



Education and Culture DG

Culture Programme



European Heritage Days
Journées européennes
du patrimoine



COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

DGIV/PAT/JEP(2010)10
31 August 2010

EUROPEAN HERITAGE DAYS
A joint action of the Council of Europe and the European Union



2009 Evaluation Report by
Sarah Wolferstan



CENTRE FOR APPLIED ARCHAEOLOGY



**Ministry of Culture
and Tourism, Turkey**



Contents

1	EHDs: 2009 Evaluation and the future.....	3
1.1	The report	3
1.2	History and aims of the EHDs.....	3
1.3	European visibility?.....	4
1.4	The Annual Forum.....	5
1.5	The on-line Forum.....	5
1.6	A declaration for the future.....	7
2	National Evaluations 2009	8
2.1	I State & II Bodies responsible for and/or involved in the co-ordination and organisation of the EHDs	8
2.2	I Themes 2009.....	8
2.3	IIIb Success of theme.....	9
2.4	XII Global (overall) assessment of 2009 edition (i.e. EHDs 2009)	9
2.5	XVII Theme 2010	9
2.6	IIIa Media: Drawing attention to the theme & IV Media: Publicity & Analysis....	9
2.7	VII Media: Visibility of the European dimension & XI logos.....	10
2.8	IV Participation: a) Numbers of sites open b) events organised.....	10
2.9	IV Participation: c) number of visits d) number of visitors.....	10
2.10	V Description of Public and IX focus on young people	11
2.11	VIII Financial analysis	11
2.12	X Historical analysis.....	12
2.13	XIII Expectations and XV Added value of the EHD coordination at the European level via the Council of Europe and the European Commission	12
2.14	XVI Expectations of the format of the Forum & the annual meeting of the Coordinators	13

1 EHDs: 2009 Evaluation and the future

1.1 The report

The European Heritage Days (EHDs) are celebrating their 25th birthday this year, providing an appropriate opportunity to reflect on what has been a resoundingly successful European-wide programme and invite discussion on the future direction of the initiative. This Europe-wide event is visited by several millions of people each year, and is communicated to an even larger audience through the media. This report has been commissioned by the Council of Europe Secretariat and prepared by Sarah Wolferstan, of the Centre of Applied Archaeology, University College London (www.ucl.ac.uk/caa).

The report is in 3 sections;

- Section 1: Introduces the history of the event; reviews the strategies that have been deployed over the last four to five years to improve the European visibility of this joint European Commission (EC) Council of Europe (CoE) project; reviews the on-line form discussion on the future of heritage;
- Section 2: Summarises the 2009 EHDs;
- Appendices 1 & 2: summary tables of the 2009 National evaluations and on-line forum debate.

1.2 History and aims of the EHDs

Every year in September, the signatory States to the European Cultural Convention take part in the European Heritage Days – a joint action of the Council of Europe and the European Commission, putting new cultural assets on view and opening up historical buildings normally closed to the public. In March 2010, with Kazakhstan's signature, the number of participating states rose to fifty. The event originated in Granada (Spain) on 3 October 1985, during the 2nd Council of Europe Conference of European Ministers responsible for Architectural Heritage. On this occasion, the French Minister of Culture suggested extending to a European level the "Monuments' Open Doors" initiative launched in France in 1984. Several European countries, such as The Netherlands, Luxemburg, Malta, Belgium, the United Kingdom (Scotland) and Sweden soon set up similar events. In 1991, the Council of Europe officially launched the European Heritage Days. In 1999, this initiative became a joint action of the Council of Europe and the European Commission. Throughout Europe, during the weekends of September, the European Heritage Days open the doors of numerous monuments and sites, many of them usually closed to the public, allowing Europe's citizens to enjoy and learn about their shared cultural heritage and encouraging them to become actively involved in the safeguard and enhancement of this heritage for present and future generations.

The cultural events highlight local skills and traditions, architecture and works of art, but the broader aim is to bring citizens together in harmony even though there are differences in cultures and languages. The European secretariat's close cooperation with the group of national coordinators ensures the success of the EHDs. Each year, national and regional events are organised around a special theme, which vary in each country from year to year. They include such topics as; specific forms of heritage (e.g. farmhouses, musical instruments, culinary traditions, garden architecture); specific periods in history (e.g. the Medieval heritage, the Baroque heritage); society's approaches to heritage (e.g. heritage and citizenship, heritage and youth). The selection of trans-national themes illustrated by cross-border activities are jointly set up by the different countries.

