Pride of participation.
- First time life experiences for many of the participants.
- Memory experience will be taken away and logged as a positive reflective experience.

The exhibit has now been dismantled and some of its constituent parts e.g. computers been re-utilised in other ways. Apparently the data content has been archived and much of the fabric of the exhibition was missing or worn out with use. As the lead partner stated: 'Exhibition is now static in Tunisia. Not necessarily a good thing, it was possibly a mistake not to make it a condition that it should not be retained by one country'.

Fêtes du Soleil

CONTRAT N° : ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-12

Signature Grant contract: 25 September 1998

Final Expiry of Grant Contract: 29.04.02

EU Grant: €646,272

Lead Partner:

- Municipality of Siena - Italy

MEDA Partners:

- Israel: Municipality of Beer Sheva
- Malta: Ministry for Gozo
- Tunisia : Municipalité de Le Kef - Institut National du Patrimoine. Ministère de la Culture

EU Partners :

- France : Etablissement Public Château et Domaine National de Versailles et Trianon
- Portugal : Camara Municipal de Tomar
- Italy: Provincia di Agrigento
- UNESCO

Project summary: the aim of the project was to enhance culturally popular festivals in the Euro Mediterranean area.

Project identification

Initially the project concept was identified by Professor Falassi who later became the scientific advisor for the project, and discussed with the Mayor of the Municipality of Siena and other potential partners already before the Barcelona Conference.

The project was then proposed for funding and selected during the Euromed Heritage identification process. The project proposal was prepared by the Centro Studi degli Scambi con l'Estero (CESTUD S.P.A) in Rome, a consulting company with whom the Municipality of Siena had a framework agreement.

As it was the promoter of the project and as the Il Palio is one of the world's greatest and renowned festivals, the Municipality of Siena was a natural choice to be selected as the lead partner.

A scientific colloquium was organised on 27 November 1998 where all partners were invited to Siena to discuss all aspects of the project. This was the official kick-off of the project. Each partner presented an explanation of their preliminary survey of festivals and examples of best practice ideas. The rules and duties of each partner were established and CESTUD prepared budgets and a future programme and calendar of milestone events. The Municipality of Siena also presented all logistics and operational modality aspects of how they organise, implement and manage the Il Palio. The partners interviewed in both Gozo and Tunisia stated that they gained significant value from understanding how a major world festival such as the Il Palio was run.

The nature of the project relied upon having the political support of the 'city fathers': the project contract was signed by the Ms Romelo (Vice-Mayor and responsible for Siena's cultural affairs).

Planned Results were:

1. realisation of a inventory of popular and traditional festivals of the Mediterranean;
2. exchange experience between partner festivals;
3. promote the partner festivals;
4. design of a Chart of popular and traditional festivals;

Budget

The Municipality opened a unique budget line for the project that was very transparent and easy for the EC to audit. The EC auditors identified budget problems during 1999 and the budget was accordingly restructured in May of that year and directed to be more 'tangibly' output orientated.

Relevance

The aim was to achieve authenticity by encouraging each partner to act as a research and publicity agent of their respective cultural resources. Festivals in this sense were viewed as a cultural commodity. However, the use of the festival as a product was determined by the community. In the case of Gozo it was directly linked to the commercial benefits that could be derived from tourism. Whereas, Le Kef viewed it more a local awareness raising benefit.

A common regional approach was therefore applied to very different local situations. In fact Le Kef festival was very much an introspective/family-based event with little wide popular appeal or tourism spectacle value. This placed Le Kef at a disadvantage vis-à-vis other partners and resulted in disappointment, particularly as the Siena Commune as the Lead Partner manages a festival of established global significance (Il Palio). In this case identifying two typologies of festivals would have helped to shape a work plan that acknowledged the different scale and expectations.

Versailles was a cultural institution not representing a community and therefore was not a natural partner to be selected. But somehow it came in with the concept of the project title 'Festivals of the Sun and the Sun King. This 'concept' went through to the use of the 'sun symbol' in the charter for the conservation of festivals that was developed as part of the project.

Interesting aspect of this project was that it didn't intend to build an academic network as this already exists, but putting together communities, which is a more difficult challenge. However both can be complementary networks, and the academic world should have been more involved in the development and update of the festival database, which is a research activity.

Efficiency

The project was structured around a series of inter-country visits and seminars held in the host festival cities and attended by country officials and political (mayors) representatives. The meetings extended for three days and were considered very intensive by participants.

Problems were identified at the first EU regular audit. At this stage the project Financial Director was vested in CESTUD (Private Company) and the EU instructed that more resources should be directed towards tangible outputs. This was the rationale given for shifting the focus from meetings to the production of high quality compendium of festivals.

Functioning of the partnerships

The lead partner configuration included politicians + academics + scientific/technical people. In retrospect it was felt that a reciprocal structure in the MEDA countries would have been advantageous: the 'scientific/technical' component was missing in the MEDA countries. Because of

the shortfall the process of taking original research material, translating and editing it suffered.

The project succeeded in demonstrating that people from different cultures can work and function together. This was clearly illustrated in April 1999 at the First Arts and Crafts Atelier meeting that was organised for partner country artisans in Portugal. On this occasion the artisans spontaneously put together a 'fresco for peace.' They felt they had to leave something behind to symbolise their harmonious coming together. A Second Arts and Crafts Atelier was held in September 1999.

Note: in retrospect it was considered that it might have been better to select artisans with more commonality between skills to attend the Arts and Crafts Ateliers. But the Ateliers were successful in allowing cross-cultural relations to be developed.

Relations with EU MEDA team

At the early stages of project identification and conceptualisation, a MEDA team member very pro-active and remained supportive throughout the project lifecycle. Otherwise, once the project was underway, the relationship with the rest of the MEDA team became essentially an administrative and financial management / control / audit function.

Regular project study committee meetings were held and the results were reported back to the MEDA team and distributed to all partners.

Effectiveness

Fêtes du Soleil had two main different objectives: first, to exchange experience between the partner municipalities on traditional festivals organization and promotion; second, to create a databank on traditional festival in the Mediterranean. However the research was carried out by the partner organizations, which were not research institutions, and the quality of the results is very uneven. The database contains about 1000 traditional festivals, but most records have very poor information. Moreover the completion and the updating of the database were not foreseen by the project. The database is therefore not exploitable and is currently not online and therefore not accessible.

The research on Gozo festivals, however, has been used by the Gozo partner to improve awareness and to promote tourism. As a follow-on to the project Gozo has a new website under development and there is the intention to include the database along with related video clips.

Fêtes du Soleil was more successful in producing promotion tools for the festivals. Outputs included a high quality publication, a highly illustrated compendium of MEDA country festivals, a series of Working Papers authored by craftsmen and women on a particular topic related to their respective festivals and a video on the different partner festivals.

"Though the EU Fetes du Soleil publication was excellent, it was costly and as a result only 500 copies were printed (Gozo received 10 copies). To maximise access we have located the copies issued to us in principle academic and public libraries in Gozo and Malta. It would have been better if smaller less expensive collateral material had been produced that could have been reproduced at a reasonable cost and used for promotional purposes in a number of centres around the Mediterranean region. In this way, it might have established a reciprocal networking process"
Gozo participant

In retrospect it was considered that one of the most successful activities were the seminars on the application of arts and crafts in the festivals, and that it would have been worthwhile to carry out them more extensively. It was felt that this would have given more grass roots contact and enabled lessons to be shared that might have improved the material content of festivals.

There was no initial direct aim to build-in an awareness or educational dimension into the project; this came as a bi-product of the project. For Gozo the development of the project database acted as a catalyst to further research and its use academically and for tourism marketing.

At the macro level the concept of producing a 'Charte de Fetes' worked by unifying the partners under a common ideology by signing-up to a declaration of festival rights. This recognised the importance of safeguarding festivals against the challenges of modernity. The Charter was presented at the 1st Study Committee meeting in Dec. 1998. This was to be endorsed by UNESCO and given added legitimacy by been under-written by a Nobel Prize winner.

Impact and sustainability

In many ways, the project was an act of idealistic goodwill, a process of building bridges and delivering lasting good memories.

For Le Kef (Tunisia) involvement had raised the self-esteem of those involved in their festival and the level of awareness at the local/sub-regional level had been enhanced but increased sustainability as such would not seem to have been an outcome.

For Gozo the result was entirely different. Gozo from the very beginning perceived this as an opportunity to 'piggy-back' on the global significance of the Siena Palio. They saw this as a great opportunity to widen the market exposure and appeal of their festival(s). This strong appreciation of the commercial value of their festivals through enhanced marketing = increased tourist visitor numbers and, in turn, increased local economic benefits, gave clarity and a strong rationale for their involvement.

Gozo also gained a comprehensive understanding of EU project preparation processes. With this level of confidence they went on to take the lead in proposing the European Islands, Island Festivals project bid for funding under the EU Interreg 3C programme.

Gozo, as one of the Maltese Islands, has been on the threshold of membership to the EU and has a long and well-established tourism industry. Therefore, was well versed in how to secure and take positive advantage of such initiatives. Whereas Le Kef, though in a country that has a considerable tourism industry, it's influence is not so concentrated and significant as it is to Malta's economy and Le Kef has not had the benefit of been exposed to the processes of adjusting to becoming full members of the EU.

Conclusions

Fêtes du Soleil was a combination of two different projects that would have required two different kinds of partners.

On first it was a networking project linking several municipality organizing popular and traditional festivals in the Mediterranean. This network was aimed at exchanging experience on the organization and promotion of their own festival and at exchanging experience between the traditional craftsmen involved in the festival preparation. This was successful as far as festivals of the same typology were concerned. In the partnership in fact there were some festivals with a wide popular appeal such as Palio di Siena, the festivals of Gozo and the festival of Tomar (Portugal) and there were other more introspective, family-based festivals such as the one of Le Kef (Tunisia) and Beer Sheva (Israel). These two typologies of festivals had different objectives and expectations, and the project met the needs of the first type of projects.

The second "project" within Fêtes du Soleil was the research on Mediterranean traditional festivals, aimed at the creation of a database. This work was more appropriate for universities or research centers that for the actual project partners, and the results are insufficient.

IPAMED

Project Title: IPAMED - Cartographie Informatisée du Patrimoine

Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-03

Signature Grant contract: 29.08.1998

Original expiry Grant Contract: 29.08.2001 (project duration: 36 months)

Final expiry Grant Contract: 31.12.2003 (project duration: 64 months)

EU Grant: 1.120.000 Euro

Operational Plan. Initial: 06.11.1998

Nine six-month reports have been produced. The final report was not ready at the time of the evaluation because the project was still not finished.

Lead partner:

- Institut National du Patrimoine (INP) - Tunisia

Partners:

- Centre de recherche archéologique, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) - France
- Centro Ricerche Archeologiche e Scavi di Torino (CRAST) - Italy
- Direction du Patrimoine Culturel, Ministère de la Communication et de la Culture - Algeria
- Cultural Heritage Directorate, Ministry of Culture - Palestinian National Authority
- Centre National de Télédétection - Tunisia
- Ecole National des Ingénieurs de Tunis (ENIT) - Tunisia

The Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums of Syria signed a partnership agreement some months before the end of the project

Summary:

Objective of the project was to provide the Southern Mediterranean partners, and in particular Tunisia, with a GIS as planning and management tool for the inventorying and conservation of cultural heritage.

The project consisted in the development of:

- a GIS of part of the Tunisian territory, with a cultural heritage layer
- a computer archiving system software for heritage sites, monuments, and objects.

This involved training and design of digital maps.

Implementation of the project

The project was foreseen to be implemented in two phases. A preparatory phase to train a multidisciplinary team and to develop the project methodology and tools. A implementation phase to develop the GIS. The two phases had some months of overlapping. A third phase was added at the end of the project to a Computer Archiving System for cultural heritage.

1st phase (April 1999-December 2000)

The first phase was intended to:

- train a multidiplinary team on the GIS methodology applied to heritage;
- develop a "Spatial Information System";
- produce a test map;

The theoretical and practical training was therefore one of the main components of Ipamed. The training session have been held as follow.

1st session (May 1999) - 29 trainees.

Two main modules:

- 1) History of the lanscape and of the soil occupation in Tunisia;
- 2) Site survey and archaeological inventory;

2nd session (September 1999) - 23 trainees.

Four modules:

- 1) IT and GIS;
- 2) spatial data collection;
- 3) database;
- 4) graphic semiology;

3th session (June-July 2000) - 23 trainees.

This session was devoted to experiment the "Spatial Information System" and to the implementation of the test map (Bir M'Charga)

Those training sessions were attended by the same group of trainees, which were selected through public announcement. The trainee group was composed by archaeologists, architects, computer experts, topographs, geologists. The minimum required academic level was a BA Degree. They were almost all Tunisians, a part from one or two Algerians, Palestinians and Frenchs.

The trainers came from Tunisia (especially for the historical and archaeological topics) and from Italy and France (especially for the technical topics).

A part the above three training sessions implemented in the frame of the project, other trainings have been organised by the partners:

- Internal training at the Centre National de Télédetection (1-30 April 1999) for 6 trainees, on ARC VIEW software.
- training at the CRAST in Turin, Italy, (17 November-15 December 1999) for 7 trainees, on remote sensing;
- training at the CNRS in Valbonne, France, (10-16 December 2000) for 6 trainees, on the use of GPS.

2nd phase (August 2000-August 2002)

The second phase consisted in the implementation of the computerised cartography of selected areas at a scale of 1:25000, and of the GIS. The geomorphologic layers of the GIS were produced by the Centre de télédetection, while the heritage layer was produced by INP using some trainees, which were granted small contracts to collect data and carry out field surveys. During the implementation of this task the INP was constantly supported by the two european partners to improve the methodology of field survey, data collection and digitisation.

The project results were presented and disseminated in Tunis on 27 December 2001 and in Fréjus (France) on 25-26 January 2002.

3rd phase (September 2002-December 2003)

The third phase consisted in the development of the Computerised Archiving System (CAS).

In 1995-97 a World Bank project developed an electronic database of protected sites. However the database, realised by an Italian firm, was not satisfying for INP, because it didn't met INP expectations and because it was not designed as an updatable tool. It could be used mainly for

heritage promotion and not for management. This happened also because at that time INP was not aware of its own needs. IPAMED allowed INP to deal with new technologies, leaving enough time to get acquainted to them and to identify how new technologies could be used to meet their needs.

Two training sessions were organised in 2003, the first on GIS and the second on Computer Archiving System. Given that three years had passed from the previous training sessions, the selected trainees were different than the previous one. Palestinians couldn't participate to the 4th training session, and the Palestinian partner was not anymore interested in the project. The INP therefore proposed Syria to participate, and two Syrians attended the 5th training session.

This task ended with the development of the CAS software. The filling of the database with the sites, monuments, objects and documents fiches has not been done. This component will have a real impact if the CAS software will effectively be adopted as the official national computer archiving system for cultural heritage.

At the moment of the visit of the evaluation mission, there were some advisable expenses to be made for an external test for the CAS software and for the update of the hardware (in particular adding RAM) which runs the IPAMED software. In fact his hardware was acquired in 1999 and is now too slow.

The contract ended on 31 December 2003.

Relevance

Project identification

The project IPAMED was proposed by the Italian government at the suggestion of Prof. Gullini, of the "Centro Ricerche Archeologiche e Scavi di Torino per il Medio Oriente e l'Asia (C.R.A.S.T)" of the University of Turin.

The prime idea was that new technologies can be profitable also to the countries in the southern tier of the Mediterranean in the conservation and management of Cultural heritage, and that is necessary that they start to be acquainted to them. In particular the project idea focused on GIS technology. Prof. Gullini identified Tunisia as the southern country with the best conditions to successfully implement the project and take advantage from it, thanks to the organisation and efficiency of its administration. Moreover Tunisia is probably the only southern Mediterranean country where cartographic data are easily accessible, while in general they are considered of military interest.

The project was therefore proposed to the Tunisian authorities that agreed to be the lead institution for this project.

Project objective

Objective of the project was to provide the Southern Mediterranean partners, and in particular Tunisia, with a GIS as planning and management tool for the inventorying and conservation of cultural heritage.

The GIS would allow an understanding of the spatial organisation of cultural heritage and the relations between cultural heritage, geomorphology, environment and urban development. It would also permit to build a systematic acquisition and collection of data in place of random discoveries.

In European countries new technologies, and especially the GIS methodology, are widely used for the inventorying, planning and managing of cultural heritage. For instance they are the base for the "Risk map" methodology in Italy. At the time of the project identification, instead, the use of new technologies for cultural heritage was a quite new topic in Southern Mediterranean countries. The project objective was therefore relevant to the needs of INP.

The project objectives evolved during the course of the project, thanks to a better understanding of the potentialities of new technologies and of the needs of the beneficiary. The partners decided therefore to develop also a "Computer Archiving Software-CAS" (Gestion électronique des documents-GED) for cultural heritage, linked to the GIS. Computerised Archiving is now one of the main issue for the inventorying of cultural heritage in many countries in the Mediterranean.

Efficiency

The Partnership

Ipamed was the only Euromed Heritage I project led by an organisation of the southern tier of the Mediterranean. The partnership worked very well. However we must note that the configuration of the project was particular. The lead partner of the project was also the target of the project, the two EC partners were giving technical assistance to the lead partner and the other two Meda partners were "observing". Therefore there were no occasions of conflicting interests. In a way it can hardly be considered a regional project, because the only beneficiary was Tunisia. The Tunisian partner was conscious of this, and tried to involve other countries. However Algeria and Palestine had not the institutional possibility to fully participate and apply the project results to their own countries.

Project methodology

The methodology was defined in the course of the project by the direct beneficiary, INP, and its main partners; CNRS and CRAST.

Originally the scale chosen for the digital maps in the approved project document were 1:50 000 and 1:500. The first was chosen as the scale with which cover in the medium term all the Tunisian territory. The second was chosen for selected sites. At the beginning of the project however the small scale changed to 1:25.000, and this was the right choice, as it is the scale now chosen by GEONAT, the national project to produce a computerised cartography for the whole Tunisian territory. In the course of the project the scale of 1.500 was abandoned. Digital maps and GIS at this scale are used for the interpretation, planning and management of heritage sites, and have a sense if linked with the development of a management plan. IPAMED didn't deal with this issue.

The project had an important training component. This was due to the fact that at the time new technologies in Tunisia were still not applied to Cultural Heritage². It was therefore necessary to train a multidisciplinary group of young graduates able to work on computerised cartography (bibliographical research, site survey, representation of sites and monuments on the maps with lines and points, digitisation of data, data validation and correction etc.).

