



Education and Culture

Culture 2000

European Commission
Commission européenne



European Heritage Days
Journées européennes
du patrimoine



COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

CDPAT(2007)7
9 May 2007

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

EVALUATION OF THE 2006 EUROPEAN HERITAGE DAYS

SYNTHESIS REPORT



Elaborated by **EUROPA NOSTRA**,
Liaison Office of the European Heritage Days

Table of contents:

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Analysis of the Reports**
 - a. Participation and attendance**
 - b. The themes**
 - c. The European dimension**
 - d. Media coverage**
 - e. Activities for young people**
 - f. Free access, financial resources**
- 3. Overall conclusions**

I. Introduction

This evaluation report on the 2006 edition of the European Heritage Days (EHD) is based on the various national reports sent in by the co-ordinators in each participating country.

38 national reports were sent in (by 35 participating countries), plus a joint report by the Nordic countries (Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden) on their joint project. The reports received concerned:

- **Albania:** “Albanian Folk Iso-Polyphony: a Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity”;
- **Armenia:** “Views on the Middle Ages”;
- **Austria:** “Water”;
- **Belgium**
 - **Brussels-Capital Region:** “Body and Soul”;
 - **Flanders:** “Import/Export”;
 - **Wallonia:** “Heritage and Citizenship”;
- **Bulgaria:** “Heritage in the Information Society”;
- **Croatia:** “The Sound of Heritage”;
- **Cyprus:** “Traditional Arts and Crafts and Social Life”;
- **Denmark:** “Buildings of the Renaissance”;
- **Estonia:** “Places of Arrival and Departure”;
- **Finland:** “Places of Arrival and Departure”;
- **France:** “Let’s bring our heritage to life”;
- **Germany:** “Historical gardens and parks”;
- **Greece:** “Let’s eat: culture on the table”;
- **Hungary:** “The Architecture of the Recent Past (Socialist Realism in Hungary)”;
- **Iceland:** “Places of Arrival and Departure”;
- **Ireland:** “Heritage Week - A celebration of who we are and where we’ve come from”;
- **Italy:** “Heritage from Afar”;
- **Latvia:** “Preservation and Renovation of Historic Interiors”;
- **Liechtenstein:** “New Living in a Historical Monument: The “Brendlehouse” at Schellenberg”;
- **Luxembourg:** “Public spaces and citizenship”;
- **Malta:** /
- **Monaco:** “Heritage of the “Belle Epoque””;
- **Netherlands:** “Celebration! Twenty years of Heritage Days”;
- **Norway:** “Places of Arrival and Departure”;
- **Poland:** “Local traditions / Cultural diversity in the regions / In the footsteps of great creators of culture”;
- **San Marino:** (no particular theme);
- **Serbia:** “Wood”;
- **Slovakia:** “Europe. A common heritage”;
- **Slovenia:** “Castles, Fortresses and City Walls”;

- **Spain**
 - **Spain:** “A future for our past”;
 - **Catalonia:** “Youth and Heritage”;
- **Sweden:** “Places of Arrival and Departure”;
- **Switzerland:** “Garden spaces - garden dreams”;
- **“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”:** “Heritage Bridging over Cultures”;
- **Ukraine:** “Pyssanka (painted eggs) in Ukraine / Treasures Saved”;
- **United Kingdom**
 - **Scotland:** (no national theme);
- **Nordic Project (Sweden, Iceland, Finland, Estonia, Norway):** “Places of Arrival and Departure”;

In spite of several reminders, including a final, personal reminder sent in January 2007, the following 16 countries did not send in national evaluation reports:

- **Andorra**
- **Azerbaijan**
- **Belarus**
- **Bosnia and Herzegovina**
- **Czech Republic**
- **Georgia**
- **Holy See**
- **Lithuania**
- **Moldova**
- **Montenegro**
- **Portugal**
- **Romania**
- **Russian Federation**
- **Spain, Andalusia**
- **Turkey**
- **United Kingdom**
 - **England**
 - **London**
 - **Northern Ireland**
 - **Wales**

It is important, therefore, when reading this consolidated evaluation report, to bear in mind that it is based on a majority of the participating countries, but not all of them. This will evidently affect the information, particularly statistical information, to be gleaned from the 2006 edition.

Furthermore, the different national reports are not all structured in the same way, and the quantity and quality of the information they contain differs substantially from one report to another. It is extremely difficult, therefore, to draw overall conclusions concerning the 2006 edition of the European Heritage Days.