The aims of the European Heritage Days are to:

- raise the awareness of European citizens to the richness and cultural diversity of Europe;
- create a climate in which the appreciation of the rich mosaic of European cultures is stimulated;

- counter racism and xenophobia and encourage greater tolerance in Europe and beyond the national borders;
- inform the public and the political authorities about the need to protect cultural heritage against new threats;
- invite Europe to respond to the social, political and economic challenges it faces.

In order to harmonise all the national and regional events and to unite them under the European flag, several principles were defined in 1991:

- EHDs should take place during a weekend in September;
- EHDs allow the general public to visit monuments and sites all over Europe usually closed to the public;
- buildings that are open all year round can contribute to the programme, providing that they offer special activities, such as guided visits, exhibitions, concerts, lectures;
- visits should be free of charge or offered at a reduced price;
- the programme should include the organisation of specific activities that will involve the general public and, in particular, young people and school pupils; all participating countries are asked to use the official name "European Heritage Days". Those countries that set up such initiatives before 1991 under a different name are invited to mention clearly that it takes place "within the framework of the European Heritage Days";
- the logos of the EHD, the CoE and the EC should appear on all promotional material; the EHD flag should be flown from all buildings open to the public during the event.

Since 1999, the EHDs have a permanent slogan: "Europe, a common heritage". This was the theme of the Council of Europe's Campaign (1999-2000), decided upon during the Second Summit of Heads of State and Government of the CoE's member states (Strasbourg, 1997). The Campaign was aimed at enhancing the value of European cultural and natural heritage whilst respecting its cultural diversity.

1.3 European visibility?

Given that the project is funded by two European organisations, there has always been an interest in the European nature of the event. Its origins as an 'Open Doors' event and commitment to opening monuments that are usually closed to the public, and ensuring access is free, reflects the core aspirations of the CoE's heritage and human rights conventions on the right to participate in culture. This aspect has grown from strength to strength over time; with more free sites and monuments opened up to the public each year; more local government authorities, schools and civil society organisations becoming involved. In-kind and voluntary contributions have grown exponentially even as budgets have been cut. One of the reasons behind this success is the simplicity of the idea; "it is yours, and it is free", an idea that has proved to be not also recession-proof, but beneficial for local economies, with many Member States reporting that the tougher economic environment has acted in their favour as tourists chose to stay closer to home and discover local places which they then chose to return to throughout the year. However, the success of the 'Open Doors' aspect of the event has also fuelled an assumption that the European nature of the event is not evident, but that the events, and benefits, are *only* local in nature.

In terms of funder expectations, this would seem to be a reasonable question to ask; what do we get from this investment? However, the grass roots nature of the event is, in one sense, inevitable, and in another, utterly desirable. The majority of visitors tend to visit local sites and attend local events, thus one could argue that they find out more about a certain aspect of their village, region and country's heritage. However, one might equally argue that what better way is there to connect with the idea of Europe than flying a European flag across thousands of monuments or museums across the participating states? Millions tune into TV or radio programmes and read newspapers announcing that the event is happening in their state, and from 2010 in 49 other countries as well, bringing the idea of Europe into villages across an entire continent. It is very hard to define what this experience of Europe means; correspondents claim year after year that it makes people feel part of "a big family"; it makes them appreciate the international links their country has always had. One correspondent argued in the forum "People define their cultural identities in very different ways and the very word 'European' will mean different things to different

people”. As our understanding of multiple cultural affiliations and the nature of identity and memory grows in its complexity, the message of a common European Cultural Heritage is as much about the diversity of representation as it is about aspects of shared heritage

1.4 The Annual Forum

Another important feature of the project has been the network of national EHD co-ordinators. In 2008 the traditional format for the annual training meetings was radically restructured in an effort to reinvigorate the EHDs and strengthen the added value of the event’s European element, in 2008 the Secretariat of the Council of Europe prepared a new strategy in partnership with the European Commission to increase the visibility and success of the European Heritage Days initiative (DGIV/PAT/JEP(2008)10 20 August 2008). The strategy put into action an annual press conference to provide focus point for professionals and associations to meet and discuss the ways and means of improving dissemination strategies. It transformed the annual co-ordinators meeting into a Forum, with a broad intellectual base focusing on interpretation methods and communication. The third tier of the strategy was to strengthen work with television, media and publishers and cinema evening with a series of activities including a magazine pilot and meetings with TV and cinema producers.