Some of the participants of the IPAMED training were therefore involved in the development of the GIS. INP tried to maintain contact with these trainees with small contracts for the field work. However it was not able to provide them with job perspectives sufficiently regular and reliable. The trainees participating to the first three sessions are therefore lost. None of the trainees of the first sessions participate to the last sessions.

Equipment

The equipment was bought at the beginning of the project was appropriate and included one server, four desktops, two laptops, one color laser printer, one A3 scanner, three UPS, one plotter, several softwares, including a GIS software. Now the hardware appears a little bit old to run heavy software such as the GIS and the CAS.

² Now the situation has changed. Several students of heritage sciences now make their thesis on GIS applied to Cultural Heritage. Moreover at the University of Tunis a BA in "Geomatics applied to heritage" has been launched, and archaeologists and architects that want to specialise can attend a master degree in Geomatics.

Reporting

The final report was not ready at the moment of the evaluation, because the project ended on the 31st December 2003. The six months reports lack a sufficient descriptive part of the evolution of the project, and is mainly a compilation of project documents such as minutes of project meetings.

Visibility

The Tunisian government is strictly controlling the Internet. All web sites of public institutions have to be approved by a special office of the Prime Ministry. Around June 2003 (only six months before the end of the project) INP has developed a website on IPAMED: This website at the end of the project was still not approved and therefore was not online.

Problems encountered

The delay in the payment of the first instalment delayed the beginning of the project. The contract signed 29 August 1998, and first instalment arrived on April 1999.

Considering that the budget was not entirely spent, the partners had decided to organise three workshops in Alger, Damascus and Tunis to discuss the use of GIS and computerised archiving in cultural heritage and to present the software produced by the project. These workshops could have benefited Algeria and Syria. In fact the partners in these countries have always been observers more than partners, and their directors seem to have not realised that they could benefit from a methodology and a software that have been developed by Ipamed and that could be useful in their work. Unfortunately these workshops could not be organised because of timing and because INP could not anticipate the needed sum. In fact these activities should have been financed with the last installment of 20 % that is given by the EC after the end of the project and has therefore to be anticipated by the beneficiary.

Effectiveness

Trained persons

Unfortunately no trainee attended the full training course. Moreover all trainees, especially those of the first phase of the project have found other job opportunities and are not anymore available for the INP in GIS and related field work. The exceptions are four trainees that attended the 4th and 5th sessions and that are now working in the urban planning project of the "Parc de la Malgaa" in Cartago. This is a project financed by the Italian cooperation and implemented with the assistance of the CRAFT of the prof. Gullini and of Arch. Paoletti, director of the "Parco dell'Appia Antica", whose urban planning methodology implies the implementation of a GIS. This GIS is developed on scale 1:500, and is used for the planning and management of a cultural heritage site. This is the occasion for the four persons trained by IPAMED to use the training received and complete it with the topics missing in the IPAMED training.

Computerised cartography and GIS

53 computerised maps 1:25.000 have been produced, of those 45 have been validated with field work. The areas to be mapped have been chosen together with the "Direction Aménagement du Territoire" on the basis of the foreseen infrastructures. As previously written no 1:500 maps were produced.

The basic GIS made by IPAMED includes six geomorphologic layers plus the heritage layer. Given the small scale, heritage sites and monuments are represented with points and lines.

Computerised Archiving Software (CAS)

The Computer Archiving software was developed in outsourcing with a constant participation of the INP computer expert, in order to ensure a satisfying result.

The software developed is a database that can be used for sites, monuments, objects and documents. It is linked to the GIS. From the digital maps it is therefore possible to research the monuments, objects and documents related to the site clicked.

A very important characteristic of the GIS/CAS software is that it has been designed to be accessible with a simple Web browser. This means that the navigation in the GIS/CAS software is very easy and can be done without buying the expensive GIS software. The CAS software is at the moment a empty database.

Impact and sustainability

IPAMED evolved together with a progressive increasing awareness within INP of the value of new technologies in heritage management. IPAMED allowed INP to be acquainted to new technologies and to develop an analysis of its own needs. Finally it provided INP with some archiving, planning and management tools. The GIS can have several use:

- for precise recording: determination of boundaries for cadastral registration plus, when linked to ground control survey database information, creates a precise geo-based/condition and annotated inventory.
- to define baseline conditions - monitor and manage change: enables the precise benchmarking of archaeological asset conditions at a particular location and point in time. Through regular time-series updating of information, changes in these conditions can be monitored and appropriate actions taken.
- for planning, site Management and training: a tool at assist site planning, development of effective actual and virtual visitor management schemes and for use in pedagogic/training and promotional activities.
- as a predictive tool: integrated with other disciplines e.g. climatology, geomorphology, and general environmental management, future impacts may be foreseen (satellite imagery filters etc.) and measures taken to mitigate against any negative impacts.
- for dissemination of lessons learnt: the digital nature of the information facilitates inter-regional comparative experiences to be shared;

The point is to verify if INP is using them. It is true that the small scale of 1:25,000 limits the use of the GIS. However the impression is that INP is currently not able to fully exploit its potentiality. It uses it mainly as a tool to give advises and make decisions concerning the approval of planned infrastructure projects. In fact it can see more easily if the planned infrastructure represents a threat for the heritage.

However the process leading to the command of new technologies is long and IPAMED had a great impact from this point of view. It is reasonable to expect that this experience will allow INP to start using GIS also for management purpose.

Concerning the Computer Archiving System, is still too early to evaluate the impact. In fact the software is ready and appropriate, however it has to be filled with all the data of heritage sites, monuments, objects and documents. What seems important is that INP has adopted the results of IPAMED as the official archiving policy for heritage in Tunisia.

However there is a absurd contradiction. As we have already written, one of the most important characteristics of the CAS/GIS software is its easy accessibility thanks to the fact that it is possible to navigate with a simple web browser. Every officer at INP could therefore have access to these data and tools through an internal net or through the internet for research or management purposes. However there is no LAN network in INP, and none is for the moment foreseen. Moreover only the director has an internet access. This is a main point because the reason is not the cost of feasibility of such LAN net (it could have been done thought the IPAMED project and funds) but it seems to be a mindful policy of the INP management.

IPAMED has also some non planned but still important impacts. Apparently INP is now one of the few institutions to possess such computerised cartography, which is now requested by the Ministère of Equipment et Aménagement du Territoire and Regional and by Municipal Councils ask now for those maps. This increase the negotiation capacity of INP to intervene in the urban planning process.

Now there is a national project to produce a computerised cartography (fonds cartographique numérisé général) for the whole territory of Tunisia (GEONAT). The chosen scale is the same of IPAMED 1:25,000. This will allow INP to negotiate with the GEONAT office the use for free of the whole set of maps in exchange of the maps it has already produced.

Conclusions

Like happened with the all project proposals, the idea came from a European partner. The project however was directly managed by the target organisation, INP, which was also the lead partner. The project was an important occasion to strengthen INP, which got acquainted with new technologies applied to cultural heritage management and developed its own strategy. In fact in the course of the project the INP developed a discussion that led to the decision to develop a new archiving policy based on an electronic archiving system linked to the GIS, which was then developed by the project.

The fact that the direct beneficiary institution was also the lead partner of the project was therefore essential for its effectiveness and sustainability. This kind of project has a sense only if it has an impact on the national strategy of cultural heritage management, and therefore is must be owned by the responsible national institution.

The relative success of the project depends on different factors:

- the recipient: INP is an autonomous structure well organised and with a strategic view;
- the direct responsibility of the beneficiary. This allowed a direct control on the expected results and activities and a project rhythm suitable to understand their needs and adapt the project to them. Timing is an important success factor.
- a good partnership. The two main partners were the CRAFT and the Archaeological Center of the CNRS in France. The involved people of those two institutions had many years of experience and a very good knowledge of heritage issues in North African and Middle Eastern countries. Moreover they acted as "technical assistance" to INP. In fact the project emerge as a Tunisian project with technical assistance from Italy and France and with some few countries observing the development of the project. Its relevance, however, seems questionable in view of the multilateral character of Euromed Heritage.
- the Tunisian project team as well as the involved team of the partner organisation didn't change during the duration of the project, except the official project coordinator who was by default the director of INP.

We conclude however underlying the fact that INP has no internal LAN net, which make useless the best characteristic of the Computersied Archiving System, which is the possibility to be accessed through a simple web browser, and therefore, potentially, by all INP staff.

Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb

Project Title : Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb

Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-05

Signature Grant contract: 26.08.1998

Original Expiry Grant Contract: 25.08.2001 (36 months)

Final Expiry Grant contract : 31.12.2001

EU Grant: 2,611,035 Euros

Lead partner: ICCROM International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property

Partners:

- **Algeria**/ Direction du Patrimoine Culturel du Ministère de la Communication et de la Culture
- **Algeria**/Agence Nationale d'Archéologie et de Protections des Sites et Monuments Historiques (ANAPSMH)
- **Morocco**/Direction du Patrimoine Culturel du Ministère des Affaires Culturelles du Maroc
- **Morocco**/Institut National des Sciences de l'Archéologie et du Patrimoine (INSAP)
- **Tunisia**/Institut National du Patrimoine (INP)
- **Tunisia**/Agence de Mise en Valeur du Patrimoine et de Promotion Culturelle (AMVPPC)
- **Tunisia**/Ecole Nationale d'Architecture et d'Urbanisme (ENAU)
- **Egypt**/RITSEC – Regional Information Technology and Software Engineering Center (silent partner)
- **Belgium**/Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
- **France**/Ministère de la Culture - C.E.S.H.C.M.A.(Centre d'Etudes Supérieures d'Histoire et de Conservation des Monuments Anciens)
- **France**/Ecole d'Avignon – Centre de Formation à la Réhabilitation du Patrimoine Architectural
- **Italy**/University of Torino - C.R.A.S.T – Centro Recherche Archeologica e Scavi di Torino per il Medio Oriente e l'Asia
- **Italy**/Istituto Centrale per il Restauro (ICR)
- **Italy**/Associazione INNOVA
- **Spain**/Escuela de Estudios Arabes
- **International**/UNESCO

Project summary

Project objective:

to strengthen the human resources involved in the tangible heritage conservation and management in the Maghreb countries.

Main activities:

1. Seminar COREMA (conservateurs et restaurateurs du Maghreb), Sep-Nov 1998 ;
2. "Cours de Tunis" d'études supérieures spécialisées en architecture du patrimoine (Oct 1998-July 2000) ;
3. "Cours d'Alger" de conservation des biens archéologiques (Jan 2000-July 2001) ;

4. "Cours de Rabat" de conservation des collections de musées (Feb 2000-July 2001) ;

Project origins

The "Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb" is the second phase of the already existing: "Programme de Soutien de la Conservation du Patrimoine Culturel en Afrique du Nord et Moyens Orient (NAMEC)". The NAMEC programme was developed during the '90 at the initiative of the Institut National du Patrimoine (INP), the institution responsible for the conservation of cultural heritage in Tunisia. Considering the lack of specialised conservation architects and of the relative training opportunities in Tunisia, INP decided to organise itself a postgraduate course for conservation architects. To this aim the INP asked the support of ICCROM for the design of the training course, the identification of suitable professors and the research of the necessary funds. Given its multilateral character, ICCROM involved the other Maghreb countries: Algeria and Morocco.

The Italian government financed preliminary meetings among Maghreb partners and ICCROM, aimed at discussing different topics related to the conservation of cultural heritage in the Maghreb in order to promote mutual collaboration and regional exchanges. These meetings resulted in the decision to organise the "Diplôme d'Etudes supérieures Spécialisées (DESS³) en Architecture du Patrimoine"⁴ as regional course.

In June 1993 this training course was officially acknowledged by the Ministers of Culture of the "Union du Maghreb Arabe (UMA)" and started on October 1994, with Tunisian and Algerian students and a very small participation from Morocco and Mauritania. The course was financed by the Italian Cooperation, (Direzione Generale per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo), the French government (Ministère de la Culture), the Getty Grant Programme and the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO.

A second session of the "Cours de Tunis" started in 1996. In the meanwhile the Algerian and Moroccan partners of the NAMEC Programme proposed the organisation of other regional training courses on the conservation of movable heritage to be held in Alger and Rabat.

ICCROM and its partners therefore designed a project called "Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb", which included a third session of the "Cours du Tunis" (on conservation architecture), a "Cours d'Alger" on the conservation of archaeological objects and a "Cours de Rabat" on the conservation of museum collections. This project was proposed and selected during the identification process of Euromed Heritage I.

Project implementation

The grant contract was signed on August 1998. First activity was a three-month training called COREMA (Conservateurs et Restaurateurs du Maghreb), held between September and November 1998. Objective of COREMA was to provide participants with a basic education on conservation principles as baseline for the Cours d'Alger and Cours de Rabat.

The "Cours de Tunis" on Conservation Architecture started on October 1998 and ended on July 2000. The main topics of the Cours de Tunis were the following:

Rudiments of management	6 %
Interpretation of Cultural Heritage and History	11 %
Building analysis and diagnostics	28 %
Restoration techniques	17 %

³ equivalent to a Master.

⁴ also called "Cours de Tunis".

Protection et safeguard of historical human settlements	33 %
Computer sciences	5 %

The Cours de Tunis proposed a technical/practical and a theoretical/scientific teaching, based on two workshops (ateliers) on i) building conservation and restoration; ii) Historical human settlements. The course focused on the implementation of restoration projects and on the supervision of works (78 %) with a relatively limited historical analysis (11%) and some rudiments of management and computer science (6% et 5 %).

The Cours d'Alger and the Cours de Rabat took place parallelly, between January 2000 and July 2001. These courses were at their first session, and must be considered as pilot courses.

Each of these courses was attended by 15 trainees (5 Tunisians, 5 Moroccans, 5 Algerians).

Objective of the Cours de Rabat or "Cours de conservation-restauration de collection de musée", was to train professionals able to manage the conservation of museum collections, i.e. :

- monitor and evaluate the state of preservation of museum collections;
- design conservation schemes;
- carry out simple conservation/restoration activities;
- organise the management and presentation of museum collections.

Objective of the Cours d'Alger or "Cours de conservation-restauration des biens archéologiques" was to train professionals able to manage the conservation of archaeological finds, i.e. :

- evaluate the state of preservation of archeological finds;
- design conservation schemes;
- carry out simple conservation/restoration activities;
- manage conservation/restoration laboratories;

The training course included conferences, seminars, visits to sites and practical training. The main topics of the Cours de Rabat and of the Cours d'Alger were the following:

	Cours de Rabat	Cour d'Alger
Law	5 %	9 %
History	9 %	8 %
Deterioration factors	8 %	8 %
Conservation techniques	36 %	24 %
Risk factors and monitoring of the preservation state	12 %	14 %
Practical activities (site visits, handling of objects etc.)	12 %	25 %
Computer science	8 %	0 %
Other	10 %	12 %

Relevance

The "Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb" aimed to improve the human resources involved in the conservation and management of the tangible cultural heritage of Maghreb countries.

The "Cours de Tunis" course aimed at training conservation architects. The course was identified on the basis of a training needs assessment of INP, which identified a lack of conservation architects within its staff. However the lack of architects specialised in the conservation and restoration of historical buildings or urban areas is patent in all three Maghreb countries, both in the public than in

the private sector. The "Cours de Tunis" is therefore relevant to the needs of the immovable Maghreb heritage.

In the case of the conservation of movable heritage, the question of the professional profiles to be trained is more complex. In fact the conservation and management of the movable heritage is a huge issue. The point is to identify which are the professional profiles required and for which positions, and then which training to organise. This, however, requires a human resources policy that the beneficiary institutions didn't have.

The Cours d'Alger and Cours de Rabat didn't train specialised professionals such as restorers, heritage managers or curators. They rather offered a "multidisciplinary" training with principles of conservation, legal context, preventive conservation, rudiments of restoration, management and awareness raising. However in the absence of a sound human resource policy this seems an appropriate choice. In fact the participants will be able to profit of their training experience in all the positions where they will be employed.

Efficiency

Project management

The project management was centralized by the Lead partner, who appointed a Programme Coordinator. A management unit has been established for each training courses (Tunis, Alger and Rabat). This management unit was composed by one training director, one assistant and one accountant. The Lead partner contracted directly the local staff responsible for the management of the training course, offering extremely high salaries. The staff was officially selected by the Lead Partner, but in actual facts generally chosen by the national partners. The Lead partner had always the final say because it managed directly the budget.

Budget

The management of the budget was entirely centralized by the Lead partner that, being an international organization, had complex and slow financial procedures.

The budget had too detailed budget lines, which hampered a necessary flexible use of it.

Partnership relations

The Lead partner was ICCROM, an international organization specialized in conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage. Meda partners were the national organization of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco responsible for the cultural heritage in their own countries, and therefore the main target institutions of the training courses. The EC partners were specialized institutions, whose main contribution was to provide trainers.

Many meetings involving all partners have been organized to define the objectives, training programmes and practicalities of the training courses. It was, however, always the Lead Partner to make the necessary preparatory work that was then discussed during the meetings.

The relations between the lead partner and the Meda partners were very different. Moroccan and Algerian partner had a rather passive attitude, accepting and executing the decisions of the Lead Partner, while the Tunisian partner demonstrated a great sense of ownership that, in certain cases resulted in some disagreements with the centralization of the project management. As a result of the different level of involvement, the evaluation team found that the Moroccan partner was considering the "Cours de Rabat " as an ICCROM course, while the Tunisian partner was considering the "Cours de Tunis" as an INP course.

Organisation of the training course

The training courses were generally well structured and the trainers were generally of high level. It would have been useful, however, that they would have been more informed about the overall training programme, to better focus their lectures and avoid repetitions.

The training course of Alger and Rabat had at the beginning some organization and logistic problems as well as some problems concerning the planning of the first lectures. Practical works were considered too limited by trainees, and have been carried in the laboratories of other institutions because the foreseen educational laboratories have not been set up. The second year has been much better organised, even if the need to make up for lost time and the preparation of the final thesis overworked the trainees. In Rabat and Alger the contacts between EC and Meda trainers were limited.

The "Cours de Tunis" was at its third session and had therefore a training methodology already tested.

Selection of students

Cours de Tunis

25 trainees attended the Cours de Tunis.

12 were Tunisians (4 INP architects, 3 architect of other public institutions and 5 private).

11 were Algerians (all private except 2 civil servants)

3 were Moroccan (2 civil servants and one private)

In Tunisia the call for candidatures for the Cours de Tunis was made public by INP through some newspapers and by informing potentially interested public institutions and universities. All architects of INP, which didn't attend the previous sessions of the Cours de Tunis were asked to attend it. The other Tunisian participants were selected on the basis of a motivation letter and of a graphic dossier demonstrating the interest of the candidate.