It was accordingly decided to send an evaluation questionnaire to all the national coordinators for the 2007 edition, in order to produce a European evaluation report based on comparable data from each country.

This evaluation report is therefore merely a working document that highlights certain salient features and tendencies of the European Heritage Days organised in each country. It also seeks to draw certain conclusions for future Heritage Days, but without offering an exhaustive analysis of the 2006 edition.

*

2. Analysis of the Reports

a) *Participation and attendance*

- **Albania:** no figures provided;
- **Armenia:** 15 towns and cities took part – 25,000 visitors;
- **Austria:** 135 events in different parts of the country – 19,000 visitors;
- **Belgium:**
 - **Brussels-Capital Region:** 89 sites – 54 events organised – 100,000 visits: figures steady from year to year;
 - **Flanders:** 580 monuments open and 501 activities organised – 330,000 visits;
 - **Wallonia:** 490 activities – 183 municipalities – dozens of events – no attendance figures, but the most popular cultural event of the year;
- **Bulgaria:** no figures;
- **Croatia:** 2 weeks of events – 30 different sites – 30% more visitors than in 2005;
- **Cyprus:** 35 events in 7 municipalities – over 6,000 visitors;
- **Denmark:** 63 organisations participated and 70 activities were organised around the country – about the same number of visitors as in previous years;
- **Estonia:** 25 events – 6,000 visitors;
- **Finland:** 82 towns and cities – 167 events – 21,500 visitors (slightly fewer than in previous years);
- **France:** 15,480 sites (including 1,000 sites open for the first time and 3,129 sites open exceptionally) – 23,000 organised events – over 12 million visitors (one of the French people's favourite cultural events);
- **Germany:** 7,000 sites in 2,500 towns and cities – 4.5 million visitors;
- **Greece:** 57 events and all state museums and archaeological sites were open free of charge – 112,000 visitors;
- **Hungary:** 450 monuments in 168 towns and cities – 75 guided tours – 20,000 visitors – (steadily increasing. The EHD are becoming increasingly important in Hungary);
- **Iceland:** 6 selected sites – 33 visitors (September is not a good time of year for the EHD in Iceland because of the weather and the numerous local traditions celebrated at the same time);
- **Ireland:** 900 events (a sharp increase) – no actual figures, but attendance seems to have been higher than ever;

- **Italy:** 821 events and 1,042 cultural sites open to the public – 362,758 visitors at the 376 monuments managed by the Ministry of Culture;
- **Latvia:** 98 events and 116 sites involved – over 40,000 visitors;
- **Liechtenstein:** 600 visitors at the “Brendlehouse”;
- **Luxembourg:** 22 monuments in 15 locations – 5,000 visitors (considerably fewer than in previous years for 2 reasons: no exceptional venues and many competing events on the same date);
- **Malta:** the EHD were not celebrated in Malta this year because of serious budgetary difficulties;
- **Monaco:** after increasing steadily since 1996, attendance levelled out in 2006 (because the Monaco-Matin newspaper did not cover the EHD) – 36 sites (including 6 new ones) – 30,851 visitors – large proportion of retired people and families – 68% had attended previous EHD – 47 visitors from other countries;
- **Netherlands:** 900,000 visitors – 358 municipalities – 3,500 monuments open;
- **Norway:** 203 events in 107 locations – 47,100 visitors (22% more than in 2005);
- **Poland:** 803 events in 195 municipalities – no attendance figures, but EHD increasingly well-known and popular;
- **San Marino:** the country’s 7 most important monuments were open to the public free of charge – 10,000 visitors (far more than in 2005);
- **Serbia:** events in 32 municipalities – over 84,000 visitors;
- **Slovakia:** 81 sites open free of charge – 52,000 visitors;
- **Slovenia:** 54 towns and cities – 132 events – 24,000 visitors (steadily increasing);
- **Spain:**
 - **Spain:** over 500 sites were open – no attendance figures;
 - **Catalonia:** 215 municipalities and 280 sites open – 345 activities – 50,000 visitors;
- **Sweden:** 91 events (220 in 2005) – 40,000 visitors (70,000 en 2005) – fewer events as the theme was too similar to the 2005 edition (Places of arrival and departure / Maritime Heritage);
- **Switzerland:** unprecedented attendance: 70,000 visitors (half of them in French-speaking Switzerland) – 230 excursions;
- **“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”:** 57 sites – 22 organisations involved (all state and local museums and heritage protection institutions) – 27,100 visitors (11% more than in 2005);
- **Ukraine:** no attendance figures (Heritage Day is on 18 April, Museum Day on 18 May and International Tourism Day on 27 September);
- **United Kingdom:**
 - **Scotland:** 802 sites open in 28 regions (out of 32) – 200,000 visits (steadily increasing).