The feedback on the first two years of the Forum shows the change has been overwhelmingly popular; the themes are wide enough to be of interest to civil servants and professionals alike and they are structured so as to provide the opportunity for debate, reflection and creative thinking. The topic of the 2008 forum, held in Belgium, was dialogue; education and planning were explored. The 2009 forum, held in Slovenia focused on creativity and innovation, exploring the potential of new technologies. The 2010 forum, held in Turkey, will explore participation and prosperity. An in-depth analysis of the 2009 evaluation suggests that the added value of the European involvement in the event is alive and well. This maybe in part due to the effect of the first annual forum, but again, the reason is no doubt far simpler; in most Member States the European Logo and spirit of ‘Common European Heritage’ is of unquestionable value, elevating the event from merely local to local, national and European.

1.5 The on-line Forum

Following feedback from the national co-ordinators, the Secretariat invested time and resources in an on-line forum. In anticipation of the 2009 Evaluation Report and discussions of the future of the event, the CoE secretariat initiated a debate.

DEBATEFORUM 1 The general aim and purpose of the EHD	DEBATEFORUM 2: The past conferences – lessons to be learned
<p>Evaluate the EHDs from your past experience and ask yourselves whether the aims set have been reached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the EHDs managing to raise citizens’ awareness of Europe’s cultural diversity? • Is the rich mosaic of European cultures better appreciated? • Have they contributed to combat racism and xenophobia and encourage more tolerance in Europe and beyond Europe’s borders? • Have they helped strengthen the sense of a common European heritage and a shared identity among Europeans? • Have they contributed to a better understanding by the public and political authorities of the need to protect cultural heritage against new threats? • What response have they encouraged to the new social, political and economic challenges facing Europe? • Propose how the EHDs and the current European dimension given to them (including the series of Forums) could be improved in the future – or 	<p>You may ask yourselves whether the specific conferences have been productive for you as an attendant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • thoughts on the past conference in Slovenia and other conferences you’ve attended – what worked? What didn’t work? • thoughts on themes, content, cases, papers, speakers – were they inspiring, did you learn anything? Was it the right choice of speakers and cases? • thoughts on specific workshops, translations, moderation, wi-fi, technicalities - what worked? What didn’t work? • thoughts on the place and the surroundings, accommodation, planned trips, network and social outings - what worked? What didn’t work?

alternatively if and why the European dimension should stop.	
--	--

These two questions explored in more depth several of the questions in the National Evaluation forms. Interesting suggestions were made. Although many EHD co-ordinators read and followed the on-line debate, only 11 correspondents from ten Member States (Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, Norway, Poland, Sweden, The Netherlands, and the UK - Scotland, Wales) were actively engaged in commenting, suggesting that the virtual environment is not necessarily the best place for discussion and debate for the EHD co-ordinators, many of whom stated in their evaluations forms (XIII, XV and XVI) that nothing can replace the face to face contact of the Forum and co-ordinators meeting.

In terms of meeting the aims of the event, the on-line forum participants were positive that the European dimension strengthened the chances of securing funding, inspired the involvement of young people, added interest to the educational message, media coverage of the national events. The Correspondent from Ireland reported that *“Without this EHD initiative the platform would not exist to promote education and awareness of heritage and its contribution to our lives. ...the government support that exists does so in part by the fact that it is a Council of Europe initiative. Without this backing it may appear to be a more optional event.”* In Norway *“though the work with EHD we have the feeling of doing something together, where all belong to the “family”. A positive platform is established in a time where we still have big differences.”* In Germany *“to be under the patronage of Council of Europe is not only basic for us, even the participants give us positive feedback and it is very motivating to them to be part of “something bigger”.* In The Netherlands *“The European dimension brings our own event to a bigger scale. It has more impact, and it has a lot more potential. Real shared culture means across the borders. And it is relevant for promotion and marketing to be a part of it. And it is relevant for financing. We depend on sponsors. To be a part of a bigger event, the European Heritage Days makes it more easy.”*

In terms of increasing tolerance and reducing xenophobia, the evidence provided was anecdotal; *“people have visited buildings representing a range of cultures and religions and have developed a positive impression of the communities represented because of that experience”*. Providing evidence of the social impact of heritage work is an extremely relevant topic across Europe, and co-ordinators would benefit from professional advice on how to evaluate such success.