The Algerian and Moroccan partners, however, didn't show interest in the Cours de Tunis. They neither coordinated the selection of candidates for the Cours de Tunis nor sent their own architects. Algerians and Moroccans candidate discovered by chance this opportunity and made an application directly to INP.

Cours de Rabat et d'Alger

Each training course was designed for 15 trainees: 5 for each Maghreb country.

The Management Unit of each training course in representation of the Meda partners organized the selection at the national level. This was done with a call for candidatures and an evaluation of applications.

Scholarships

Scholarship have been given to all trainees of the Cours de Rabat and of the Cours d'Alger, even to the trainees that maintained their own salary.

In the Cours de Tunis, however, only foreign trainees received a scholarship. This created problems to some private Tunisian architects, which had not sources of income.

Diploma

The diploma foreseen for these courses was a "Diplome d'Etudes Supérieures Spécialisées (DESS), equivalent to a Master Degree. Only the Cours de Tunis, however, was able to deliver it, because the Cours d'Alger and the Cours de Rabat started too late the discussions with universities qualified to deliver such diplomas. Trainees,, to their disappointment, received only a certificate from ICCROM. There are some chances that the problem could be solved in the case of the Cours d'Alger.

Effectiveness

Improvement of the human resources involved in heritage conservation

The trainees of the Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb are now professionals prepared to work in the heritage conservation field. They have acquired a theoretical knowledge on the concept of cultural heritage, on the conservation principles, on the diagnostics of the preservation state of objects/structures, and are able to identify and plan the necessary intervention.

They are prepared to be the architect responsible of a restoration project (Cours de Tunis). They are prepared to be the public officer responsible of the conservation of a museum or of an archaeological site, without anyway being able to act as a restorer. (Cours de Rabat et Alger).

Institutionalization of the training courses

The Cours de Tunis has been institutionalized, and a fourth session has been organised. This was funded through the balance of Euromed Heritage I funds, however it would have been financed anyway by INP, which consider it important for its

The cours de Rabat et d'Alger, ended the first session without the responsible institutions having created the conditions for further sessions. The first reason is the low level of ownership of the Moroccan and Algerian institutions if compared with the Tunisian INP. The second reason is that the continuation of the project has neither been planned during the design nor during the implementation of the training courses.

Moreover current costs of the training course were too high (in particular salaries) while the investments necessary for future sessions have not been foreseen. To ensure the sustainability of the project, the management structure of each training course should have been composed by professionals provided by the national partners and therefore paid on the basis of local standards.

Impact

The impact of the project is very important in Tunisia, in particular as far as the Cours de Tunis is concerned. In fact all INP architects have been trained by this training course, and it is therefore possible to affirm that the INP capacity in conservation architecture derives almost entirely by the course. Another impact indicator of the institutional strengthening is the fact that now INP is able to organize by itself a training course of this complexity.

The Cours de Tunis has an impact also on the private sector. In fact it trained also some private architects that have now more chances to get public contracts to carry out restoration works.

On the contrary the Algerian and Moroccan institutions are not exploiting the new skills. During the implementation of the courses and immediately after, these institutions (with the exception of ANAPSMH with the Cours d'Alger) didn't take into consideration the competencies acquired by the trainees. The situation, however, seems to have improved. The trainees complained and some of them forced their way through.

The project had however not a significant impact at the level of an increased regional cooperation. It seems that no new collaboration initiatives has been organized between the three Maghreb heritage institutions. In fact even during the implementation of the project the collaboration between them was quite limited and it was the Lead partner that was often acting as mediator between them.

Finally the Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb was the occasion for the Maghreb heritage institutions to collaborate with EC specialised institutions and professionals, which resulted in some new collaboration initiatives.

Sustainability

The project outcomes likely to have a positive impact after the project are:

- the skills acquired by the participants to the training;
- the use of these acquired skills in the beneficiary institutions (only in Tunisia);
- the experience gained by the institutions in participating to a regional project (especially in Tunisia);
- the new partnerships with European institutions (especially in Algeria and Tunisia);
- the institutionalization of the course in Tunisia.

MANUMED

Project Title : MANUMED– Sauvegarde et conservation preventive des manuscrits du Proche- Orient Méditerranéen

Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-15

Signature Grant contract: 05.08.1998

Original Expiry Grant Contract: 05.08.2001 (3 years)

Final Expiry Grant contract : 31/08.2003 (extended)

EU Grant: 1,284,625 Euro

Lead partner: Centre de Conservation du Livre (CCL), France

Partners:

- **Algeria**/ Université d’Alger Institut de Bibliothéconomie
- **Cyprus**/ The Cyprus Development Bank
- **Egypt**/ RITSEC – Regional Information Technology and Software Engineering Center
- **Jordan**/ Yarmouk University Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
- **Jordan**/ Ministry of Finance Department of Lands and Survey – Archiving and documentation
- **Lebanon**/ MAISON D’ANTIOCHE
- **Morocco**/ Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines
- **Syria**/ AL-BAATH UNIVERSITY Faculty of Arts and Humanities
- **Spain**/ Universitat de Barcelona - Institut del Proxim Orient Antic
- **Greece**/ National Book Center of Greece
- **Sweden**/ The Royal Library National Library of Sweden

Project Summary

Creating an inventory of smaller libraries in North Africa and the Near East, as well as training in document conservation.

Project description

Project Identification

The project idea stemmed from a cooperative project between the Centre de Conservation du Livre (CCL) and Greek monasteries in Patmos, which was funded by Objective 1 funds and Raphael funds in Mistra and Athos. Monasteries in Lebanon subsequently contacted Mr. Ipert who went to Brussels for advice. He was told about a MEDA culture project.

Initially only ministries were informed about the possibility of a MEDA culture project.

“For civil society to be involved, information flows need to be expanded beyond ministries of culture. Otherwise public institutions are in a monopoly situation “.

Comment from Lead Partner

The project focused on religious libraries and the 1998 proposal was aimed at religious libraries in the Middle East. The EC suggested broadening the content and the geographic area, so small libraries, particularly those outside the capital city, and Maghreb partners of Algeria and Morocco were added.

Budget

The project budget was not adequate to meet all project expenses as the project itself expanded during implementation to provide more training and more services. "Most of the experts sent were not paid a salary, only their expenses were paid." In order to cover other costs such as equipment, some of the per diem allowances were used.

The Lead Partner estimated that about 50% of the budget went to South Mediterranean countries.

Implementation of the project

According to the Lead Partner, "The project was based on no previous assessments although it responded to country needs. For example the Algerians identified one of subprojects and Berber manuscripts were included in Morocco".

Because of the regional character of the project, it was decided to organize by areas of expertise with an emphasis on south/south exchanges, for example, in the area of information technology. This was perhaps more difficult to organize, but there was more south –south cooperation than in other projects, for example Algeria and Syria. The experience of the project was that Meda partners are "not used to working together, are mistrustful, and don't like it (Turkey/Cyprus, Algeria/Morocco). Also the prevailing bi-lateralism of assistance creates a distortion. There is a dominant role of French or Italian cooperation.

This meant however that a strong lead was needed to motivate the partners, and also implied staffing costs. In fact these additional staff costs were subsidized by the region of Marseilles.

The project evolved throughout its lifetime, and in some respects the fact that there were no call for proposals gave them the flexibility to do so. For examples, the project in its later stages put efforts into creating "Centres de Ressources" (Beirut, Algiers, Jordan etc). The Jordan center has not been made operational.

Project Results:

- Regional meeting : Algeria, Cyprus, Lebanon , with a lot of professional participating to the meetings.
- Training on site of many technicians for conservation, digitalization, inventory, philological description, paleography, etc.
- Pilot projects for "Lebanon National Library" and "Palestinian Virtual Library."
- Publications : Sinai Arabic manuscripts, Aleppo Library inventory
- Regional resources centres established in Lebanon, Algeria, Jordan (not operational)

Selected materials produced by the project:

- www.manumed.org a multialphabetic inventory system for manuscripts
- Publication of inventories (sent to the Commission in June 2002 for authorisation of publication): Sinai Arabic manuscripts, Aleppo Grec-Catholic Manuscripts, Oriental Library manuscripts (Lebanon) ,
- Travelling exhibition on calligraphy and alphabetic variety of Mediterranean languages

Objectives

The project identified five key objectives:

- 1.Cooperation between professionals (librarians and archivist)and specially south to south cooperations;
- 2.Developing multialphabetic-NTIC support for professionals;
- 3.Training of local technicians;
- 4.Library inventories and philological research;
- 5.Publication of catalogues and others documentations on Mediterranean libraries

As the project evolved the importance of manuscripts and archives for contemporary life became increasingly evident. Manuscripts now kept in Jordan in the Ministry of Lands are an important source for the history of Palestine and land ownership. Manuscripts and archives are the basis for urban history and for the history of science. In Alexandria, the National Library has begun a children's education programme aimed at bringing children into contact with historical manuscripts.

Relevance

The project was the only Euromed Heritage project to focus on manuscripts and archives. These are a very important aspect of cultural heritage in the Mediterranean region, and are under threat from inadequate storage. Equally important, these historic records document the nature of Mediterranean exchange and dialogue between cultures for many centuries. They inform present day views of multi-culturalism and the coexistence of different cultures and religions in the region.

The specialized professional training provided was also highly relevant and was then utilized by the trainees in their respective libraries and archives. Twenty courses were given, with up to 300 participants in all. Training, however, demands tailoring to the circumstances on the ground and an understanding of the system of transmission. The European model of highly specialized and long duration courses (5 years) is not practical in a Meda setting, yet short term training may not be of much value. There is a need for training of technicians as in Algeria and of trainers.

Target groups

The target audience was librarians for small libraries. This became enlarged to archives and other collections. In the case of Lebanon assistance was given to the National Library as there has been no functioning national library after the war. In Jordan small assistance in the form of equipment was given to the Ministry of Finance, Lands and Surveying.

Partner selection

Since there was no call for proposals, it was up to the Lead Partners to find other partners. The partners were found largely through the CCL's existing network. The Cyprus partner was found through a colleague, the Egyptian on the Internet as they needed a new technologies element, and in Lebanon the Maison d'Antioche was a known NGO dealing with Christian cultural heritage.

The Lead Partner also went to the countries to meet with potential partners, and selected them. Some were outside the original list. Manumed was the only project to reject partners. Were rejected the partners that were involved in too many other projects (Egypt, Morocco) and could devote enough energy to each one. Manumed had partners in countries which were not listed (Turkey, Palestinian Authority, Tunisia, Israel and Malta) but had actions in five countries. There was some instability in partners, due to the need to find an appropriate technical partner (Cyprus).

The composition of the project included universities (Algeria, Jordan, Morocco, Syria, Spain); ministries (Sweden); Institutes (Lebanon, Egypt, Greece); and the private sector (Cyprus).

Efficiency

Project Management

The responsibilities for project management rested with the CCL. They took care of project design, control and contracting. At the outset in 1998, the CCL had a staff of 12, of which between 2 and 3 worked on Manumed. Later there was a cut in budget and the full time accountant was reduced to half time.

They maintained the ability to change partners in the event of non-performance. From the beginning they carried out smaller projects with other partners in the same country to create competition. In their view, “the capacity of organization of ministries and public authorities” is a key factor in the effective of projects.

Overall some 50 % of the Lead Partner’s time was spend on EU related matters, 20% on the project and 30% on coordination, the media and raising awareness of Manumed within the professional community including libraries, archives, private foundations and international organizations.

Decision making

Although the project was centralized, it was flexible and allowed for the project to evolve over the life span of the project. This included efforts to leverage funds from private sources, the Region, UNESCO and others. Small grants for local activities were also introduced.

Meetings were held every six months. After two years of the project, partners came individually to Arles for meetings and meetings were held in country. This was found to be more efficient than larger meetings such as the ones held in Rhodes, Damascus, and Hildesheim but this did not promote the regional aspect of the project. Partners also met among themselves.

Communications were carried out by mail, fax, Email (this was difficult in Algeria and Syria). There was an intensive exchange of communication throughout the project’s life.

The project produced a total of 9 reports (the final report is in process). These were short reports documenting project activities.

The Lead Partner felt that their efficiency was compromised by the EC. They commented that “the EC did not respect dates” which made it difficult and the projects then followed its own dates. The changes in EC internal procedures in regard to administration and finance also meant changes. Moreover the CCL did not feel that the formats for reports to the EU were appropriate.

Partner relations

Relations with MEDA partners were generally good. “They are proud of Manumed and took ownership (Lebanon, Algeria, Cyprus)”

<p><i>“They received finance and official recognition, both of which are lacking in their own country”</i> Comment from Lead Partner</p>
--

“Countries wanted to have changes in partnership within countries, for example to have a university as a partner.” There were also some political arrangements suggested by the Commission, i.e. Syria would participate in Manumed and Israel in Corpus.

The Lead Partner found the universities to be efficient. They also have useful networks that were more up to date. The universities were happy to participate and had the time and students as well. It was good for students. Working with NGOs is also important as it tends to reduce the political risk inherent in working with Ministries.

They found that partners were generally quite proactive, for example “The partners took initiative in order to get funds.”

EC partners. EC partners had students that participated in the project. For example Spanish students were sent to Aleppo for three summers to work in libraries. They produced useful reports. However there was no real exchange of know how with local people.

The Region of Marseilles has shown its commitment to the work of Manumed with a continuous stream of funding.

The Lead Partner was not convinced about the value of large meetings, “There was an idea of connection and relation among project consortia, but in fact it was a sort of ‘incest’ as all members were members of other projects.” “It would better to cancel large meetings as they are too costly and a waste of time since they are self-congratulatory.” In contrast, meeting between Project Leaders would have been helpful

Another important comment was that the lack of sector knowledge resulted in overlaps and duplication, for example ICCROM did a paper course in Algeria. “The Commission was unclear about boundaries.”

EC interactions

The EC provided a financial audit (a priori) after a few months of work, for accounts. Advice was given from the EC office and staff who left a written report on financial and administrative matters. A second visit took place after two years.

The CCL was very critical of the assistance provided by the MEDA team. For example for the question of bank guarantee they stated that they were only partially helpful "although they were acting for the EC, and all contact was to be through them, there was difficulty in having responses from them and they demonstrated disinterest in the projects and reports".

“What was needed was technical assistance: guidance on procedures, guidance for budget, help for customs formalities, help for obtaining visas, and legal advice for preparation of contracts between partners. In the last case, we provided more assistance to them than they to us. What was needed was a Project Implementation Handbook.”

Lead Partner

Thus the relation of confidence necessary between project and the EU was not satisfactory and from the point of view of the Lead Partner there was a lack of expertise in the EU itself. For example, on the questions of reporting, there was a feeling that no one reads them so why waste time.

Effectiveness

Objective achievements

The project surpassed its original targets. It provided 20 courses for specialized and professional training, in which between 200-300 people participated. Training was aimed at practitioners such as librarians and technicians. It also gave first aid advice on preventive conservation to owners of libraries (Algeria, Cyprus). A third activity was grants to students for field visits.

The project supported expert missions to provide advice on standards and practical matters related to conservation of libraries and books. This also included provision of equipment and materials.

Training was the second major objective of the project. This training covered such subjects as models of description for inventories, methodologies for management, and advice on other subjects. The CCL believed that short training had no real sense but long training is expensive and runs of risk of investing in people who do not use the training for the purpose intended. In the MEDA countries, the cultural orientation that does not recognize or place value on handwork is a special obstacle. Also the European standard of a five year course may not be suited to local needs, for example in Lebanon where the idea of a two year course was put forward but later rejected. Solutions were found in various ways. In Lebanon trainees were selected among technicians who were to follow the whole course of 5-6 modules. In Algeria the training was also for technicians. The Lead Partner concluded that training of trainers as a system of transmission needs more understanding.

Lebanon was a success story. The National Library was in boxes and in a very poor condition. Manumed disinfected the books with the assistance of a local private company and trained its employees. This company, which was an agricultural company, now also assists libraries. The library was scanned using the first page of the volumes. The Ministry has now taken up the work that is ongoing. The Region of Marseilles continues to provide a small help (providing labels). There is also another EU project to build national libraries through bilateral cooperation which has been established.

The project financed expert visits and courses as well as physical conservation

The Lead Partner noted that a EU label was important in many of the Meda countries as a form of recognition.

Outreach

The project audience was reached, and in some cases extended to owners of libraries. The exhibition and catalogue as well as media coverage expanded the audience considerably. In countries such as Algeria and Morocco the outreach was quite remarkable, with owners of private libraries and their extended families taking part in activities.

Impacts

In a number of countries clear impacts can be identified. In Lebanon, staff was trained and now work in 5 or 6 libraries. The Maison d'Antioche has set up a consultancy in conservation and a small workshop. In Syria, Cyprus and Lebanon they purchased equipment, conservation boxes and other materials. In Cyprus they trained monastery staff who now work for other private institutions.

In Algeria the project became part of the "sustainable development" effort. Manuscripts are owned by families. Associations of families are supported by local authorities, an idea of Manumed with the University of Algiers. Manumed held 4-5 courses for families. They were very interested and passionate about their collections. They made inventories and small salaries were given to the children of families to do so. Funds were also used for emergency roofing and showcases and other small things."

Sustainability

The three-year time horizon for the project was short, and finding funding to continue activities was necessary. The main elements of sustainability are related to the training of staff who are now using this new knowledge in their own libraries (Lebanon); the process of inventorying that was begun in Algeria; equipment and supplies that are promoting good conservation (Syria, Cyprus, Lebanon); and development of new consultancy services by those trained in the project (Cyprus, Lebanon).

The sustainability of the project was enhanced by activities to increase awareness of the importance of manuscripts and private libraries. An additional 80,000 euros was provided by the EU for media coverage. During the project it was realized that newspaper and television coverage would increase the impact of the project. A freelance journalist has been hired to travel to the project sites and write illustrated articles about the project.

Demand for assistance continues from other libraries, for example the library of Aleppo. “They have proposed new activities which indicates a level of confidence.” Also in Lebanon a private library has requested assistance and is now open to the public. The experience gained by CCL has also been applied in Mali. There is a continuing demand for assistance from libraries in such countries as Algeria, Syria and Lebanon. Nevertheless, the three-year time horizon means that there is a need to think of funding for the future.

Other results/spin offs. The EU label of the project was useful for protection and official recognition in several MEDA countries, including Turkey, Syria and Jerusalem.