Conclusions:

The report of the previous Liaison Office, the *Centro Nacional de Cultura* in Portugal, spoke of a record figure of “21,764,378 visitors in the 48 participating countries” for the 2005 European Heritage Days.

In 2006 49 countries (minus Malta) took part and the total number of visitors in the **27 countries** which submitted figures was **19,082,672**.

It is therefore safe to say that **the 2006 edition beat all previous attendance records** and that the EHD are becoming an important part of the European cultural scene. More and more countries are participating, more and more sites and monuments are opening and more events are being organised, with the result that the number of visitors is increasing.

However, while many national reports show that the EHD are becoming increasingly important at the national level and increasingly successful from year to year, not all countries have the same high attendance scores.

In France, where the concept of the EHD was born in 1984, there was a record figure of over 12 million visitors, or one out of five French people. In the Netherlands, one of the first countries to have followed France's example, there were 900,000 visitors, or one in 17 inhabitants. The proportion is about the same in Germany, where 4.5 million visitors attended the EHD in 2006.

Other countries, like Latvia or Serbia, whose participation in the EHD is more recent, have also registered very high attendance figures, and Switzerland, Poland, Scotland, Wallonia and Hungary report a steady increase in the popular success of the EHD.

The potential of the EHD is therefore clear and steadily increasing in most of the participating countries. The fact that the first countries to have started organising EHD have the highest attendance figures shows that the public is not tiring of the event. Far from it.

b) The themes

It is worth noting that the EHD in different countries do not focus solely on the built heritage but are diversifying their activities from year to year.

The following few examples show the diversity of subject matter and approaches in the 2006 edition.

In **Albania** the theme of the 2006 edition of the EHD was “**Albanian Folk Iso-Polyphony: a Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity protected by UNESCO**”. It was even suggested that the Ministry of Education and Science should include in the school syllabus for 9-year-olds a chapter on the history and values of Albanian iso-polyphony, in order to introduce the younger generations to the values of the country’s spiritual heritage.

In **Bulgaria** the theme in 2006, “**Heritage in the Information Society**”, was chosen for its exceptional topicality following the decisions taken at the regional forum “the cultural corridors of South East Europe”, held under the auspices of the President of the Republic of Bulgaria, the Director General of UNESCO and the Secretary General of the Council of Europe in May 2005. 2006 was also declared “electronic education year” in Bulgaria and two pioneering multimedia tools were developed and published on the Internet (“*Development and promotion of multimedia product: the children and the cultural heritage of South East Europe*” and “*Virtual cultural corridors in South East Europe*”). The importance of the new information technologies was highlighted, as were the possibilities offered by these new means of communication for heritage conservation, promotion and education and the encouragement of cultural tourism. The EHD were also an opportunity to combine the efforts of the public authorities and NGOs working in the heritage field.

In **Croatia** the theme of the 2006 EHD was “**The Sound of Heritage**”. Audio and visual information was disseminated on CDs and CD-Roms concerning organs in Croatia, and cultural and sports programmes were organised for the public. Visitors were also allowed into the workshops of the Institute of Restoration, where the different working methods were explained.

In **Denmark** the theme was “**Buildings of the Renaissance**”. It was extended to embrace a number of activities not necessarily centred on the built heritage, including intangible heritage features such as Renaissance music concerts and workshops concerning the taste of foods.

The theme chosen by **Spain**, “**A future for our past**”, was an opportunity to introduce a new dimension into heritage research: the coexistence of the historical heritage with new additions, and also changing landscapes and cultural contributions from elsewhere. The idea was to show that taking pride in the cultural heritage was an important aspect of citizenship.

In **Estonia** the village of Karula celebrated the EHD in a practical way. 25 people volunteered to spend the day together cleaning the surroundings of the local presbytery. This was followed by a discussion about churches and cemeteries as symbols of **places of arrival and departure**, the theme of the Nordic transfrontier EHD project in which the country took part.

In **Greece**, the EHD theme was “**Let’s eat: culture on the table. Various approaches to the history of nutrition**”, with different approaches to food: historical, economic, anthropological, ethnographic, cultural and so on.