As far as the economic challenges facing Europe, several member states are developing increasingly sophisticated data collection methods. For example, the government in Ireland recruited specialist advice from an international firm of accountants, whose study found that there was a ten-fold return of the investment as a result of the EHD event in 2008. The value of the print media in 2009 was independently calculated at approx €2 million (excluding TV or radio). Their correspondent wrote that *“The economic, social, educational value of heritage week is immense in Ireland”*. Scotland (UK) provided even more impressive figures, the return on investment in 2008 of 17:1 for public investment and in 2009 over £2.4million was generated for the Scottish economy.

Participants in the DEBATE 1 suggested that the aims of the EHD could be furthered by:

- deciding on a common theme, if not for every year, then for the anniversary years, well in advance so that states have time to plan;
- a pan-European launch in early September, or a joint launch in several European towns/ cities;
- buy time on a European satellite channel to publicize the international nature of the events more widely;
- replicate the success of the International Heritage Photographic Experience through other projects highlighting the European dimension of the national events;
- if there is no funding for the forum, the annual meeting of co-ordinators must be prioritised.

As far as the evaluation of the Forum and the annual co-ordinators event in Belgium and Slovenia, again

the support was overwhelmingly positive. Correspondents made several suggestions on how to improve the format:

- Forum: the moderator did not have specialist knowledge of heritage and was unable to stimulate discussion at key moments in the debate.
- Co-ordinators meeting: increase the time for discussion and debate; publish an agenda in advance so that participants have time to prepare
- General: timing and funding continues to be a problem, especially for those states with more than one national co-ordinator. The many trips organised for participants were fantastic but tiring, reducing our energy
- Two states recommended that the Forum / Co-ordinators events be held later in the year, or even at the beginning of the year following.
- One co-ordinator recommended that venues to be easily accessible by air/land transport, and the agenda clearly defined in advance, with supporting papers distributed prior to the event
- More contact needed throughout the year to stimulate cross-boarder projects, promoting the European dimension on a more structural basis.

1.6 A declaration for the future

The 2010 Annual Forum in Istanbul will be the occasion for the EHD co-ordinators to reflect on the last 25 years of the event and prepare a declaration on its future. The following table provides a draft framework for discussion.

Option / Action	Limitations / Consequences
Strengthen the political support for the EHDs	Link the promotion and monitoring of conventions (namely the Faro Framework convention) more explicitly to the EHDs and the responsibility of the CDPATEP. Examine areas where the Herein database and the CMS are able to assist EHD and Herein co-ordinators to gather relevant data
Disseminate evaluation methods between participants to improve and standardise data collection on the social and economic benefits of EHDs.	
Reduce the cost of central co-ordination by establishing an independent body that can seek additional funding and sponsorship e.g. A Belgian ISBL.	Requires that the political role of the CDPATEP be clarified i.e. CoE may be able to provide the intellectual and policy guidance through their network of experts.
Reduce the cost of central co-ordination by merging the activity line with the activities of other EU supported organisations / activities.	The spirit of international governmental co-operation needs to be protected as this guarantees the support of all participating states. The participation on Non-European Union countries must be ensured.
Reduce the cost of central co-ordination by ensuring other sources of funding for the EHDs website.	Enhance its economic value by linking it to other European-wide projects that have a wider remit e.g. European Heritage Labels
Review and reduce the cost of holding an annual Forum.	The CoE could host the event in Strasbourg. National governments should subsidise travel in return for participating in the event. Ways of supporting the cost of travel for countries with smaller budgets should be ascertained.
Increase the value of the annual Forums by using them to decide on the direction of the EHD and future annual Forums.	Seek feedback from participants on the topic for the 2011 forum at the 2010 forum. Support co-ordinators in forming working groups to form common themes and joint projects.
Continue to strengthen the European dimension of the event through common themes	This has had limited success in the past. Not all countries will want to adopt a common theme due to the local and grass roots nature of support for the project. Diversity of themes is also a valuable aspect of the event (nb. Poland has suggested water as a common theme for 2011).
	The format of the annual co-ordinators meeting could be adapted to allow thematic groups to emerge and solidify, and this could be supported through small grants for European wide projects.

2 National Evaluations 2009

This overall evaluation report of the 2009 edition of the European Heritage Days is based on the national reports submitted by the coordinators of each participating country. The conclusions in the report take into consideration the EuropaNostra evaluations of 2007 and 2008. The national reports were drawn up on the basis of a standard evaluation form produced by the Council of Europe following the various requests for information made by the national co-ordinators throughout the year. The main body of the document summarises the various national reports. Answers have been paraphrased and tabulated in the appendices. For more details the co-ordinators may refer to reports submitted by each country.