There are some intangible impacts, such as project participants who have now developed their own businesses related to manuscript conservation.

A catalogue published by the Institut du Monde Arabe and an exhibition were a direct and unexpected result of the project. The exhibit in Paris attracted considerable attention and audience.

An unexpected outcome is the Lead Partner’s role in the Tempus Project.

Manumed’s conservation assistance to the Balaman manuscript in Lebanon, the oldest Arabic Christian illuminated manuscript, exemplifies the meaning of the Barcelona Declaration. An expert group made up of individuals from five to six countries went to Lebanon and provided training. Not only was the text written in Arabic but it contains the story of Buddha. The project was organized on the basis of regional activities so that south-south cooperation was encouraged.

Conclusions

The importance of Manumed lies in its complementarity and pluridisciplinarity. It demonstrates how manuscripts can be used, and why their conservation is needed. For example in Cairo, an exhibition was held of scientific manuscripts illustrating tools. It was the only Euromed Heritage project to address the issue of manuscript and archive conservation, and followed internationally accepted good practice in concentrating on preventive conservation. It also demonstrated how urgent is the need to conserve these exceptional records of a regional heritage, many of which are at risk due to poor storage conditions and many of which are still unknown to a wider audience. The project evolved during implementation as needs and opportunities became clearer.

It was one of the few projects to be composed of partners beyond ministries and it reached out to civil society by including universities, institutes and the private sector. It is also important as south-south relationships were established.

Lessons learned in Manumed include the following:

- For publishing, it is essential to involve the private sector;
- As a result of the project, south/south collaboration is more acceptable;
- Southern expertise is also more recognized.

Suggestions for Euromed Heritage (from the Lead partner)

Call for proposals

- Simplify procedures as it is too long and expensive. Institute a two-step screening with Step 1 to select the ideas and Step 2 to submit a detailed proposal.
- Do not set a budget minimum. The EC should provide a list of indicative costs per type for items such as conferences, training. They should see if the costs for large budgets are justified
- Chose projects that are interesting for the MEDA countries

Partners

- Limit the number of national government institutions that participate
- Encourage the participation of universities
- Prohibit the coordinating role to international organizations and ministries
- Raise the participation of civil society partners to 50%
- Have NGO's take the Lead Partner role

Procedures should be clear and rigorous with appropriate budgets

- Budgets should have ceilings for certain types of expenditure
- Introduce a better administrative support for procedures such as customs, visas etc.
- Provide assistance to project head
- Control the budget for unjustified expenses and limit the percent of salaries
- Emphasis on results and their verification
- Set up incentives to create commercially viable services (such as a minimum percent for sales and services)

Actions

- Allow flexibility and modifications
- Integrate monitoring
- Ensure operations that are south/south and south/north
- Require status reports and audits

ISLAMIC ART IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

Museum with No Frontiers - Islamic Art in the Mediterranean – Exhibition trails
OING MSF – Austria
project duration: 06.08.98 - 31.03.01
budget: 1.604.460 Euro
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Algeria/ Ministère de la Communication et de la Culture, Direction du Patrimoine Culturel ▪ Cyprus/ Ministry of Communications and Works – Department of Antiquities ▪ Egypt/ RITSEC – Regional Information Technology and Software ▪ Egypt/ Ministry of Culture ▪ Israel/ Mishkenot Sha’ananim Jerusalem ▪ Jordan/ Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities, Department of Antiquities ▪ Jordan/ Ministry of Culture – Directorate of Cultural Exchanges ▪ Morocco/ Ministère de l’enseignement supérieur, de la recherche scientifique et de la culture – Direction du Patrimoine Culturel (DPC) ▪ Palestinian Authority/ Palestinian Ministry of Culture Directorate of Cultural Heritage ▪ Tunisia/ Institut National du Patrimoine – Ministère de la Culture ▪ Turkey/ EGE University ▪ Spain/ Ministerio de Educación y Cultura Dirección General des Bellas Artes y Bienes Culturales ▪ Finland/ National Museum of Finland ▪ Italy/ Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali Ufficio Centrale Beni A.A.A.S. ▪ Italy/ Association INNOVA ▪ Portugal/ Institut Portugais du Patrimoins Centra Nacional de Cultura Direçao-general do Turismo, PITC ▪ Sweden/ Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities, Medelhavsmuseet
Project summary: Creation of exhibition trails and catalogues focusing on Islamic art and architecture in the Mediterranean region.

Project Description

Objectives

The project articulated five main objectives:

1. Create a context that allows all the countries to present their history and cultural heritage from their own perspective and point of view.
2. Raise awareness of Islamic art and culture as an integral part of the Euro-Mediterranean identity and facilitate sharing of knowledge about Islamic art and architecture.
3. Involve local public and private partners in the project implementation in each country to promote local support.
4. Make the results of the project visible and accessible for the large public through a partnership with the private sector.
5. Make it possible for the local population in each country to identify their (Islamic) cultural heritage as a source for economic and social development .

Expected results

- Regional cooperation: Establishment of a regional network of experts, scholars, public organisations as well as private sector participants.

- Public / private cooperation: Co-operation between public entities in the participating countries and the private sector such as private publishers in the production and distribution of the exhibition catalogues as well as the investment of private sponsors in the production and installation of the signposting..
- Capacity building: Experts from the participating authorities and organisations were selected and trained in the field to act as Production Managers (technical co-ordinators) for the project in their countries.
- Publishing by local scholars: Production of cultural guides (the exhibition catalogues) by local experts targeting the international audience, thus presenting national culture in an authentic way.
- Awareness: Promotion and awareness raising about the Islamic art, and about the common roots, history and culture among the countries of the Mediterranean

MSF is a “platform for each country to define its own history from its own perspective while participating in regional a joint venture.” It allowed local experts to work without outside interference.

MSF is based on the Tyrolean exhibition trail experience, but has been tailored to suit the Mediterranean reality. The attempt has been to create a “corporate identity” for the project, and this means a standardized product for each of the countries.

Origins

1994 marked the launch of Musées sans Frontières (MSF), originally based in Austria. Its first project was on Gothic Art and was based on the earlier experience of using exhibitions and the concept of exhibition trails that do not involve transporting works of art to communicate history and spark local development. The idea to promote this experience in the Mediterranean was discussed with representatives of the Tunisian government and with the Barcelona Process.

Initial funding from the Tyrolean government proved essential in maintaining momentum, and in 1997 training was given to young people from some seven Mediterranean countries to prepare exhibition trails. Significantly 90% of these individuals are still collaborating with MSF.

When the contract was finally signed in end 1997, nearly 50% of the original project had been done. This allowed a redesign and extension of the project beyond Tunisia and Morocco to include Spain and Portugal. The concept of printed catalogues was also added to the project outputs.

Budget

The original budget includes: 1) a launch event in Stockholm to create commitment among the partners and 2) press conferences in the respective countries to raise awareness and to attract private sector support. Only basic office costs were paid under the grant. Funds for coordination and communication were not provided in the budget. There was no budget for dissemination of results. The project coordinator estimates that some 90% of funds went to the MEDA countries.

In order to fulfill the objectives of the project, the partners were asked to find funding for specific activities, such as signs. In some cases this meant that they went to private sector sponsors for support.

Overall the project promoted the “philosophy of marketable products,” namely high quality handbooks and signage.

Relevance

Islamic art and architecture and the connection between Islamic and European culture are little known in the EC. This project set out to demonstrate the regional aspect of Islamic art, whether in Portugal or Turkey. Through the creation of exhibition trails and catalogues focusing on Islamic art and architecture in the Mediterranean region, the project aimed to raise awareness of Islamic art and culture as an integral part of Euro-Mediterranean identity and greater sharing of knowledge about Islamic art and architecture.

The Spanish Ministry of Culture financed a 10-day scientific committee meeting for Islamic art experts to prepare ideas for projects. This allowed the content structure of the exhibition trails to be agreed. In addition EU funding from its tourism department helped finance further content development for Tunisia and Morocco. A good deal of south-south exchange was promoted by the project, for example between Morocco and Tunisia.

Furthermore the project involved civil society, not only government officials.

Target groups

They include: experts in Islamic art; educators, tourists to the region; people interested in museums and the more general public. Books were distributed to libraries. Later journalists were targeted. The target groups were reached either through the walking itineraries or the guidebooks. The public launches also attracted attention. The guidebooks are produced in several European languages, and some are being translated into Arabic.

Partner selection

The Lead Partner is an international NGO, Musées Sans Frontières, initially based in Austria and then in Madrid. It has a five member Board. Organisations from Spain, Portugal and Italy are associated but are not funded through Euromed Heritage I. They have access to Interreg and transboundary cooperation funding. In Italy the European Social Fund has provided assistance to train people without job possibilities, namely in Sicily where cultural tourism is a new avenue for job creation. MSF approached different national partners to participate in the project. Nine Meda countries are partners, several of which have more than one organization participating. Spain and Portugal were also active partners.

Efficiency

Project Management

The project was tightly organized, with a dynamic Lead Partner. MSF took responsibility for communications, contracts, budget, timing, interface with the EC, and overall project management. They also established the project methodology and took the lead on quality control. MSF was instrumental in contacting publishers and arranging for the publication of the various books. MSF was committed to sticking to the agreed time schedule as far as possible.

Each country had a three member scientific committee to supervise the project.

Operations and organization

Each national partner appointed a national committee and chose researchers and scholars to research, select and write up the itineraries. For the most part, they were well known scholars. The technical aspects of production were handled by a production coordinator in each country. They were usually young professionals, and were very active. The production managers played a key role in the realization of the project, and were able to learn from each other through joint meetings. Each of these local coordinators had the same budget.

Internal communications were very well organized, with distribution lists and reports written on a bi-weekly basis by the national coordinators. This resulted in a “virtual office” with everyone working together.

MSF also maintained a complete project archive with all correspondence, press releases and articles.

Decision making

For the project as a whole, decisions were made by MSF. At the national level, the national committees made the decisions about which sites to include on the itinerary and the content of the guidebook. The scientific content was 100% determined by the national teams. They also decided on the placement of signs.

Partner relations

Meda partners were generally satisfied with the project management and appreciated the meetings of the production advisers. One participant noted that within the project close relationships developed and a strong network was built. The participants also indicated pride in the guidebooks, which they saw very much as a joint effort. There were two countries that were replaced due to lack of involvement/non performance: Israel and Algeria. The Lead Partner noted that there was a range of results among the national partners, particularly in regard to the integration on the itineraries into the tourist offer. Delays in payment were difficult for all participants as well as for the Lead Partner.

Effectiveness

Objective achievements

MSF was well viewed by the participants because of its tangible results. MSF went beyond its original objective to produce a set of nine texts, each translated into at least three languages (English, French) and some into German and Spanish. This was not foreseen in the original proposal. In fact MSF convinced the private sector to produce and distribute the guidebooks.

These guidebooks focus on one specific aspect/period of the national heritage. They demonstrated a very good scientific level but are probably too detailed for normal tourists. Because they are published in several European languages, they can contribute to promoting Euromediterranean cultural heritage among tourists interested to deepen their knowledge on the local history and heritage. Unfortunately they are difficult to find in the countries (Turkey, Egypt, Jordan and Morocco, for example)

In addition to the publications, the project also produced signage to accompany the itineraries. This signage was paid for by the host country. The signs, however, did not include sufficient information about the site itself to really add to the visitor experience and no information on how to reach the next stop of the itinerary. For more detailed information the visitor needs the accompanying guidebook. Ideally the signposts should also have provided detailed information about the site, so that everybody with or without book can learn about the heritage in front of them.

The project demonstrated strong capacity building though its focus on practical skills such as photography, writing of press releases, preparing press conferences etc. A number of the production advisers have gone on to responsible positions. The project chose young graduates for production advisers and trained them to carry out an international project. Training thus was not a component of the project but a byproduct.

There is also some indication of increased awareness as a result of MSF, for example articles written in Le Monde etc.

Outreach

Beyond an academic and tourist audience, the project also interacted with municipal officials. The project also encouraged cooperation between ministries, such as tourism and culture in a number of the countries.

The initial project did not include a budget for dissemination but later in the life of the project the Lead Partner realized that greater visibility was needed. The catalogues are capable of reaching a large audience, for example each of the publishers has included the catalogues in its own sales brochure. Complementary copies were distributed to libraries, and experts in the region. The publishers have shown the books at major book fairs attended by thousands of people, such as the Frankfurt Book Fair. Press conferences were held in all Meda countries to mark the launch of the guidebook.

To be noted is the interest taken by travel agencies that are utilizing the travel itineraries defined in the project.

Selected materials produced by Project

- Inauguration of an Exhibition Trail in the Palestinian Authority, in Egypt, Israel, Jordan Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey as well as transfer of the acquired experience to the partners in Algeria and Cyprus.
- CD-ROM presentation of the project in two languages
- Catalogues in at least two languages.
- First issue of the MWNF Magazine in English, Spanish, Italian and French.

Impact and sustainability

The catalogues continue to be sold and new editions are being printed. Signage is in place and is being replaced as needed, at the discretion of the host country as in the case of Jordan which has improved the quality of materials used to increase longevity.

MSF persuaded publishers to publish the catalogues and distribute them, without EC subsidies. Electa and Edisud are among the publishers. There are some 15 associated publishers, including German language publishing houses. Attendance at book fairs is provided through publishers, for example Frankfurt Book Fair.

The project did not finance infrastructure, so its impact on actual tourist itineraries is quite weak. However in some countries, such as Morocco, it has helped spur investment in regional museums that were identified in the MSF work.

Another important impact relates to the learning that took place in producing a high quality publication. All the illustrations in the books were made by local people, as was the text.

MSF attempted to transfer commitment from individuals to institutions in order to create a climate in which responsibility is assumed and impact is maximized. They commented that the secret is young people, thus their choice of young production coordinators.

Conclusions

MSF represents an original idea of open museums and itineraries to showcase the Islamic art and architecture of the Mediterranean region. There is a strong regional dimension in the project, and important realization of the commonality of cultural expression based acknowledging Islamic civilization as part of European history. The scientific committees set up in each country played an

important role in determining content as well as giving experience of working to a well-developed methodology.

The project brought to the attention of both local and regional audiences aspects of Islamic art and architecture that were little known. It was an opportunity for Meda countries to deepen their knowledge of their culture and identity beyond the prevailing and often undifferentiated view. It also brought a certain degree of awareness of the value of Islamic heritage in countries, such as Egypt, where this has been largely overshadowed by the Pharaonic heritage. The countries were invited to present their history from their point of view, and this provided a basis of dialogue.

At the time of the project conception, in the late 1990s, the idea of Mediterranean cooperation was very strong. “This does not exist any longer and it is more difficult to get funding for regional projects.”

Comments from the Lead Partner relate to project timing and feedback, namely that the EC should stick to the schedule. Delays in payment on the part of the EC created hardships.

PISA

P.I.S.A. (Programmation Intégrée dans les Sites Archéologiques)
IMED – Italy
Budget: 3.210.037 Euros
Project duration: 02.09.98 - 01.03.02
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Algeria/ Ministère de la Communication et de la Culture-Direction du Patrimoine Culturel▪ Israel/ Israel Antiquities Authority - Conservation Department▪ Morocco/ Ministère des Affaires Culturelles INSAP▪ Palestinian Authority/ Culture Directorate of Cultural Heritage▪ Tunisia/ Institut National du Patrimoine – Ministère de la Culture▪ Germany/ Romisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Forschungsinstitut für Vor- und Frühgeschichte/Mainz▪ France/ Centre archéologique du Mont-Beuvray▪ Greece/ Ministry of Culture▪ Italy/ Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali Ufficio centrale Beni ambientali e paesaggistici▪ INT./ FEMP (Fondation Européenne des Métiers du Patrimoine)
Project summary: New approaches to the conservation and management of archaeological sites including integration with the local economy

Project description

Project objectives

- Comparison of the different experiences of selected European and Mediterranean countries in the field of preservation of archaeological sites.
- Introduction of integrated planning for the archaeological sites in policies, interventions, culture and practises of governments, institutions, of economic and social actors and of the public opinion of the countries involved.
- Contribution to the awareness process of Mediterranean partner countries' (MPCs') populations, of the cultural and economic values of the cultural and particularly archaeological heritage.
- Involvement of governments and of institutions of the Member States in important programmes of enhancement of the MPCs' archaeological sites.

Expected Results

- Collection of information and analysis on the integrated planning of the archaeological sites and on specific aspects of the sites' conservation/management/enhancement.
- Identification of common actions for better conservation, management and enhancement of the sites, linked to local sustainable development also through the know-how transfer of the best integrated planning practises and certain aspects of the sites' conservation/management/ enhancement.
- Identification of the main reform and modification factors to be introduced in policies and regulations for integrated planning in archaeological sites and experimentation through case studies, in the five partner countries.

- Involvement in the five Meda partner countries, of the institutions concerned and of the social and economic actors, mainly at local level, in the enhancement of cultural and of sustainable development factors linked to the archaeological sites; and the private sector.
- Dissemination of knowledge and best practices of integrated planning in the archaeological sites, to institutions, civil society of the Meda countries and of the EU and public in the five Meda countries concerned.

Relevance

Origins

The origins of the project date from 1997 when a new law was enacted in Italy giving more autonomy to archaeological sites for their management. Pompeii is the prime example in Italy of this new model of management. The Ministry of Culture was interested to replicate this experience elsewhere and had previous experience of EC programmes under the Raphael Programme. IMED, with its competence in trans-national cooperation was invited to participate in Euromed Heritage, although originally they had another project in mind.

Design

The project design was based on sharing experience and developing suitable models so as to integrate archaeological site management with regional policies. The project was not based on any formal needs assessment. The design allowed for evolution of thinking and practical application. It followed a rigorous process, with provision for ongoing monitoring and evaluation, written reports (published) and a series of meetings at different scale, from national working groups to plenary meetings.

Objectives

At the institutional level the aim was to introduce new ideas of archaeological site management for policy makers. There was also a recognition that in the Maghreb there was a need to work on the legal framework for management.

It is the only project to be related to specific sites, with pilot sites chosen in each of the participating countries.

Programme Relevance

The programme addresses an important Mediterranean wide issue, which is archaeological site management that will be of benefit to local populations. This issue is very acute in many Meda countries where sites are deteriorating due to lack of surveillance and disinterest by local authorities. The PISA project is the only Euromed Heritage I project that brings together researchers, archaeological site managers, local government, civil society and the private sector. It recognizes that archaeological site management is multidisciplinary and concerns not only archaeologists, but also local governments, civil society and the private sector.