Italy chose the theme “**Heritage from afar**”, which touches on various cultural fields, such as archaeology, architecture, art, popular traditions, archives and books, cinema, theatre and music. Furthermore, these EHD were an opportunity to highlight the links between European and other cultures, and to get a better grasp of the complex cultural identity of Italian citizens as Europeans.

In **Poland**, the EHD covered three different themes: “**local traditions**”, “**cultural diversity in the regions**” and “**in the footsteps of great creators of culture**”. As well as guided tours, conferences or exhibitions, presentations of craft trades and traditional activities were organised. A hundred-odd shows and concerts, religious ceremonies and meetings with creators of culture also took place.

Finally, **Germany** and **Switzerland** focused their EHD on **gardens and parks**, intrinsically European themes that help to underline the various influences and peculiarities imported from abroad, with visits to gardens, cemeteries, kitchen gardens, parks and so on.

Conclusions

The themes selected for the EHD and the different related events are becoming increasingly **varied**, highlighting every aspect of the heritage, including buildings, landscapes, nature and the intangible heritage (oral, artistic, musical, gastronomic, visual, auditory and so on) and the various traditions and customs of the participating countries in general. It will be interesting to see if this tendency towards diversification is confirmed, to see which aspects of their heritage Europeans are interested in. It is already clear that events organised in connection with the EHD, in the performing arts, for example (concerts, plays), or sporting events, are very popular.

With the exception of the joint programme organised by the Nordic countries, which we shall refer to later, the themes are generally **national**, even if the same themes sometimes recur from one year to the next or are found in different countries at the same time.

In most countries the choice of EHD theme does not seem to affect the level of public interest displayed. The way in which the theme is tackled is very important, however, and how the events are organised determines which dimensions of the heritage are highlighted.

Some themes, because of their titles, **carry political messages**. For example, “Let’s bring our heritage to life” in France, “Heritage and Citizenship” in Wallonia, “New Living in a Historical Monument: The “Brendlehouse” at Schellenberg” in Liechtenstein or “Heritage Bridging over Cultures” in “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”.

Other themes hark back to the recent or more distant past, such as “The Architecture of the Recent Past (Socialist Realism)” in Hungary, or the supranational dimension of the heritage, as in Spain or Italy.

Finally, some countries choose not to select any particular national theme, as in San Marino or in Scotland, or select several themes, as in Poland.

c) The European dimension

In most of the countries participating in the EHD, the organisers focused on the European dimension, either in their information campaigns or through their choice of theme (see above) or the type of events they organised, such as cross-border tours. Rare were those countries where this dimension was completely lacking. The following examples show the EHD national co-ordinators’ concern to publicise the involvement of the Council of Europe and the European Commission:

- **Armenia:** in the press release the country presented the EHD and the political activities of the Council of Europe, the European message of the EHD and their scope and role;
- **Austria:** cross-border activities were organised (mainly in Upper Austria) and six city tours were organised in different languages;
- **Belgium:**
 - **Brussels Capital Region:** flags with the EHD logo were available at each site;
 - **Wallonia:** cross-border activities were organised;
- **Catalonia:** each municipality was free to organise the EHD in the spirit of the slogan “Europe, a common heritage”;
- **Denmark:** normally the country would take part in the Nordic project but this year it wanted to celebrate the EHD in the framework of its national “Renaissance” year. This theme has a strong European dimension as the Danish Renaissance was inspired by the Italian, German and Dutch styles;
- **Greece:** the logo was on all the publications and the EHD flag was on display almost everywhere; the EHD brochure was distributed to the organisers;
- **Hungary:** the European logo was widely disseminated; the world heritage sites and the winners of the European Union’s cultural heritage prize / Europa Nostra competition were included in the programme;
- **Luxembourg:** cross-border programmes were organised with Lorraine, the Sarre region and Wallonia;
- **Monaco:** a cross-border programme with France was set in place for the occasion; the logo was present on all promotional material and the EHD flag and the slogan “Europe, a common heritage” were used;

- **Norway:** an information pack for the media was available (with the brochure co-ordinated by the Liaison Office to emphasise the European aspect of the EHD); the EHD logo was widely disseminated;
- **Poland:** the organisers highlighted the European dimension all over the country; the logo was used on posters and promotional material and the flag was flown on the monuments concerned;
- The most remarkable initiative of the 2006 EHD was without a doubt the ***pilot project developed for the first time by five Nordic countries***: Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. This project, around the theme “places of arrival and departure”, highlighted the Nordic heritage and the common spirit that prevails in these different countries. It was a real opportunity to share ideas and experiences, leading to new means of promoting and raising awareness of the EHD. A platform for future co-operation in the Nordic countries was built. The same promotional literature in five languages was produced and distributed free to event organisers (poster, brochure, leaflet, etc.).