The questions are numbered as follows:

- I. State and theme for 2009
- II. Bodies responsible for and/or involved in the co-ordination and organisation of the EHDs
- III. Themes for 2009
- IV. Participation and attendance
- V. Description of public attending
- VI. Media analysis
- VII. Visibility of the European dimension
- VIII. Financial analysis
- IX. Activities for young people
- X. Historical analysis
- XI. Logos
- XII. Global assessment of the 2009 edition
- XIII. What do you expect of the coordination for the European Heritage Days at European level through the Council of Europe and the European Commission?
- XIV. If appropriate, please inform us if the format of the Forum “Heritage Creativity and Innovation” (Ljubljana 24-26 September 2010) followed by the annual meeting of the coordinators met your expectations.
- XV. What is the added value of co-ordination at European level?
- XVI. Other remarks.
- XVII. The European Heritage Days in 2010

Thirty-nine reports from 35 Member States have been returned from the 49 participating countries in 2009. Thirteen countries did not submit a national evaluation report, and Belgium and the UK sent three each. This incomplete participation in the evaluations activity should be taken into account when reading this overall evaluation report, especially some of the numerical data, which unfortunately is not entirely representative. For the purposes of this report, several questions have been grouped for ease of discussion.

2.1 I State & II Bodies responsible for and/or involved in the co-ordination and organisation of the EHDs

There has been little change with the organising structure for the majority of states organise the event centrally through their Ministries of Culture or Antiquities Service. Less frequently, independent NGOs or organisations were involved as National Co-ordinators. Most States involved local authorities and local organising committees for the implementation.

2.2 I Themes 2009

The 2009 themes were wide ranging. The majority of States (ten) chose to focus on a type of heritage e.g. 20th century heritage (Belgium – Wallonia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cyprus, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Poland, Slovak Republic). Five took a more national approach, commemorating a specific aspect or period of their state’s heritage (Belarus, Latvia, Monaco, Italy and Ukraine). Eight States chose concepts (such as caring, time, otherness, magic) as their theme (Belgium - Brussels capital, Belgium - Flanders, Czech Republic, Greece), and in this category, two states chose to focus on places of leisure / aggregation (Germany, Luxembourg), and two states focused on water (Norway, Switzerland). Five states chose a general theme related to discovering, or encouraging participation in Heritage (Ireland; Lithuania; Portugal; Turkey; UK - Northern Ireland). Four States chose dialogue, cross-border heritage or

routes to express interactions with other states (Denmark; “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”; Holy See; Sweden). Three States (Austria; Slovenia; Spain) were inspired by the topic of the 2008 Forum as their theme (innovation, creativity). Two states chose to focus on one monument, or one city (Principality of Liechtenstein; Turkey).

2009 differed from 2008 as in the previous year, no states chose a common theme.

2.3 IIIb Success of theme

The majority of States reported back that their themes had been a success. Two Member States (Estonia; Finland) explained that their choice of theme had been very relevant to changes going on with their heritage management systems e.g. a reform of national museums. Several other Member States reported that the open-ended nature of their chosen themes, for example encouraging participation or focusing on a subject (Greece; Norway; Slovak Republic; Turkey; UK – England) proved to be a successful strategy as the themes widened the programme and encouraged a diversity of groups to get involved. The evaluation question would benefit from a more nuanced interpretation of success i.e. success in what terms? Guidance could be provided on different types of outcome-evaluation.

2.4 XII Global (overall) assessment of 2009 edition (i.e. EHDs 2009)

An overwhelming majority of States reported having had their most successful year yet in terms of visibility and visitor numbers. Only two states said that numbers were slightly down year on year, and one was due to the proximity of national elections affecting their media strategy. This question could be clarified as several states were unfamiliar with the nuance of ‘global’ assessment and ‘edition’.

2.5 XVII Theme 2010

The breakdown for the 2010 themes is similar, with less of a focus on examples of national heritage than in the previous year (although eight out of the 39 states had not decided their theme at the time of submitting the evaluation). Two states are repeating their theme in 2010 (UK-Northern Ireland; Holy See; Greece). Several countries were inspired by the themes used by other member states in 2009. Slovenia was inspired by the topic of the 2010 Istanbul Forum.

2.6 IIIa Media: Drawing attention to the theme & IV Media: Publicity & Analysis

These questions have been grouped as the majority of correspondents interpreted question IIIa *‘How did you draw attention to the theme during the EHD?’* as a question on their media strategy providing responses on their use of press conferences, press releases, websites rather than how the theme itself was specifically communicated. As a consequence of this confusion, many answers in III and IV were repetitive and were touched on again in question VII.