Partner selection

Partners were chosen based on the personal knowledge of the then Minister of Culture, Alessandra Melucco. She was responsible for the external relations of the Ministry and had forged important ties with other Mediterranean countries. In the course of the Programme identification, however, other Meda national heritage ministries/agencies expressed their interest to participate and were included in the partnership. IMED was told at the preliminary Euromed Heritage meetings to restrict the number of participants to ten. For the MEDA countries each was represented by the Ministry of Culture or a central agency: Israel (Israel Antiquities Authority), Morocco (INSAP), and Tunisia (Institut National du Patrimoine). Greece and Italy were also represented by Ministries of Culture. Germany, in contrast, was represented by the Romish-Germanisches Zentralmuseums,

Forschungsinstitut für Vor-und Frühgeschichte (Mainz) and France by the Centre archéologique du Mont-Beuvray.

PISA had a trans-national partner, the Council of Europe (through the Fondation Européenne des Métiers du Patrimoine (FEMP)).

Target groups

The target groups of the PISA training were heterogeneous and consisted of archaeological site managers, architects, planners and university teachers. The trainees were generally early mid career with management responsibility for sites. The countries forwarded CVs to IMED according to defined criteria, and IMED checked their profile.

Efficiency

Operations and organization

IMED was the Lead Partner and project coordinator. It took responsibility for the project budget and reporting as well as monitoring. The project administration was centralized, and required huge efforts from the Lead Partner.

PISA was informed by a Scientific Committee that helped guide the project from its outset to completion. The Scientific Committee was determined by IMED. The Scientific coordination was needed to create the same tools for all research groups and to increase the coherence between groups.

In addition to the project Scientific Committee, each participating country had a national coordinator and a local team. The local team carried out research for the case studies and field-testing. Seminars were conducted for local actors and meetings at the national level to strengthen the vertical link and raise awareness, share theoretical results and practical findings. The Committee was made up of one or more expert per country. The first phase was to create a methodology that was well designed and rich to be applied to different countries, sites and institutions. The resulting matrix was complex and detailed.

The new methodology was then field-tested. For each case study there was a research team made up of staff and a coordinator. For the implementation and fieldwork, interaction between the scientific team and administration of the site was needed.

There were also thematic working groups, which were international. At the beginning and end of the project larger conferences were held, with some 195 participants (roughly 10 per country), to present and discuss the results. Thematic groups worked on “laboratories”: planned maintenance and management of sites; vulnerability of sites; standards of conservation and security of sites; problems and methods of presentation and interpretation; enhancement of sites and economic development.

Decision making

The project started from a common agreement on methodology, followed by field-testing. The project is characterized by adjustments in methodology, research activities and involvement and linkage among research teams and partner representatives. It is one of the most participatory of all Euromed Heritage I projects. Decisions on budgets, however, were taken by IMED.

Other procedures

PISA carried out a program of continuous assessment by monitoring the participant groups. Evaluations were undertaken on the occasion of specific events, such as workshops. Questionnaires were prepared for events. This internal evaluation then allowed a comparison with initial objectives and results.

PISA found the Meda team to play “an important role in the orientation and re-orientation” of the project and judged them to be very useful.

Partner relations

The stated aim was to develop “a participatory” methodology. Cohesion was promoted by face-to-face meetings, as for example in workshops attended by up to 50 participants. Some events were organized in Meda countries, for example the launch for research activities. Visa restrictions however made it impossible to hold activities in some of the other partner countries.

The EC partners were responsible for the Thematic Laboratories. The “idea is of transfer, starting from accumulating relevant experience.” The Laboratories began with a framework and preliminary discussions, and then all were involved. Because of logistical considerations, meetings were held in the EC countries.

Selected Materials produced by Project

- 1) Initial Seminar of the P.I.S.A. project: i. Preparatory materials, ii. Meeting's minutes
- 2) Research-action on the Integrated Approach in the Archaeological Sites:
 - Methodological schemes and tools to guide the research-action implementation
 - Preparatory documents discussed at the Initial Seminar of the Research-Action
 - List of participants to the Initial Seminar of the Research-Action
 - Nine case studies: Pompei in Italy, Tharros in Italy, Bibracte in France, Pella in Greece, Cherchel in Algeria, Jericho in the Palestinian Territories, Caesarea Maritima in Israel, Lixus in Morocco, Dougga in Tunisia
 - Final version of the Regional Comparative Report on the Integrated Approach in the Archaeological Sites
 - Preparatory documents, texts of interventions and list of participants of the the Final Seminar of the Research-Action
- 3) Thematic laboratories: Final Reports of the Five Thematic Laboratories on the following themes:
 - Planned maintenance in the conservation and management of the archaeological sites
 - Vulnerability of the archaeological sites (Italian project partner)
 - Standards of conservation and security of the archaeological sites
 - Problems and methods of presentation and interpretation of the archaeological sites
 - Enhancement of the archaeological sites and local development
 - Preparatory documents, texts of interventions, list of participants of the five Workshops:
- 4) Preparatory Actions for the Implementation of the Five Pilot Projctes in the MPCs:
 - Presentation forms of the field experimentations in the 5 MPCs archaeological sites
 - Executive projects of the field experimentations in the 5 MPCs archaeological sites
 - Results and products of the field experimentations in the 5 MPCs archaeological sites
 - Preparatory documents, minutes and list of participants of local seminars for the decision-makers and the actors in the 5 MPCs Countries (Plans, publications, raising-awareness and training actions, multimedia products, replicas and moulages, etc.).
 - Preparatory materials, texts of the interventions, list of trainers and trainees, Final trainees Reports of the Training Course on the Integrated and Planned management of the archaeological sites
 - Five Pilot Projects for the MPCs countries archaeological sites:
- 5) Final Seminar of the P.I.S.A. project: i. Preparatory materials, ii. Texts of interventions. iii Euro-Mediterranean Charter on the Integrated Enhancement of Cultural Heritage
- 6) Dissemination activities :

- Leaflet on the Project
- Newsletter (Nr. 1-11)
- Project web site (www.pisanet.org)
- Video on the Project
- DVD-Rom on the Project
- Book on the Projects results
- Press and Radio-TV releases on the occasion of all Projects' events
- Articles and reports for the specialised press and scientific and cultural dissemination

7) Project coordination: i. Minutes of Steering Committee and Coordinators Group meetings, ii. Semestrial and Final Reports to EC, iii. Reports of monitoring and internal evaluation

Effectiveness

Objective achievements

PISA produced a series of very high quality publications that document the project and can be used as reference material for the different aspect of site management. It also created a website.

An objective that became evident later in the project was governance related to cultural heritage, in this case archaeological sites. It aimed at local involvement in archaeological site management.

Field visits and discussions with Meda partners suggest that impact on sites was less pronounced, with only Israel actively applying the lessons learned. In Algeria, a foundation was laid for a more integrated approach to site management.

Outreach

At the national level the project involved universities, research centre, ministries. At the local level it involved local government, civil society through NGOs and associations, and the private sector through businesses and trade unions.

PISA made considerable efforts to reach beyond the archaeological profession. It produced and commissioned articles in the media about PISA, had a web site and at the country level had meetings in which a range of stakeholders was invited.

Impact

The strongest impact was on the 3-5 participants per country. They were archaeologists, architects, planners, and university professors. PISA gave them an opportunity to develop a new methodology and field test it. They worked as part of an international project team over a period of more than three years, and shared their experiences with other country teams. Some also took part in the thematic groups. The innovation of the PISA project is the link between cultural enhancement and economic development. This is a cross sectoral effort that involves site managers, local government, and craftsmen. The creation of informal networks, motivated by the interest of partners in exchange of experience was an important result. This allowed partners to share their experience and problems,

Israel was very active in the project and used and tested the model on other sites. "They changed their policy as a result." Concretely, the cooperation between natural parks and the cultural sector was initiated due to the common approach introduced by PISA. In Tunisia the PISA programme seems to have contributed to new activities at the Dougga site, financed by bi-lateral donors. In other Meda countries the direct impact is much more difficult to determine. However, the participants are very much convinced of the value of the integrated approach.

In Italy there is a demand for material by MA students. Also the material is used for training courses for public administration.

Sustainability

Factors of sustainability that have been set up by the Lead Partner are:

- the creation of a cohesive group;
- the creation of a commonly agreed research framework;

Many aspects of the project are continuing under Delta, funded under Euromed Heritage II. Delta activities provide continuity for many of the research groups, such as the Israeli. In Israel this has resulted in university seminars and meetings for government employees. The research framework has been validated and accepted by participants. The web site is ongoing.

Other results/spin offs

An intangible achievement has been the communication and links established between Israeli and Palestinian experts. “They help each other, for such things as obtaining restoration materials, applying for visas etc.” This has extended to friendships at a personal level.

The creation of an informal network among participants is one of the spin offs from PISA. The training component of the project, in which up to 30 people were put together, has resulted in a common experience and strong ties.

Materials prepared by PISA are being used in university course in Algeria. The project approach has been taken up in other projects, setting up a sort of chain. For Morocco, the initial work at the site of Lixus on the north coast led to a program on maritime routes which is funded under the MEDOC program of Interreg 3B. However, as structural funds cannot be spent outside of the EC, Morocco is excluded from direct funding. As a result of the PISA experience, there has been an attempt to initiate a project through Interreg 3B in the Balkans. In Tunisia the site of Dougga has been chosen for financing by the French as well as the Japanese. PISA was used to develop complementary themes such as the handicraft sector linked with site management,

In Italy there is an increased interest in integrated projects, for example by the Ministry of Economy in less developed regions and the use of public resources for cultural heritage support. In two out of six regions (Sicily and Campania) there are substantial results with funding devoted to cultural heritage development as a focus of integrated territorial enhancement. The increase in demand from visitors is higher than the national average and the impact on marketing activities through joint marketing is also stronger. A PISA participant is now responsible for activities in Campania financed by structural funds.

There is also evidence of influence in countries outside the network, such as Andalusia in Spain that has joined the Delta network.

Conclusions

PISA, the largest Euromed Heritage I project, was an innovative project that attempted to link archaeological site conservation and management with local economic development. It was a multidisciplinary project that expanded the institutional canvas beyond the Ministry of Culture to local government. The project was tightly organized with an active Scientific Committee, country teams, and thematic groups. PISA was successful as it was a collective effort.

The concept of “valorization” of cultural heritage, not only conservation – was pioneered at the regional level. Cultural heritage was tested as a lever for socio-economic development. The link with local development and territory, that is the indigenous, was also elaborated. PISA and other projects

showed the importance of enhancement of heritage, “mise en valeur.” It also demonstrated the need for training and for knowledge of heritage for those responsible for the sites.

PISA is also of interest because it is one of the few Euromed Heritage I projects that carried out monitoring and evaluation and used the results to improve the project. Participants were asked their views on meetings and reports were written on the specific activities as well as on the overall project.

Recommendations by the Lead Partner include: produce guide for implementation; avoid delays by EC in payment as they cause severe problems; and seek mechanisms to insert integrated planning projects into bi-lateral aid. It also noted that there is little cross-fertilization between regional programs and core business of EC, which are national programs

RIAS - International Network of Marine Archeology

Project Title: RIAS - Forum Euro-Méditerranéen d'Archéologie Maritime (FEMAM)

Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-04

Signature grant contract: 28.10.1998

Expiry Grant Contract: 30.10.2000 (24 months)

EU Grant: €285.379

Lead partner:

- Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports of Spain, Directorate General for Fines Arts and Cultural Assets

MEDA Partners:

- Algeria, Ministry of Communication and Culture
- Cyprus, Ministry of Communication and Labour
- Egypt, Ministry of Culture
- Israel, Israel Antiquities Authority
- Malta, Ministry of Education and National Culture
- Morocco, Institut National des Sciences et de l'Archéologie (INSAP)
- Tunisia, Institut National du Patrimoine (INP)
- Turkey, Ministry of Culture

EU Partners:

- France: Ministry of Culture - Dép des Antiquités Subaquatique
- Greece, Ministry of Culture
- Ireland, Ministry of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands
- Italy, Ministry of Cultural Activities and Assets
- Portugal, Instituto Português do Arqueologia

Summary:

The project aimed at establishing co-operation between the Mediterranean countries for the preservation and the research in the underwater archaeological heritage.

The project was intended to encourage and increase contacts and exchanges between researchers, professors and students from the EU and the Mediterranean countries.

Project implementation

Identification process

Following the Bologna conference in 1996, the Minister of Education and Culture of Spain asked the director of the Museo Maritimo in Cartagena, Mr. Ivan de Neguerela, to identify a regional project. Upon receipt of the outline from de Neguerela, the Spanish Ministry of Education and Culture decided to develop it into a more comprehensive project document. This project was presented during the launching meeting of the Euromed Heritage I programme in September 1996 in Brussels, and collected a majority consensus.

RIAS lead partner waited two years before signing the grant contract in October 1998, during which they got contradictory information whenever they solicited the EC about the project start. The first funds came through in April 1999.

Project implementation

RIAS project was designed to be implemented in two phases: a preparatory and an implementation phase. The first phase was aimed at: i) setting up the network and cooperation framework for Euromediterranean cooperation in marine archaeology ii) developing the structure of training courses for underwater archaeologists.

The second phase was to establish a Center for Euromediterranean Marine Archaeology and to implement the training courses for underwater archaeologists and other common activities.

Euromed Heritage I was financing only the first phase.

The RIAS project ran from October 1998 – October 2000. Upon signing of the contract, the project established an Executive Committee and a Scientific Committee. The Executive Committee was made up of representatives of participating countries and involved mostly representatives of the various Ministries of Culture. The Executive Committee was set up not only to oversee the implementation and management of the project but also to work on the development and implementation of appropriate legislation in the participating countries.

The Scientific Committee was made up of representatives of scientific institutions of the participating countries in the area of marine archaeology – museums, universities or research institutes. This Committee was supposed to draw up a plan of action for the two-year project period, and develop the summer course programmes as well as study research projects submitted by the project partners.

The main project activities were the organization and implementation of a total of three meetings of the Scientific and Executive Committees. The first was the "Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Marine Archeology", which was held in Murcia, Spain, 17-20 May 1999. The conference gathered policy-makers of all partner countries and aimed at creating a consensus among them about the project objectives and at receiving a preliminary political acknowledgement.

On December 5th, 1999, a second meeting was held in Tunis, which gathered the scientific committee. Minutes of the first meetings in Murcia were adopted and the platform again elaborated on the idea of setting up a training centre and best ways to preserve underwater archeology in the Mediterranean. Representatives of Greece and Portugal, however, were in disagreement with the project methodology.

A third meeting was organized in Cartagena on 18-20 February. At the start of the meeting, the participants received a message from the Spanish Ministry of Education that the Project Director, Mr. de Neguerela, was removed from the project as of immediately. Later on, this proved to have a big impact on the continuation of the network.

During the last meeting in Cartagena the project partners, left without coordinator, organized a working group to develop an outline for a training programme on marine archaeology that could be implemented by a other marine archeology centres. During the following months the working group developed a detailed programme for intensive training of underwater archaeologists. This programme could be used by any group who wants to implement such courses. It appears, however, that the outline of this programme has not been distributed outside the scientific committee.

Relevance

Project objectives

The general objective of the RIAS was:

- To protect the marine archaeological heritage of the Mediterranean;

Specific objectives:

- to promote contacts and exchanges between researchers, teachers, students, managers and civil servants of the countries of the EU and those of the Associated Mediterranean Countries to bring together their experience in the field of underwater archaeology;
- design training courses for marine archaeologists of the Mediterranean countries;
- establish common strategies and common activities;
- establish a Mediterranean center in Cartagena that would coordinate the above activities;

Relevance of the field (Marine archaeology)

In most of the MEDA countries marine archaeology has not been developed very much. Although the MEDA countries possess important treasures in their coastal waters, they often lack the capacity and resources to safeguard their underwater heritage. In many cases teams from abroad come and dive up treasures, sometimes in coordination with the local authorities but in many cases these excavations are mainly for their own benefit.

The RIAS project intended to change this situation by exchange of knowledge and experiences between the countries on both sides of the Mediterranean. The main idea was that if local capacity within the MEDA countries were developed, these countries would be in a much better position to safeguard their own cultural heritage.

So far, underwater archaeology has received little attention in most of the MEDA countries, mainly due to a lack of resources and qualified people. By creating a platform on underwater archaeology all these issues could be brought under the attention of not only local researchers but also of decision makers.

Appropriateness of the project objectives and of the chosen methodology

The project was intended to develop a Euromediterranean network of marine archaeologists to discuss and adopt a common strategy in the field of marine archaeology and to establish in Cartagena a regional centre for marine archaeology. Some partners, however, were in disagreement over this idea.

The project was too ambitious. Establishing a permanent structure should have been an action to develop in a second phase, after carrying out common activities and verifying the functioning of the partnership. It should have been the possible development of a common strategy, and not its precondition. A pragmatic approach such as training small core groups of marine archaeologists in an exchange programme would have been more effective.

Target audience

The target audiences of the project were underwater archeologists, researchers, teachers, manager, students, and civil servants in the MEDA countries as well as Ministries who should work on the protection of marine archeology. The general public would only become a target group in a successive (never implemented) phase.

Researchers and higher civil servants were quite involved in the project. However, due to the fact that no training was implemented, teachers and students did not benefit of this project.

Selection of partners

At the time the project was developed, the Spanish Ministry did not have any project partner in mind. After the meeting of 1996, the lead partner wrote letters to all other Ministries of Culture in the MEDA region as well as to the EU countries with the question who wanted to join the project. Fourteen countries reacted and all became project partners. Also Ireland showed interest and joined the project. All partners were public entities, generally Ministries of Culture or public heritage institutions.

Efficiency

Functioning of partnership

The project showed an active participation by all European and Meda partners. The members of the Executive and Scientific Committees were generally marine archaeologists, and discussions were quite passionate. The Lead Partner had a leading role but a number of project partners were active in bringing up ideas and suggestions. Some divergence, however occurred, as some European partners, mainly Portuguese and Greeks, felt that the lead partner was centralizing the decision-making and were in disagreement over the idea of establishing a regional center in Cartagena.

Most of the communication was done by phone or e-mail, either in English or in French. However, when the original project director was replaced by the Lead Partner, the new project directors were not able to communicate in anything else than Spanish. This obviously greatly hampered the implementation of the last phase of the project. In this last phase the lead partner limited itself to a mere administrative coordination and some partners took the lead and decided to develop the programme of a training course, which resulted the main achievement of the project.

Decision making process

All decisions in this project had to be approved by the Executive Committee, in which each project partner had a representative. However, as the Project Director was responsible for the day-to-day management of the project, some of the project partners found the lead partner had too much power and influence in the network and even started to lobby for shifting more responsibilities to other countries.

Project outcomes

A first outcome was the agreement of all project partners about the relevance of protecting underwater cultural heritage. It is however not clear how the different partners are now elaborating on this general agreement.

The main physical output of the project was the publication of the proceeding of the first conference of 17-20 May 1999. The book proved to be useful as it contains details about the different legislation on marine archaeology from the participating Mediterranean countries. The book was published at the end of the project, about one year after the conference took place. Translation into Arabic presented many problems of quality and delayed the production process for months. This project though is one of the few projects that also produced their final output in Arabic.

The final output is a detailed model for a course to train future underwater archaeologists. This model was only developed towards the end of the project and has not been discussed with all project partners. Due to the fact that there has been no second phase of the RIAS project, the training course model has never been implemented or tested.

The replacement of the project director by the Lead Partner (due to political reasons within the lead partner organization) at a very critical moment had a very negative impact on the implementation of the project. Due to his replacement by only Spanish speaking staff (2 individuals) from the Ministry, a follow-up proposal for funding of the second phase was not prepared and communication with project partners was severely compromised.

Effectiveness

The project was designed in two phases, based on an assumption of follow-up funding, but only one phase has been implemented. The main objective of this phase was not achieved. This objective was to establish a platform for common actions in the field of marine archaeology to be implemented in

the second phase. Nor was achieved the objective to establish a center for Mediterranean research. A training course programme was designed but never implemented.

Many partners therefore felt the project was a waste of money, as it did not undertake any practical measures. Several project partners indicated this to the Lead Partner during the project period but always were told that the implementation of concrete training activities would only be part of the second phase of the project.

Some specific objectives though, like the exchange of experiences and the promotion of contacts between different players in the field of marine archaeology were indeed achieved.

Impact and sustainability

As it didn't achieve its main objectives the impact of RIAS is extremely poor. During the project period, however, it brought technical people together to exchange experiences and practices. In doing so it helped to build a Mediterranean communication network that still functions to some extent. This resulted in the RIAS idea/approach to be again proposed in the EU Syracuse meeting on Regional Conventions. Syracuse has the ambition to create a central institution for training.

In some countries RIAS had a certain impact. The publication on policy and legislative frameworks has been instrumental in helping to direct policy in Malta.

The RIAS project was designed to last for much more than two years. The part that was financed by the EC only covered two years and worked on setting up a network of underwater archaeologists and the development of a model for the training courses that should be implemented in the years following the end of this project. Due to the fact that no proposal was prepared for the Euromed Heritage II programme, this project completely ended at the end of the contract. If the project should have continued in Heritage II, it is still questionable whether this project should be sustainable without complete EC funding. In the best-case scenario, bilateral funding would have been secured. It is worth noting that initially the Project Director was under the impression that this project would receive funding not only for Heritage II, but also for III, IV and so on.

Towards the end of the project, France, Tunisia, Cyprus, Portugal and Greece decided to prepare a follow-up proposal for ECH II but the Greek representative who was supposed to follow up on this, failed to do so.

Conclusions

All project partners involved feel this project has failed as it resulted in little more than meetings and declarations about the importance of underwater cultural heritage. The remaining output of the RIAS project is the publication in four languages (including Arabic) of the proceeding of the RIAS conference with texts on the on legislation of marine archeology of several Mediterranean countries and the design of a training course for marine archeologists.

A less ambitious and more pragmatic approach would have been more effective.

It should be recognised, however, that the project had an appropriate blend of policy and technical content that has particular application at the MEDA regional level where the Mediterranean 'ancient classical world' can be viewed as a common resource.

Salambo

Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-02

Signature Grant contract: 7 September 1998

Original expiry Grant 30.09.00

Final expiry Grant Contract: 30.09.00 (project duration:25 months)

EU Grant: €272,812

Lead Partner:

- Fondation Européenne des Métiers du Patrimoine (FEMP) – Council of Europe, Strasbourg

Partners:

- Algeria : Ministry of Communications and Culture, Directorate of Cultural Heritage
- Cyprus: Ministry of Communications and Works, Department of Antiquities
- Egypt: Ministry of Culture, Supreme Council of Antiquities
- Jordan: Yarmouk University
- Malta: University of Malta;
- Lebanon : Ministry of Culture
- Morocco : Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur, de la Recherche Scientifique et de la culture, Direction du Patrimoine Cultural
- Palestinian Authority : Ministry of Culture, Directorate of Cultural Heritage
- Syria : Ministère de la Culture, Direction Générale des Antiquités et des Musées
- Tunisia : Institut National du Patrimoine. Ministère de la Culture
- Belgium: Université Libre de Bruxelles;
- France : Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, Direction du Patrimoine
- Italy: Centre Européen de Venise pour les Métiers de la Conservation du Patrimoine Architectural
- Portugal: Instituto Portugues do Patrimonio Arquitectonico Arqueologico (IPPAR);
- Greece : Hellenic Ministry of Culture.

Project summary:

Feasibility study for professional training in traditional decorative arts applied to historic buildings

Project description

Project Origins

Prior to Salambo FEMP's activities were circumscribed by the member states of the Council of Europe in which FEMP resided. FEMP had a number of projects on-going and in preparation before the 1997 Preparatory Phase of Salambo was complete that were influential in shaping the design of the project⁵.

⁵ Within 3 years of FEMP been established in 1995/96 it was responsible for 18 projects e.g. Historic building worksites management and exchange programme (EC Leonardo), Management of archaeological sites (AGESA - EC RAPHAEL programme DGX, 2nd European Symposium of Firms Specialising in the restoration of the Architectural Heritage (AEERPA - EC RAPHAEL programme DGX), Vocational guidance in heritage occupations for young people and adults (CARAVELA) etc. Other projects: The European Information Network on Heritage Policies (EC DG XIII – Telematics

In 1996 the EC DG1 invited FEMP to participate in the launch of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership in the cultural sphere. At this meeting project ideas were canvassed for inclusion in the EC's Euromed Heritage programme. FEMP proposed the idea of applying its network, integrated approach to heritage in the wider territorial regions of the MEDA countries focusing on skills development in the decorative arts. On this basis a financing agreement was made in 1998.

Design

The project design was not based on any sector or country 'needs' assessment. It was based on the assumption that the experience gained in the European context could be adapted and replicated in the MEDA countries. Module A⁶ of the project was meant to move out from its basic inventory to a definition of needs.

Had Stage 2 been possible, on reflection it was considered that a weakness in the project design would have been the lack of appreciation that 'tourism' was perhaps the most important economic driver behind market demand for decorative art skills. However, even had tourism been identified as an important factor, for many of the countries the tourism sector was very poorly organised.

Budget

Conceived as a two-stage project but only the first stage constitutes the project under evaluation. This was conceived as a 'pilot' feasibility to determine the skills development potentials and requirements in the 13 participating countries. This limited perspective and the fact that FEMP's operational overheads were absorbed by the Council of Europe; shaped the size of the budget requested and allocated.

FEMP were not provided with any indication of budget limits when designing the project. On reflection it was considered that they were not ambitious enough and should have requested more to ensure continuity after Stage 1 for the project to have had a more meaningful impact.

Relevance

Salambo intended to use Euromed Heritage to launch a process aimed at developing a partnership built on a common understanding in the field of professional training in traditional decorative arts. This process was aimed at identifying common problems and common actions to be implemented in a successive phase. This choice was made to address the lack of needs assessment characterising the Euromed Heritage identification phase. Expected results were therefore a strategy benefited from results that were [verifiable](#);

developed and a project proposal identified.

The project consisted in workshops structured under 3 modules:

- A. Assessment survey of existing training establishment courses and capacities.
- B. Training methodologies and approaches.
- C. International standards framework

These workshop/seminars were carried out in four partner countries. For each Module a report was published together with a final synthesis report. Otherwise there were no other tangible or measurable outputs. The positive intangible outcomes were considered to be:

- Feasibility tested and positive,
- Identification of possible future partners, and
- Awareness raising successful.

Application Programme) and The 'Days of European Heritage Skills Networks' (Council of Europe and EC DG X) gave expression to FEMP's 'networking' and 'skills-based' philosophy.

⁶ Essentially a survey of existing training schemes and structures to ascertain training 'needs'.

The real outcome of the project, however, would have been a project proposal for the second phase of Euromed Heritage 2.

Module A was most relevant to policy makers, aimed at awareness raising and to move out to define 'needs'.

Module B had a wider interest with professionals responsible for setting-up training courses. The original intent was to carry out in service training for decorative arts using the module as a framework.

Module C. was considered to be theoretical but a useful database/reference – problem was that the database was logged on the FEMP website but was not accessible by most of the MEDA partners.

The stated intent was to follow-up these modules with a staged programme to implement first a 'pilot' multinational skill course for decorative arts targeted at skilled and unskilled workers, and then to disseminate this within the various countries belonging to the partnership. This was not achieved.

The objective would have been to integrate workers, engineers, and architects with the community and to link the project outcomes to delivering community benefits. The idea was to adapt the primary target group with wider stakeholders by taking a site management approach. (Note: in many respects this aspiration reflects the approach of the PISA project). Thus, on reflection was considered that it would have been better to have taken a 'live project approach' that integrated all the target groups.

The lead partner focused on three countries Morocco, Tunisia and Syria, that hosted the seminars, while the others had more an "observer status". Egypt had an indirect involvement through the proactive role of an Egyptian expert as a project coordinator. From the EC partners, Italy, France and Portugal were the most active.

In principal the 'developmental' aspirations of the project design would seem to have been relevant to MEDA country needs but a number of obstacles question the validity of the approach adopted to achieve the desired results. For example the real target groups were craft workers, but only public sector agencies have been involved. Moreover the project did not fully appreciate the need to understand the market in terms of demand for various sorts of heritage based products or crafts, and did not include any trade based partners.

Efficiency

In the main the project consisted of holding 4 workshops style seminars each based around three module work-streams. At each seminar moderators used questionnaires on each theme as a modality to elicit information and opinions. The findings were captured in Module reports and brought together in a Synthesis report – all were disseminated to the participating partners.

The project objectives and methodology were not clear to many the project partners, and their participation and level of involvement was low. As a consequence, the module reports are the sole result of the work of the module coordinator. It appears that the fact that no tangible results were foreseen was a factor of de-motivation for many partners who did not involve themselves in the project. After the first meetings a serious change of direction should have been taken to readdress the project.

The quality of the module reports is uneven, and only the report of the module B is satisfactory.

A newsletter was posted on the FEMP project Internet web site and internal reporting to partners was done via fax.

FEMP was satisfied with the working relations and support they received from the MEDA team. The only criticism was that there was no sector expertise in MEDA, therefore their role was mainly related to administration, ensuring that the money was spent appropriately. A systematic reporting back system to the EU after all meetings and milestone achievements was carried out.

Effectiveness and impact

In the main the project impacted on the partner country public sector agencies with which the seminars were held in Tunisia, Morocco and Syria. Interface mainly at this bureaucratic level limited the outreach achieved to the craft worker target groups.

The aim was that existing or aspiring decorative arts craft workers (i.e. the workers on the site) would be the ultimate beneficiaries. But without a follow-on stage 2 to the project, this was not possible within the commissioned resource and time framework. Building a cooperative network in a new geographical region takes much longer than was anticipated.

It was recognised that to reach the intended target groups would have required additional country coordinators to carry out more in-country organisation to involve the artisan sector.

Overall there was insufficient political support for the decorative arts due to perceptions that there was a minority and vested constituency that had an elitist appreciation of its only intrinsic value, and there was little wider appeal or appreciation of its potential commercial and economic value. To establish this 'political will' would have required more in-country organisation to establish a wider network of support together with a huge awareness building exercise.

Also, the approach would likely have achieved better results had the focus been widened from the application of 'decorative arts' within a 'built cultural heritage' context to include the application of decorative arts traditions to new contemporary buildings. In this way, 'market' value might have been more easily understood [e.g. promoting the application of traditional decorative arts as part of process of creating a distinctive contemporary vernacular style]. It was felt that in the future a revival of the decorative arts could be underpinned by 'cultural tourism'.

The ultimate 'testing' of the training objectives by running short-term focused training programmes in existing establishments was impossible as Stage 2 was unable to be implemented.

The original idea of working through the craftsmen and broadening out to the integrated site team and to wider community network was too ambitious.

Though it was considered by FEMP that the 1st Stage proved the feasibility for Stage 2, a project proposal for a second phase was not designed and no project proposal was made for a second phase of the project, meaning that the project failed to achieve its primary objective.

Sustainability

The project concept had a sound pedigree in FEMP and the aspirations to expand its agenda through the EC MEDA programme to a wider territory were and remain valid.

The project as carried out was conceived as a 'feasibility' study to test the concept of implementing a MEDA region-wide decorative arts training programme delivered through a series of site-based 'live projects' adopting a developmental approach delivered through an integrated team of artisans, architects/designers, contractors, policy makers and the community.

Unfortunately the geographical reorientation of the Council of Europe to Central and Eastern Europe and the Balkan States underpinned the demise of FEMP. As such, the rationale to benefit from the lessons learnt by incorporating these into a follow-on initiative was not achieved. This would have been a logical progression and would have required MEDA and FEMP to recognise the need for another suitable partner to adopt the project and bid for its support under the EC Heritage II programme.

Given the considerable importance attached to ‘continuity’ as an essential ingredient for the success of the Salambo initiative, it is surprising that as FEMP been aware of its own demise did not transfer ownership to another one of the consortia partners. The Centre Européen de Venise pour les Metiers de la Conservation du Patrimoine Architectural would have seemed a natural choice and under its aegis a bid could have been prepared for Euromed Heritage II.

On reflection it was felt that the project should have been designed in two, two-year phases with the 2nd Phase conditional upon achievement of stated goals, objectives and outcomes. E.g. Phase 1 to identify goals and methodology, delivery: means and ways and building the network. Phase 2 testing through live projects and a series of applied training experiences.

Unimed Audit

Project Name	UNIMED AUDIT - Cultural Heritage Legislation and Training
Lead Partner	UNIMED – Italy
Project Dates	31.07.98 31.03.00
EC Contribution	324.130 Euros
Other Partners (Country)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Algeria/ EPAU - Ecole Polytechnique d'Architecture et d'Urbanisme ▪ Egypt/ Ministry of Culture Supreme Council of Antiquities ▪ Jordan/ University of Jordan ▪ Lebanon/ Université Saint-Esprit de Kaslik ▪ Palestinian Authority/ Palestinian Ministry of Culture - Directorate of Cultural Heritage ▪ Tunisia/ Institut National du Patrimoine - Ministère de la Culture ▪ Syria/ Ministère de la Culture Direction Générale des Antiquités et des Musées ▪ Italy/ Ministero per i Beni Culturali e le Attività Culturali ▪ Portugal/ Universidade de Evora
Project Summary	Computerised index of legislation and institutions related to cultural heritage throughout the Mediterranean

Relevance

Unimed proposed this project to support the efforts of Meda countries to:

- improve their legislation on cultural heritage conservation and
- publicize training facilities related to heritage.

Unimed Audit was intended as a service to Culture Ministries. This was intended to particularly benefit the Palestinian Authority, which needed to design new heritage legislation.

The expected result was the implementation of an online databank divided into 3 areas: legislation, training, website, addresses dealing with Euromediterranean Cultural Heritage.

The project was an attempt to create a common set of information for the region and thus share knowledge. It was meant to give a panorama of comparative information. As a pilot it covered legislation for both north and south Mediterranean. The concept beyond the programme was that universities, research and training organizations and public institutions in the Mediterranean region need to have mechanisms for exchange of information.

Unimed Audit was seen as a first step toward the provision of a monitoring and intervention instrument supporting the heritage policies of the Euro Mediterranean countries, the development of a comprehensive web directory and the creation of a permanent regional agency to carry forward this work.

Although the need to support national ministries and central agencies in improving their heritage legislation appears obvious, the choice to focus on the collection and translation of national legislation is questionable. In fact UNESCO had already compiled, translated and published the heritage legislations of several countries. The project should have built on this work already done

and focused on the comparative analysis of national legislation (identifying gaps) and on their actual application and enforcement.

Efficiency

Partnership

The partners were a mixture of universities (Algeria, Jordan, Lebanon, Portugal), Institutes (Tunisia) and Ministries (Egypt, Palestinian Authority, Syria, Italy). They were chosen from among the interested participants at the meetings.

It was one of the projects with both Mashreq and Maghreb partners.

The EC partners, Italy and Portugal, seem to have been rather silent partners with the exception of La Sapienza.

Initially ICOMOS had a co-coordinator role for scientific matters, but later declined.

Decision-making and operations

The project was directed solely by UNIMED at its Headquarters in Rome. Decision-making was centralized and the participation of the partners very limited. They could propose a researcher who was then directly contracted by the Lead Partner. This allowed the lead partner to directly control the research activity carried out in the partner countries bypassing the national partners. As a result, however, the level of involvement of the partner organizations was extremely low as was their sense of ownership. This lack of involvement of the partners was the main reason for the limited impact of the project.

A scientific committee advised the project. The Sapienza University in Rome was directly involved as the project coordinator is a faculty member and staff was drawn from the student body.

In some senses this was a “virtual” project as it was carried out in each of the participant countries and except for the initial and for the final meetings all exchanges were by Email or phone.

Concerning the technical aspects of the project, plans were made to set up a second (mirror) server in Tunisia. A server was sent and a staff member received training in Italy in its use; however, the server was never operational.

Relationship with the EC and Meda team

UNIMED Audit found the MEDA team to be helpful and positive. However, “more transparence” was needed since the MEDA team was charged with interpreting the EC and often resorted to explanations such as “the Commission said this.”

Effectiveness and impact

The Unimed Audit website contains the translated heritage legislation of several Mediterranean countries in English or French. The budget did not cover any language editing, so it can be expected that there is considerable variation in quality. Furthermore, there were no lexicons that were made available to the researchers so that terminology is consistent.

There was no quality control for the comparative legislative elements. Nor were there cross-references for each country on legislation pertaining to urban planning, nature conservation and other areas of the law that can impinge on heritage.

There are no translations into Arabic, nor the original Arabic version has been included in the database online, which would have greatly increased effectiveness in the Meda region. Finally the database and related website were only ready at the end of the project and not made known among partners, some of which were not aware of it when the Evaluation mission met them.

A comparative analysis made by an Italian legal expert has also been included, illustrating the juridical basis of the State's protection activities and the relations with international conventions in on conservation and enhancement of cultural goods. The later, however, doesn't represent a tool to identify deficiencies and ways to eventually improve the heritage legislation.