There were exceptions and several correspondents provided useful and relevant responses. Finland held a seminar with heritage professionals in advance of announcing their theme that helped them decide and led to a publication that informed their event. Lithuania worked together with NGOs and other interested organisations on their communication strategy. Hungary co-ordinated with the organisers of another major national event closely linked to its theme. Monaco linked the event to a national celebration. Norway began to consult on the theme with its heritage professionals a year in advance of the event. The Slovak Republic published a special issue of its Cultural Heritage Review in advance of the event. The UK – England encouraged local groups to propose their own theme if they wished and as a result noticed that a trend evolved with common concerns being expressed e.g. climate change.

In terms of their media strategy and impact, all of the states listed a wide range of promotional material used. Some states used professional distribution companies, others, with more restricted budgets, relied with a high level of success on a mixture of press releases, and information on their websites and social networking sites. Print and web articles were recorded accurately by the majority of states, who are increasingly collecting data on the media impact of the event. Several states had formed strong partnerships with their national and regional television and radio networks, ensuring a very impressive coverage of the events. To give just a few examples; Germany reported 50 TV programmes; FRYOM: 12

programmes (4 of which were interviews); Lithuania: 26 local TV programmes and 6 National; Denmark: five national programmes with 350,000 viewers, and Cyprus two.

2.7 VII Media: Visibility of the European dimension & XI logos

Several Member States gave detailed answers on the perception and evidence of the European nature of the events. Austria, Luxembourg and The Netherlands pointed to the importance of cross-border activities, Iceland emphasised the history and background to the EHDs in its media strategy; Slovenia and Estonia wrote that the flags with the EHD logo were very useful as was the European brochure. Ukraine wrote that an international element usually raises more interest. Those who had chosen the more open-ended themes, such as Lithuania '*Creating History Together*' were able to increase the visibility of the multicultural nature of the country through the links with the European dimension of the event. Greece wrote that although the European dimension was visible in nationally produced materials and felt at many of the events, it was not always visible at the local level. Despite their efforts, Belgium-Brussels Capital felt that the European dimension was not of interest to their Media.

All of the Member States confirmed that they had used the recommended logos on their materials alongside their own institutional logos or those of their sponsors. Unfortunately, the majority of correspondents referred to the use of the EHD logo in their materials and media releases in question VII (visibility of the European dimension), and duplicated their answers again in question XI on logos, suggesting that the wording of question VII should be refined in future evaluation questionnaires.

2.8 IV Participation: a) Numbers of sites open b) events organised

Of the 39 co-ordinators to have responded, 37 provided (partial) answers to this question. Thus a conservative estimate is that over 22,630 sites took part in this event. The numbers ranged from one site in the Principality of Liechtenstein to 7500 in Germany, 5285 in the UK, 1245 in Belgium, 1052 in the Czech Republic, 900 in Hungary, 500 in Ireland, c.400 in Italy. Over 10,250 additional events were also organised including archaeological and photographic exhibitions, competitions, guided tours, bus tours, walks, cycle routes, debates, conferences seminars, concerts, parades, fairs, workshops, re-enactments, theatre, puppets, storytelling, poetry, film screening, traditional games, opening and closing ceremonies. The 2008 Evaluation report found it difficult to report back figures.

2.9 IV Participation: c) number of visits d) number of visitors

Unfortunately very few states reported clearly on the number of visits (single entry to a site or event) and the number of visitors (usually less than the number of visits as many visitors make repeat visits during the EHD events). In some cases this was due to a miscomprehension of the question, which could be resolved with an explanation in the next evaluation form. However, the majority did not have the ability to collect the data. Several states reported that as no tickets were issued it was difficult to calculate how many entries were made and if these were repeats. Sweden tackled this problem by questioning a sample of visitors to see whether they had made repeat visits. Furthermore, certain countries provided figures only for the events, and not total number of visits / visitors to the monument and sites (e.g. Norway).