While the database on heritage legislation is quite comprehensive, the database on heritage training is extremely limited. Many local researchers seem to have focused on legislation neglecting the training.

Outreach

Unimed Audit pointed to the need for dissemination of heritage related information. The project was the only web based project and by definition was intended to reach a large audience. This however was not achieved because the website remained unknown.

The idea that Unimed Audit website could become a vehicle for all the projects was discussed with the EC. One of the arguments was that it would have resulted in greater visibility for the site and for all Euromed Heritage I projects. However this was not taken up by the EC.

Impacts

It is difficult to measure impacts, as no information about actual usage of the web site is available. The field missions, however, indicate in general that the database tool is not known and not used in Meda countries. The case of the Palestinian Authority is a striking example. The evaluation team found that the Palestinian partner, who was entrusted to draw up the new heritage legislation, was collecting legislation from other countries to compare and adapt, without utilising the results of Unimed Audit. The project seems therefore to have a very limited impact in the Meda countries.

It is known however that the database is used in Italy by universities, and research institutes and that university students are visiting the site.

Sustainability

For a web site that covers such subjects as training opportunities, there is a need to update information, but Unimed Audit didn't foresee real provision for updating the database. The project, however, has continuity in the form of the project "Unimed Heritage II", financed in the framework of Euromed Heritage II.

In regard to continuity of partners, only three partners are present in both projects: EPAU, Algeria; University of Saint-Esprit de Kaslik, Lebanon; and Universidade de Evora, Portugal. Four countries changed partners: Egypt, Palestinian Authority, Tunisia and Italy. Two countries, Jordan and Syria, dropped out and three (Spain, Morocco and Turkey) have joined the consortium

The new web site has added a news feature and other information areas, in order to retain and expand its audience.

Although not successful, it must be recognised that Unimed Audit, has been designed with a long-term strategic objective in view: "to improve cooperation in the field of Cultural Heritage preservation, restoration and management, so as to create a community in which know how and experiences developed by some Mediterranean countries can be shared with all other partners". Unimed is trying with Audit and Unimed Heritage II to achieve this objective in a virtual space, (web portal), before being finally able to achieve it in a physical and institutional space of discussion and common regional action (a Euromediterranean heritage institution).

This strategy, however, should be the outcome of a participated process involving the most relevant heritage institutions in the Mediterranean region, and not the idea/objective of a single organisation.

Unimed Herit

Project Title: UNIMED HERITAGE
Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-06

Signature Grant contract: 24.07.1998
Original expiry Grant Contract: 23.07.1999 (project duration: 12 months)
Final expiry Grant Contract: 31.03.2000 (project duration: 18 months)
EU Grant: 404.565 Euro

Lead partner: UNIMED - Italy

Partners:

- Cyprus: University of Cyprus;
- Egypt: Cairo University, Supreme Council of Antiquities;
- Israel: Israel Antiquities Authority;
- Jordan: University of Jordan, Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities;
- Malta: University of Malta;
- Palestine: Directorate of Cultural Heritage;
- Germany: Institut Fur Restaurierung und Baudenkmalpflege, Hildesheim;
- Greece: University of Athens;
- Italy: University of Rome "La Sapienza", CRAST-University of Turin and Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali- Uff. Centrale per i Beni Archeologici, Architetonici, Artistici, Storici;
- Spain: Universitat de Barcelona;
- Portugal: Universidade de Evora.

Project summary

The project consisted in a training course on heritage management, held in Malta 19 April-21Mai 1999 and in Italy 27 September 12 November 1999.

Project description

The contract was signed on 24 July 1998, and during the Meeting of Rhodos, 25-26 September the partners met to discuss the project methodology and appoint a Scientific Committee.

The Scientific Committee was composed by professors from the University of Roma "La Sapienza", University of Torino, Cairo University, University of Jordan, University of Athens and from the Directorate of Cultural Heritage of the Palestinian Authority. The Scientific Committee met to agree on the overall project implementation and the organisation and schedule of the course, but in reality the main player was prof. Gullini of the University of Torino, who designed the course, selected trainers and participants, was himself the main trainer and supervised the final thesis.

The course was planned to start in December 1998. However it had to be postponed to April 1999 because of the delay in the disbursement of EC first instalment and for the complexity of the training organisation. An amendment to the grant contract had therefore to be agreed to expand the project duration to 18 months.

Design and planning of the course

The course was designed by Professor Gullini, discussed in the scientific committee and proposed to the partner institutions. It consisted in a 400-hour post-graduate course a core module in Malta and

modules in Rome and Torino, as described in the following table.

Core module in Malta (19 April-21 Mai 1999)	
Methodology of the historical research	prof Gullini - Italy, prof. Fiore - Italy
Methodology of the Land-Approach and Land Systematic investigation	prof Gullini-Italy, prof. Mascarenhas-Portugal
Theory and History of the preservation and restoration	prof. Turco-Italy
Museology	prof. Khairi-Jordan, prof Gullini-Italy
Heritage protection law	prof. Cutajar-Malta
Planning and Managing	prof. Gullini-Italy
Training course in Italy - first part in Rome (27 September-15 October 1999),	
History of architecture and conservation	George Lavas-Greece, Eman Assi-Palestine
Planning and protecting	Yaacov Schaeffer-Israel, Paolo Fiore-Italy
Prehistoric archaeology	Barbara Barich-Italy, Joseph Fullola-Spain
Training course in Italy - second part in Torino (18-29 October 1999)	
Egyptian archaeology	Shawki Nakhla-Egypt
Near Eastern archaeology	Nabil Khairy-Jordan
Islamic archaeology	Nabil Khairy-Jordan
Mesopotamian archaeology	Antonio Invernizzi-Italy
Hellenism in Asia	Antonio Invernizzi-Italy
Greek archaeology: the archaic age	Maria Clara Conti-Italy
Late antiquity	Maria Negro Ponzi-Italy
European late antiquity	Maria Negro Ponzi-Italy
Byzantine archaeology	Maria Negro Ponzi-Italy
History of the material culture	Euphrosyne Egoumenidou-Cyprus
Remote sensing applied to the archaeological heritage	Laura Pompeo-Italy
Remote sensing vs. aerial photographs: advantages and comparison	Carlo Alberto Birocco-Italy
Software for the image processing and analysis	Carlo Alberto Birocco-Italy
Practical stage in Rome (1-12 November 1999)	

Selection of participants and trainers:

Each partner institution was asked by UNIMED to propose six candidates to the scientific committee. Each institution responded in a different way. For instance the Israel Antiquities Authority identified suitable candidates among its staff, while the Maltese partner widely publicised the training opportunity and received candidatures coming from persons working in different organisations.

Each candidate had to send a CV and a letter of motivation, which appears to have been an important factor of selection. The selection considered the interest to have participant with different background (mainly historians, archaeologist and architects) and ensured that all countries were represented. 40 participants were selected. 38 participated in the Core Module in Malta and 33 in the modules in Italy.

In the same way each partner institution was asked to propose four trainers. The trainers were then selected by Prof. Gullini and accepted by the scientific committee and by the partners. Anyway, because of changes of date and questions of trainers' availability, the team of planned trainers changed during the course of the project.

At the end in Malta there were 6 professors (3 Italians, 1 Portuguese, 1 Jordanian, 1 Maltese) plus 2 tutors, while in Italy 14 professors (7 Italians) plus 3 tutors.

Relevance

Project origin

Training was one of the main priorities identified during the preparatory workshops and approved at the Conference of Bologna. Considering that there was already a training in French (Cours du Patrimoine du Maghreb), UNIMED, under the suggestion and with the support of Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro, of the Italian Ministry for Cultural and Environmental Property, proposed a training to be taught in English.

Justifications

The training subject was "heritage management" and was targeted to officers of Mediterranean institutions dealing with heritage. The training was not designed on the basis of an assessment of training needs of the targeted institutions more in general of the labour market in the targeted countries. However, being a regional training, this would have been a complex and long task. The justification of the training was therefore based on the recognised fact that heritage management is a crucial issue in all Mediterranean countries.

The training philosophy was based on the acknowledgment that the management of cultural heritage includes all operations aimed to the identification, interpretation, preservation and exploitation of cultural resources, and that a cultural heritage manager must therefore have a knowledge of all these aspects. Objective of the training was therefore to provide heritage managers with a multidisciplinary knowledge integrating historical and scientific disciplines.

Efficiency

Design of the training courses

The original training design as described in the project proposal was quite complex, with core and optional modules. The final training design was simplified.

Unanimously the participants acknowledge the interest and quality of the lectures given. However they unanimously complain about the fact that there was a disproportion of historic topics at the expenses of management topics.

Selection of participants and trainers

The participants were coming from different countries (Palestine; Cyprus; Egypt; Israel; Jordan; Germany; Spain; Greece; Italy; Malta; and Portugal) and different disciplines: archaeology, architecture, history, etc. This resulted to be an excellent opportunity to exchange experiences between different situations and to discuss different topics from different perspectives, enriching the debates and the training experience.

The same positive impact had the fact to have trainers from several Mediterranean countries.

Practical organisation and logistics

The UNIMED administration was responsible for the overall organisation. The University of Malta was responsible for the logistics of the Core module in Malta.

The complex administrative and logistical aspects of the training were very well organised.

Organisation of didactics

The organisation of didactics was in general satisfactory, even if the training methodology was too much based on lectures, with few workshops and practical works.

Lectures were generally of high level, but many trainers were not using training tools, and some couldn't speak the official training language, i.e. English and some student had to translate.

The trainers were of high level, but there seems to have been little interchange between them to encourage interdisciplinary discussion either before the beginning of the course or during the course. The trainees complain about some problems of availability of the foreseen trainers and have the impressions that some trainers were found at the last minute. This happened in the session in Torino, where the main trainer had health problems.

Most of the trainers provided trainees with reference material.

The trainees had to prepare a final thesis. The trainers that had to follow the thesis work was the one that felt sick, but he was apparently not substituted, and the trainees got no feedback for their final works.

There was a misunderstanding with trainees that were expecting an official diploma. This was apparently promised, but the required official steps with a University qualified to deliver such diplomas were not undertaken or were undertaken too late.

Partnership involvement

The decision-making process was very centralised by the Lead Partner and few Italian trainers. Meda partners felt difficulties to participate, even when they were part of the scientific committee.

Effectiveness

The Unimed gave to trainees a good theoretical knowledge about the conservation principles and some rudiments about new technologies applied to heritage. The training didn't provide the trainees with specific skills, but with a multidisciplinary historical and technical background from which they can benefit in the execution of their job.

Impact

The project has not a direct impact on the institutions to which belong the trainees. The increased capacity of the trainees is likely to have an indirect and non-measurable impact on the institutional capacity, as the following example shows:

Among the postgraduate students to participate in the UNIMED Herit programme was the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities representative from Irbid in northern Jordan. The UNIMED Herit advanced training course enabled this conservation architect to update his ideas for a project in Irbid to conserve and rehabilitate an old prison. The prison building is one of the few historic buildings to remain in the town. Exposure to the theoretical and practical content of the integrated conservation lectures and the opportunity to see first hand good examples of conservation reuse and museums enriched the final plans for the Irbid building. The course also confirmed the importance of respect for the original fabric of the building and authenticity of materials. The main work is now complete and waits the second phase of work, which is to prepare the museum displays and installation. The architect is keenly aware that good management depends on cooperation and collaboration between different disciplines, such as museologists, archaeologists and administrators.

Unimed Symposium

Project Title: UNIMED SYMPOSIUM - colloque sur le Patrimoine Immatériel

Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-08

Signature Grant contract: 24.07.1998

Original expiry Grant Contract: 23.12.1998 (project duration: 5 months)

Final expiry Grant Contract: 31.07.1999 (project duration: 12 months)

EU Grant: 114.400 Euro

Lead partner:

- UNIMED - Italy

Partners:

- Algeria: Université de Constantine and Université de Oran;
- Cyprus: Ministry of Education and Culture;
- Egypt: Cairo University;
- Israel: Tourism Recreation Planning Office and Hebrew University of Jerusalem;
- Palestinian Authority: Directorate of Cultural Heritage;
- Jordan: University of Jordan;
- Malta: University of Malta;
- Morocco: INSAP and Direction du Patrimoine Culturel;
- Turkey: Middle East Technical University - Ankara, Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey.
- Belgium: Université Libre de Bruxelles;
- France: CNRS Dép Musicologie, Université de la Méditerranée Aix-Marseille;
- Germany: Studiosus Reisen Munchen GMBH, Frei Universitaet Berlin;
- Greece: "Dora Stratou" Theatre, National and Capodistrian University of Athens;
- Italia: Min. Beni e Attività Culturali - Discoteca di Stato, University of Roma "Roma Tre", CIDIM, University of Roma "La Sapienza", Istituto Universitario Suor Orsola Benincasa;
- Portugal: Universidade de Evora and Universidade Nova de Lisboa;
- Spain: C.S.I.C. Institucio Mila i Fontanals and Centro de Documentacion Musical de Andalucia - Junta de Andalucia;
- UNESCO Division du Patrimoine Culturel;

Summary:

The project consisted of a congress on Intangible Heritage, which was held in Rome on 28-29 May 1999.

Project description

Project identification

Unimed was involved in a preliminary phase of identification of suitable projects to be funded through the Euromed Heritage programme. During the first meeting of Bruxelles (September 1996), the Algerian representatives noted that intangible heritage had not been considered, stressed its importance and insisted to foresee a project dealing with that topic. A Symposium on intangible

heritage was therefore planned, with the aim to identify possible projects in this field, which could be later proposed for funding.

Project objectives

As other Euromed Heritage projects, the objectives are stated in the project proposal as a list of different levels of objectives, results and even activities, that can be synthesised as follows.

- identify common initiatives and project proposals to preserve, highlight and disseminate the mediterranean intangible heritage, to be submitted for a subsequent phase of euromed heritage;
- stimulate the networking between specialists in the different fields of intangible heritage and related institutions;
- stress the importance of intangible culture in the Mediterranean;

To this aim the project intended to organise a symposium that would congregate specialists in different aspects of intangible heritage, scholars and cultural operators.

Implementation of the project

Unimed Symposium had 29 participating institutions, the highest number in Euromed Heritage I. They represented 9 southern tier and 7 northern tier countries. The institutions included: universities and research institutes, theatre groups, museums, ministries of culture, and a regional government. Independent musicians, artists and other unaffiliated cultural workers also participated.

A scientific committee, composed of 5 university professors, was formed to guide the project. It was composed by Prof. Ilaria CARACI, Terza Università degli Studi di Roma; Prof. Sergio BRACCO, Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza"; Prof Faouzi ADEL, Université de Costantine; Prof. Reynaldo Fernandez MANZANO, Instituciones del Patrimonio Historico de la Junta de Andalucia; Prof. Paolo SCARNECCHIA, Unimed (Three Italians, one Spanish and one Algerian), and chaired by the project coordinator Prof. Franco Rizzi They were involved in such fields as cultural heritage, ethnology, anthropology, museum studies.

The participants to the symposium were proposed by the partner organisations and selected by the Scientific Committee on the base of their CVs. The selection ensured that all countries were represented. The participants were experts in different fields (from theatre to folk traditions etc.), coming from different professions (anthropologists, cultural managers etc.) and from almost all Mediterranean countries (except Syria and Lebanon because of the participation of Israel).

The Scientific Committee developed and sent out a questionnaire to be answered by experts in the field of non-material heritage. They then analysed the responses to the questionnaire. The information they derived became the basis for the symposium that took place on 28-29 May 1999 in Rome.

The symposium was divided into three workshops:

- the first workshop on "Educational and Training Programmes to Build Awareness of Immaterial Culture" was chaired by Prof Adel Fouzi of Constantine University;
- the second workshop on "Festivals, Exhibition, Traditions and Folklore in Mediterranean Countries" was chaired by Prof. Paolo Scarnecchia of Rome;
- the third workshop on "Immaterial Culture as a Tourism Resource" was chaired by Prof. Ilan Ben Josef of Israel.

Experts were assigned to participate in the three workshops.

The proceedings of the Congress were published by UNIMED on October 1999.

The original duration of the project was five months. However, due to the delay of the first grant instalment and of the high number of partners, Unimed asked for an amendment to the contract which would extent the validity of the contract until the 31th July 1999.

Relevance

In many Mediterranean countries the non material heritage is not the object of conservation and promotion policies, generally turned only to the archaeological and architectural heritage. However while intangible heritage is a main factor to ensure cultural diversity and a guarantee for sustainable development, there is a serious risk of disappearance and destruction of it, due to processes of globalization and social transformation. The safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage promotes, sustains, and develops cultural diversity and human creativity and provides people and groups of people with a sense of identity and continuity.

In the mid 1990s the safeguard and enhancement of intangible heritage was still a minor issue in relation to the tangible heritage. Even in Euromed Heritage the emphasis was on material heritage, except for the project "Fêtes du Soleil".

We mention that on 17 October 2003 eventually a "Convention for the Safeguard of the Intangible Cultural Heritage" was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO. The Intangible Heritage is defined as " the practices, representations, and expressions, as well as the associated knowledge and the necessary skills, that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage". The intangible cultural heritage, which is sometimes called living cultural heritage, is manifested, *inter alia*, in the following domains:

- oral traditions, expressions and language;
- the performing arts;
- social practices, rituals, and festive events;
- knowledge and practices about nature and the universe;
- traditional craftsmanship.

Euromed Heritage was involving the authorities responsible of the conservation of cultural heritage of all Mediterranean countries at the highest level. It was therefore important to include a project on Intangible Heritage. Considering that Intangible Heritage had almost been "forgotten" in the identification phase of Euromed Heritage I, Unimed proposed the project Unimed Symposium as an occasion to identify project proposals in the field of Intangible Heritage through discussions between specialists in the different fields.

The mistake that has hampered the project effectiveness, as explained in the following chapters, has been to foresee the Symposium as a punctual activity, without planning follow up and networking activities.

Efficiency

Functioning of the partnership

This project was consisting mainly in one congress. The role of the partner institutions was mainly to propose participants to the Scientific Committee, which was quite restricted.

Quality of the outputs

All participants met by the Evaluation Team agree that the symposium was well organised, that the discussions were extremely interesting. It was the first time for them to discuss about "intangible

heritage" in general. In fact each participant was essentially an expert on one specific aspect of non-tangible culture. The Symposium created the consciousness among the participants that all fields of intangible culture have common conservation and enhancement problems that can be dealt through common policies and strategies. As one participant said: "The Symposium was useful to understand what non-material culture is".

The organisation in workshops allowed the participants to really participate in the discussions and know each other. Many project ideas concerning non-material culture were discussed and identified: "There was a momentum that was created".

The following results stated in the final report were achieved, but only among the participants and only during the symposium:

- Identify research trends and develop joint project guidelines;
- Support an interdisciplinary debate on non-material culture.
- Establish a linkage between the academic world, museums, and centres for conservation and documentation and the artistic world

Effectiveness, impact and sustainability

The Symposium was well organised, was the occasion of a real exchange of experiences and of personal enrichment for the participants. It also allowed the identification of project ideas. However its effectiveness and impact is extremely poor. Project ideas proposed by the participants were discussed and collected but not developed as project proposals. None of them was then proposed for Euromed Heritage II or for the additional available funds from Euromed Heritage I. In summary nothing followed.

One reason is because in reality project proposals were only at a very preliminary stage and needed therefore a big work of project design to be proposed for funding. The other main reason was that no follow-up was organised by the project coordinator or by another institution. This created a certain disappointment among the participants. They expected that the organiser would follow up looking for funding for some of the project proposals. This didn't happen.

It seems also that the project had no impact on common activities and networking between participants and related institutions. No networking activity was carried out after the symposium (mailing list etc.), and no network created. Apparently few contacts have been maintained by the participants among them. Follow up and networking activities should have been organised by the project coordinator. These could have been foreseen in the project and in the related budget.

Briefly the symposium was not linked to any process, but organised as a punctual activity.

However in some countries there could have been some unexpected results, like the evaluation team found out in Malta. The Maltese heritage law had just been approved, and it didn't contemplate intangible heritage. The Maltese participant, made conscious by the symposium, protested and talked to the Minister, showing also the publication. Now 'intangibles' have been included in the law, and apparently also thanks to this intervention.

Conclusions

"It was an interesting conference, but nothing followed"

This project had the merit to have created an occasion to gather experts of different fields related to intangible culture where they had the opportunity to discuss the communalities and common problems of their own fields. However this remained an individual experience with a very limited impact.

Museomed

Project Title: Museomed

Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-16

Signature grant contract: 22 October 1999

Expiry contract: 22 January 2001

EU Grant: €97.089

Lead partner:

- ICOM – International Council of Museums – Hellenic National Committee, Greece

MEDA Partners:

- Malta, Ministry of Education and National Culture
- Palestinian Authority, Palestinian Ministry of Culture, Directorate of Cultural Heritage
- Syria, Ministère de la Culture de Syrie, DG des Antiquités et des Musées
- Cyprus, Ministry of Communications and Works Department of Antiquities

EU Partners:

- Greece, Ministry of Culture, Directorate of European Affairs

Description of the project

Identification process

Museomed was selected during the identification process in 1996, but then abandoned by the proponents. It was during the Second Conference of the Ministers of Culture, held in Rhodes, in September 1998 that the Meda team insisted to recuperate the proposal supporting the Greek proponents in designing a new project proposal. The project was presented to all countries but only Cyprus, Malta, Syria and the Palestinian Territories were interested in this project. The project leader declared that maybe many country representatives thought that their countries were already involved in too many projects and were therefore not keen in participating to this one.

Project implementation

The project consisted of three training seminars that were organised one after each other in October – November 2000. Each of the five participating countries could send three trainees. The Palestinians however, due to the severe political situation and travel restrictions, were not able to attend the training courses, while Syria sent only one trainee for the first two sessions and three for the last one.

Seminar I (29 October - 7 November 2000) dealt with the following issues:

- The Birth of the Museum – Museum Histories

Introduction to Museology – Introduction to Material Culture Studies – Introduction to Collection Studies - The History of Museums - Categories and Types of Museums - The Formation of a Collection: Ideology, Content, Methodology - Code of Ethics for the Formation of a Collection - Museum collecting in the 21st century - Research in the museums

- Museum Architecture, Philosophy and Design

Choosing the ideal place for the erection of a museum - The use and transformation of historical monuments to museums - Building new museums. Contemporary trends in museum architecture - Erecting a good museum building - Museum Exhibition: Theory and Practice – Museum Management

Seminar II (8-16 November 2000) was about:

- Museum Documentation

Introduction to museum documentation - The documentation process - Labelling museum objects - Methods of documentation - The importance of documentation - Data standards - Systems of classification - Manual documentation - Electronic documentation – Museums and the New Technologies

- Preventive conservation in the museums

Environmental control - Disaster planning - Handling of museum objects - Packing and transportation of museum objects - Museum security - Museum storage

Seminar III (17-25 November 2000):

- Museums and the Public

Museum Education - Visitor Studies - Museum Languages - Museum shops - Publishing policies of museums

All seminars had theoretical sessions, workshops and field visits to museums. The seminars lasted from 09h00 to 14h00 and from 17h00 to 20h00, which made some participants complain about the intensity of the seminars.

Relevance

Objectives of Museomed were:

- to train museum staff of partner countries on new management approaches and up-to-date methods and practices;
- to explore the state of the current museum practice of the project partners;
- to strengthen Euro-Med links and partnership by facilitating the exchange of views, experiences and know-how among the participants;
- to establish long-term cooperation on museum and heritage matters among the project partners;
- to achieve a better understanding of the museum work and world of the Mediterranean partners;

Museomed was the only Euromed Heritage training focused on one specific theme: i.e. museum management. This allowed a better understanding among partners about the projects objectives and about the target audiences, which were:

- first target audience: the museum staff
- secondary audience: (potential) museum visitors or the general public.

Museomed concept was based on the fact that the museum public is changing and becoming more demanding. Museums are therefore taking on multiple roles and functions and have to develop higher standards to assume their role as key cultural institution. The choice was to deal with this issue in a comprehensive way, involving all aspects of museum management: documentation, conservation, presentation etc. A more specialised training would have required a deeper training

needs assessment among the partner organisations, and anyway it would have been difficult to tailor a specialised training addressing the training needs of different situations such as Syria or Palestine and Greece and Malta.

The different topics were divided into three different sessions. This allowed trainees to participate in the sessions more responding to their specific interests.

Efficiency

Training design and implementation

The training was designed by the Greek partner, and benefited of the experience gained from their first stage national museums refurbishment programme.

The training seminars were focused and directed to their first target group, museum staff. Within a short period they touched all kind of issues related to museum management. Given the limited time, each topic could not be dealt in a detailed way, but participants had the opportunity to have a general overview and to develop specific questions during the discussions. Trainers were generally of high level and all fluent in English.

The training was well balanced. The training was mainly consisting in lessons ex cathedra, but with some visits to museums (probably insufficient during the first session) and some workshops.

The project coordinator realised that those workshops resulted very interesting and fruitful to participants, and probably, given also the different experience and situation of the participants, it would have been advantageous to organise more of them.

Participants considered the visits to museums and the meeting with curators as the most interesting aspect of the training.

The documentation provided during the lessons resulted very useful.

The first session had some logistical problems, solved during the successive sessions.

All courses have been organised immediately one after each other. It would have been better to have some time between the courses. Not only to be able to make adjustments in methodology, tutor selection and approach of the courses, but also to give participants the possibility to attend more than one course. Now some of the potential participants were not able to leave their job for such a long continuous period.

Participants:

Maltese participants were nominated by the director of the museum department. They were all curators of museums. They could only participate to one session each because they could not leave for more than one week.

Also participants from Syria were nominated by the director of the partner institutions. The choice was restricted by the necessity to find trainees able to understand English, and actually one Syrian participant had a very low level of English and could really participate to the training.

Greek participants were generally younger and newly graduated, some with short term contracts with the Greek Ministry of Culture.

Functioning of partnership

The training was designed by the lead partner, which collected in the preparation phase the impression and needs of the other partners. All trainers were identified by the lead partner, which was also responsible for coordination and logistics.

The relationship among partners were very positive as far as the European countries were involved. With the Syrian partner there were difficult contact. It seems that it didn't feel involved and only sent some participants.

During the courses, all partners had the possibility to present their specific problems and solutions for discussion with the other partners.

Effectiveness

Museomed was a small and well focused project. The training was well organised and there were very important Greek specialists as trainers. The training was an enriching experience for all participants. They could compare with other specialists (which standards, services they propose etc), exchange experience and get acquainted with different approaches and methodologies. Participants also had the possibility to discuss their own work and problems and were able to work on solutions with fellow participants.

Project partners all felt very involved in the project and up to date there are still quite some contacts between the various participants.

Impact and sustainability

Museomed had a very different impact in the different partner countries. It had a certain impact in the museum management in Malta. Maltese participants, in fact, were all high-level staff of Maltese museums, well selected by the museum dept director, which also participated during the first session. They are therefore able now to apply in their museums the approaches and methods learned. The impact is also given by the fact that nine museum curators trained are a significant number for Malta.

On the contrary, Museomed had no impact in Syria. In fact the acquired knowledge was not taken into consideration by their institution (DGAM). Moreover some Syrian participants were not sufficiently able to understand English (the language of the course).

In the case of Greece, the number and the position of participants obviously limited the impact on Greek museums management. The organization of such training can be, however, considered a experience and as a pilot project for the Greek partner institutions, from which they can benefit in the organization of new training courses. Unfortunately there was no follow-up of the training seminars. No training but also no feed back sessions (for example by e-mail) for participants after they returned to their daily work. It seems also that the lead partner did not take the experiences they gained from this project any further within the other activities ICOM is organising.

Museomed consisted in one single training. The sustainability of such kind of projects is obviously limited. To address this problem more attention could have been given to training of trainers, so that course participants could repeat (part) of the courses to local museum staff. Follow up of the project also should have received more attention. Now the project really was just a one – time event.

Euro-Mediterranean Heritage Days

Project Title: Euro-Mediterranean Heritage Days

Project Number: ME8/B7-4100/1B/97/0353-1

Signature grant contract: September 1998

EU Grant: €146.406

Lead partner:

- King Baudoin Foundation

MEDA Partners:

- Cyprus, Ministry of the Interior, Department of Town Planning and Housing
- Jordan, Ministry of Culture
- Egypt, Ministry of Culture
- Morocco, Ministry of Higher Education, Direction du Patrimoine Culturel
- Syria, Ministry of Culture, Department of Antiquities and Museums
- Tunisia, Institut National du Patrimoine
- Turkey, Ministry of Culture

EU Partners:

- Belgium, Ministère de la Région Wallonne
- France, Ministry of Culture and Communication
- Spain, Ministry of Education and Culture
- Greece, Ministry of Culture
- Italy, Ministry of Cultural Activities and Assets
- International, Council of Europe

Description of the project

The project was a feasibility study to look into the possibilities of extending the existing European Heritage Days (EHD), which were launched in 1991 by the Council of Europe, into the MEDA countries. Since 1994 the King Baudoin Foundation (KBF), the lead partner of this project, performs the role of coordination office of the European Heritage Days at an international level.

In view of the scale and the success of the EHD in Europe, in 1998 the King Baudoin Foundation looked into extending the event to embrace the Euro-Mediterranean area. Stage one of the project consisted of a survey aimed at gaining a better understanding of the context, existing actions and logistical and financial needs for awareness raising. The results were then used in the second stage to design a programme of exchanges helping to identify pilot actions for raising awareness of and promoting the Euro-Mediterranean cultural heritage.

Alongside the feasibility study, the Mediterranean partners were involved in the European Heritage Days publicity campaign that helped them to familiarize themselves with organising and implementing an awareness raising campaign.

At the same time the partners were invited to attend all of the working meetings and European Heritage Days related events (official launches, the annual meetings of the national coordinators, colloquiums, visits and experience exchange meetings etc), which enabled them to forge useful contacts with EHD officials in most European countries.

Relevance

Identification process

The Euro-Mediterranean Heritage Days Project was developed by the King Baudoin Foundation in Belgium, which in that time was the coordinator for the international events of the European Heritage Days. In this capacity the King Baudoin Foundation was invited by the Commission to discuss possibilities within the Euromed Heritage Programme.

Although the King Baudoin Foundation had no experience in working in the MEDA countries they thought the Euromed Heritage Programme I provided a good framework to look into the possibilities of extending this concept to the Euro-Mediterranean region. Furthermore, the Commission seemed to be keen on the KBF submitting a proposal together with the Council of Europe.

With support of the Euromed Heritage Programme they were able to launch a feasibility study in order to assess whether the conditions were right to extending the European Heritage Days to the Mediterranean countries.

Project Objectives

The aims of this project were to be achieved gradually over time. In the short term the project aimed at:

- Raising of awareness on Euro-Mediterranean cultural heritage.
- To create a network that could set up the Euro-Mediterranean Heritage days.

Selection of partners

The Euro-Mediterranean Heritage Days project immediately aroused the interest of the 27 associate countries of the Euromed Heritage Programme. However, the King Baudoin Foundation, concerned first and foremost with ascertaining the feasibility of the project, decided to limit the number of initial partners to 10, trying though to include a representative cross-section of Mediterranean cultures.

The 10 partners can be subdivided into three groups: a group of European countries organizing the EHD, France, Italy, Greece and Belgium (Wallonia); two Mediterranean countries already involved in the European Heritage Days, Cyprus and Turkey, and four other Mediterranean countries, two from the Middle East, Syria and Jordan, and two from North Africa, Tunisia and Morocco.

Efficiency

Functioning of partnership

Most of the partners were Ministries or departments within Ministries. The King Baudoin Foundation had no experience with working with this kind of partners and found it quite difficult. "Looking back, we should have worked with more NGO type of partners" according to the project director.

There was no financial involvement or commitment from the partners and no money was spent on activities in the MEDA countries. The partners were very passive, took no initiatives but it was agreed in the beginning of the project that because of the feasibility study nature of the project, the project leader clearly had a leading role.

Although there were quite a number of bi-lateral contacts between partners from both sides of the Mediterranean as well as with the lead partner, within a year after conclusion of the project most contacts between partners had vanished.

All decisions in this project, financial and managerial, were taken by the project leader, mainly because the other partners did not show interest to be involved in this process.

Project activities

The project was divided up into two separate stages between September 1998 and January 2000. The first stage consisted of a survey aimed at gaining a better understanding of the context, existing actions and logistical and financial needs for raising awareness on cultural heritage. This was mainly done by filling in questionnaires in order to obtain information on cultural activities at local level that are geared to raising awareness on cultural heritage.

Furthermore an exchange network was created that identified pilot actions for raising awareness. This led to a joint agreement among the partners to foster methodological exchange, develop a shared view of the notion of heritage and identify a common approach for the launch future joint actions.

These interactions revealed a great diversity of different types of heritage being promoted in each of the partner countries, ranging from handicrafts to archaeology. Despite differences, the feasibility study showed that it was possible to create a network for Euro-Mediterranean countries to share their experiences of raising awareness and promoting their heritage.

The second stage of the projects then used the results of the first stage to design a programme of exchanges helping to identify pilot actions for raising awareness of and promoting the Euro-Mediterranean cultural heritage. The results of the first stage also showed that many of the partner countries already staged a series of cultural actions that are well entrenched at local level and are geared to raising awareness of the cultural heritage. In Jordan there was already a "Heritage Week", in Tunisia "Heritage Month" and in Morocco there is the "World Monument Day".

The survey also revealed a great diversity of the kinds of heritage promoted from one country to then next (archaeological, architectural, intangible, etc.) and thus the different degree of understanding of what heritage means in the Euro-Mediterranean area. In view of this, the expectations and needs of partner countries were bound to be different or even totally divergent. This was why, at the general project coordination meeting held in Athens in June 1999, the Euro-Mediterranean partners felt that it was still too early to launch an European Heritage Day-style joint awareness-raising action in their area.

The second stage was launched on this basis, more operational in nature and aimed specifically at setting up a cultural awareness exchange network. This stage ran from September 1999 to end January 2000, culminating in "The Workshop of exchange of knowledge and experiences on raising awareness about Euro-Mediterranean Cultural Heritage and its development" that was held in Brussels in January 2000.

The aim of the working sessions was to find a response to the needs and expectations that the Euro-Mediterranean partners had expressed during stage one, i.e. the desire to foster methodological exchange, to develop a shared view of the notion of heritage and to identify a common approach for the launch of future action.

The meeting also gave participants an opportunity to work on joint themes, such as 'water' and 'places of worship' which they looked at in close association with the surrounding monumental, archaeological and trade heritage. Finally the workshop participants detailed a dozen joint actions, both bilateral and multilateral depending on the type of cooperation that the partners had opted for.

Effectiveness

During the course of the project, the project partners devised around a dozen concrete initiatives, reflecting the wealth of exchanges of methodology and concepts that took place during the various meetings and workshops. Among these initiatives some will probably always remain at the planning stage, whilst others, like organising a photo contest, are now regularly being implemented in various partner countries.

For the first time, various countries from the Mediterranean region have established for the first time the foundations for a voluntary programme of communication on the heritage theme. The project partners also have been able to evaluate their policies at local level and draw their own lessons on the implementation of activities to raise awareness on cultural heritage.

Impact and sustainability

Because of the project, partners received and were able to develop many new ideas in the field of raising awareness on cultural heritage. Some of these ideas have been integrated in existing local heritage activities. Tunisia for example implemented some of the ideas into its Mois du Patrimoine⁷, without, however changing its approach in organizing such event.

In some cases the project contributed to a fruitful bilateral exchange of experience, Wallonia for example had an agreement with Tunisia on joint activities. Furthermore some of the partners are now included in the list of representatives of the European Heritage Days.

Due to the fact that the King Baudoin Foundation project of the European Heritage Days with the Council of Europe came to an end, the KBF decided not to focus anymore on the Euro-Mediterranean region and therefore, no proposal for the Euromed Heritage II was prepared. Many ideas therefore were not developed into concrete actions.

Conclusions

The conclusion of 18 months of joint work is generally positive. What was initially intended to be a feasibility study looking into the possible extension of the European Heritage Days developed into a programme of experience and know-how exchange tailored to the Euro-Mediterranean context.

This study was one of the few projects that was specifically concerned with awareness raising of heritage as a vital contribution to any integrated policy of conservation.

As there was no real follow up of this project, to date not many contacts between partners still remain. However, the expertise was gained during the project period and is still being put into practice in various partner countries.

⁷ Tunisia since 1992 organises every year its own “Mois du Patrimoine” a whole month with various activities for the sensitisation of cultural heritage. Workshops are organised, sites and monuments are opened for the general public, press conferences are held, school teachers can follow workshops on how to teach on cultural heritage, etc.

The contents of this report is the sole responsibility of ARS Progetti S.r.l. and GHK and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.