Of the 39 reports, 34 co-ordinators provided figures; 11 on the number of visits, which totalled c. 5,826,000 and 30 on the number of visitors c. 3,716,000. However, Belgium – Brussels Capital; UK – England; Slovenia and Germany only provided number of visits, and if this figure is added to the total the number of visitors, the total for the 34 Member States is c. 9.5 million. This figure should be treated as a very conservative estimate, as it appears to be down on 2005 and 2006 figures, despite the fact the majority of the States replied that visitor numbers are increasing year on year. This may be in part due to the absence of key reports such as France, where numbers have been c12,000,000 in previous years. The 2005 report of the Liaison Office, the Centro Nacional de Cultura in Portugal, recorded a record figure of 21,764,378 visitors in the 48 participating countries. In 2006 the total number of visitors in the 27 (of the 49 participating countries) that submitted figures was 19,082,672, with the total figure likely to have been much higher. The 2007 and 2008 Annual Evaluation Reports prepared by Europa Nostra found total figures difficult to calculate due to the inconsistencies in level of responses.

2.10 V Description of Public and IX focus on young people

The majority of Member States replied that visitors came from very varied ages and backgrounds. The most frequent visitor profile were young people, families and older people, and three member states referred to interested and educated visitors as more prevalent (Germany, Greece, The Netherlands). Two evaluations from Belgium and the UK claimed that the events had an appeal to older people (Flanders, Northern Ireland) whereas Monaco said that this trend had shifted from older people to families. This may be related to their choice of theme; 'Russian Ballet'. Lithuania reported that there was an increase in the number of National Minorities at the 2009 EHD (their theme was 'Creating History Together'). The UK responses had the most sophisticated breakdowns of age, ethnic and social and economic background, locality. The majority of British visitors were local.

As well as describing this wider public, six Member States (Austria, Cyprus, Finland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Slovenia, Turkey) described their international partners, and the partner institutions / organisations with whom the events were organised, emphasising the important role of the EHDs in providing a partnership opportunity for national governments using the EHDs to build links with regional and local government and non-governmental organisations, or 'heritage communities'.

The participation of young people was encouraged through targeted media and the organisation of educational, theatrical or interactive events and workshops at many of the EHD sites across Europe. Many local organising committees worked in partnership with schools or youth groups, running events in schools and using young volunteers to organise their own events with several states referring to the importance of young volunteers in organising and running many of the events (Germany, Norway, Slovenia, UK - England). Examples of projects include: Belgium – Flanders, that provided grants for workshops, exhibitions and events, published an educational manual for teachers, and a handbook for children; Austria and Belgium (Wallonia and Brussels Capital) ran a special EHD day in all of their schools, and The Netherlands piloted a similar initiative, which will go nationwide in 2010. Denmark released a game for mobile phones. Several states also ran heritage competitions (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and many ran the International Heritage Photographic Experience (IHPE).

2.11 VIII Financial analysis

All of Member States who replied used public funding for the EHDs. The public budgets were not all central; with a range of public partners at national and local level getting involved (i.e. State Television, Tourist Agencies, City Councils). Several mixed this public funding with limited private sponsorship (Belgium - Wallonia & Flanders; Cyprus; Hungary; The Netherlands; Norway; Portugal; Slovenia; Switzerland – where it was 25% of the budget; UK - Scotland). Latvia mentioned the importance of contributions of private owners. Only three of the correspondents (UK – England; Belgium – Flanders; The Netherlands) estimated the running costs (i.e. the cost of staff time) and in all three cases these were the largest proportion of their EHD budgets.

In terms of budgets, the totals varied widely from none in Iceland (only staff time is funded and they run the entire event through volunteers) and Italy's €2,000,000. Seven countries did not provide a budget figure, but of those 24 States that did, the total spend, largely excluding staff time, was over €5,000,000. The majority of this was spent on promoting the event. Five Member States were in the €800-10,000 range, seven Member States in the €14-28,000 range; two spent €400,00 (Cyprus, Hungary); four spent €100-150,000 (Norway; Poland; Denmark and Switzerland). The UK and the Netherlands both spent between €400-470,000; the next highest being Belgium at €1,025,000 and Italy at €2 million.

None of the correspondents estimated the value of the in-kind contribution made by staff and volunteers, with the exception of the UK-Scotland, who reported that 5,900 volunteers contributed 31,750 working hours. However, the majority of correspondents replied that volunteers were used to a greater (15-20,000 in The Netherlands) or lesser (6) extent. "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Slovak Republic, Turkey and Portugal reported that no volunteers were used.

The true beneficiaries, however, were the general public. 27 of the 39 countries had 100% free access to sites and events. A further 10 reported that they were nearly all free, with some event charging subsidized amounts.

2.12 X Historical analysis

Of those Member States to send in their evaluations, the countries of Benelux together with Sweden were the first to join the initiative in the late 1980s. Since then there has been a steady increase in participation with Northern and European countries (Ireland, Denmark, Finland, Estonia, Germany) and Central European countries (Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Hungary, Poland), joining in the early 1990s. Thirteen new States joined between 1994-96, mainly from the Mediterranean, but also from other areas in Europe. Bosnia & Herzegovina and Austria joined in the late 1990s, and finally Turkey and the Ukraine joined in 2007 and 2008 respectively.

In terms of the evolution of the EHDs from its early days until present, most Member States report that the number and range of sites being opened up to the public as part of the EHD initiative have increased over the years. States have also tended to move from a central organising committee to increasingly fluid co-ordination networks composed of local municipalities, organisations, and volunteer groups, with the exception of The Netherlands, that has had a local set up from the beginning, and Poland, that began as a loosely organised event, and has become increasingly centralised. The events have become increasingly organised, with more of a focus on planning themes, media strategies and supporting documentation and as a result have an increasingly high profile as the years have progressed. Several Member States have extended the length of the event from what was originally a one day event to a whole week, or longer. Iceland has found timing and budget constraints to be a barrier, but despite this has recorded an increasing interest in the event year on year. Spain has found that widening the definition of heritage through its themes has got more people engaged. In Ukraine the event has become a national priority for achieving social development.

The majority of Member States report that the event is hugely popular, and increasingly so. Some report that their visitor numbers are starting to stabilise, and are evaluating the reasons why this has happened and seeking alternative ways of diversifying the event (Cyprus, Denmark, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”; The Netherlands) such as increasing the involvement of local communities and NGOs, combining it with other relevant events. Sweden blames a 300% budget cut for a loss in popularity over the years, but again hopes that a rebranding of the event will help it link better to the European message.

2.13 XIII Expectations and XV Added value of the EHD coordination at the European level via the Council of Europe and the European Commission

The expectations of the majority of Member States of the COE and EC co-ordination include

- Guidance & support: communicating themes well in advance; suggesting common themes; exchange on practical matters; sharing expertise on European values; international collaboration; inspiring new ideas; providing the opportunity to meet and share a platform for debate on common areas of concern;
- Materials: providing media packs and materials;
- Overview i.e. providing the overall evaluating the public benefit of EHDs; developing an overall vision;
- Communication: raising the profile at an international level and assisting with communication at a national level;
- A source of funding for national events, or an international pilot.

The majority of Member States saw a great deal of added value in the European-level co-ordination (with the exception of two responses from the UK). Several co-ordinators repeated their answers in replying to question XV on added value of European-level co-ordination. Useful comments covered the following topics:

- Personal contact with the secretariat and other EHD co-ordinators represents an invaluable support;
- The importance of the human rights aspect of CoE’s work, makes us feel part of a family, connects people across Europe;
- The European mark is ‘prestigious’ and ‘empowering’. It distinguishes the event which stands out from other nationally organised events, makes it easier to secure finances and media attention

internally;

- A key forum for International / European exchange allows us to develop a common approach, increases quality of the profession to inspire and innovate.

2.14 XVI Expectations of the format of the Forum & the annual meeting of the Co-ordinators

The correspondents lent their overwhelmingly support to the Forum format. Some of the positive comments included; *'an inspiration'*; *'very interesting, helpful and well organised'*; *'lively discussion'*; *'I sincerely hope this becomes an annual CoE event'*; *'very useful, I got lots of new ideas out of it, and got in touch with experts'*; *'exceeded expectations, very educational, well organised, enlightening, appropriate theme'*; *'instructive, inspiring and motivational. I liked that the theme was more practical this year'*. Several Member States made very practical suggestions as to how to improve the format.

- Austria suggested that the online data transfer used during the workshops in the Brussels 2008 Forum worked better than flip charts;
- Denmark made some suggestions on how to improve the quality of presentation and increase interaction between participants by opening a call for papers, allowing specific projects to be presented, and strengthening the social media forum for EHD co-ordinators on the website;
- Northern Ireland (UK) found the co-ordinators meeting too formal;
- Scotland (UK) was very disappointed with the timing, which clashed with their EHDs;
- Several Member States (Norway; Sweden; Switzerland) reported that the face to face contact is the only way to encourage exchange of experience;
- Turkey suggested that more time was needed for discussion.

Further suggestions on the format of the Forum and Annual Co-ordinators meeting were made by the seven co-ordinators who participated in the on-line forum debate (see 1.5).