The organising countries shared a number of objectives:

- the development of a basis for future co-operation on the EHD in the Nordic and Baltic countries;
- the setting up of an example of a cross-border EHD initiative in Europe;
- making the Nordic heritage more visible for EHD visitors.

The reader is referred to the joint report submitted by the Nordic countries concerning this project. It resulted in the visible satisfaction of the participants and considerable mutual enrichment in terms of heritage conservation in general and of the working methods of the different partners.

The fact that this project was financed by the Nordic Council of Ministers enabled countries with more limited resources to implement a more ambitious project than usual.

Conclusions

The various national reports reveal that the national co-ordinators make a real effort to stress the European dimension of the EHD, in the information campaigns aimed at the public and/or the media, or in the actual organisation of the EHD (themes, cross-border activities, participation in an international photography event, etc.).

The European dimension of the EHD seems to be present in a large majority of the participating countries although, regrettably, there are still countries where this is not the case at all. A ***detailed analysis of the visibility of the European dimension in the countries which organise the EHD***, prepared by the Liaison Office, is available in a separate document.

Based on information available on Internet sites and the printed matter produced by the participating countries, the analysis focuses mainly on: (i) use of the official name “European heritage days”; (ii) use of the official logo of the EHD; (iii) presentation of the concept and the European history of the EHD; (iv) presentation of the EHD as a joint action of the Council of Europe and the European Commission; (v) the dissemination of

information about EHD events organised in other countries; (vi) the use of foreign languages; (vii) cross-border events.

See the analysis for further details of the findings.

As well as analysing each country, the document prepared by the Liaison Office focuses on various cross-border projects (the Nordic project, the collaboration between Luxembourg, the Sarre region, Lorraine and Wallonia, as well as the Thalys train service, which advertised the event and offered special fares during the EHD in France, Germany and the Netherlands).

d) Media coverage

Some examples of media campaigns and coverage in the participating countries:

- **Catalonia:** ample coverage in the press;
- **Austria:** over 100 press clippings;
- **Belgium:**
 - **Brussels-Capital Region:** press kit distributed to the media and press conference in early September;
 - **Wallonia:** radio announcements, mailing shot – good coverage in the printed press – good media support in general;
- **Bulgaria:** organisation of large media and press campaigns (radio, TV, etc.);
- **Cyprus:** press coverage – press conference by the Minister of the Interior – fact sheet for the newspapers and the media;
- **Denmark:** mainly local media coverage;
- **Estonia:** broad press coverage (25 articles), plus radio and television;
- **Finland:** 225 articles in the press – press conference and press release – TV and radio coverage;
- **France:** the theme of the 2006 EHD did not spark much interest in the media, but coverage was good all the same thanks to a well-orchestrated campaign – a telephone hotline and an information point for the public were also provided;
- **Greece:** media coverage in the press and on local radio and television channels;
- **Hungary:** very wide coverage in the press (200 articles), on the radio and on television;
- **Ireland:** broad media coverage – advertising on buses and trains, special postcards distributed in cafes, cinemas, restaurants, etc;
- **Latvia:** broad media coverage;
- **Norway:** extensive press coverage (350 articles) – information pack produced for the media;
- **Poland:** television, radio and press coverage;
- **San Marino:** wide media coverage (press, radio, television, etc.);
- **Slovenia:** wide media coverage;
- **Sweden:** coverage in the press (183 articles) – information pack produced for the media;
- **Switzerland:** extensive media coverage (600 articles in the press: 10% more than in 2005);
- **“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”:** extensive coverage in the press (11 dailies and 1 weekly), on television and on the radio (9 radio and TV advertisements);

Conclusions

Once again, most of the national reports stress the importance of the media. As a general rule extensive national media coverage helps to attract increasing numbers of visitors. As well as the national, and even the European media, the national reports also highlight the importance of coverage in the local media.

In addition to information aimed specifically at the media, a large majority of the participating countries set up Internet sites about the EHD. These sites are analysed in detail in the analysis, mentioned above, of the visibility of the European dimension of the EHD in the participating countries.

Internet sites are increasingly being used as a decisive means of advertising and informing the public about the EHD.

Very few national reports, however, contain any information about coverage of the EHD abroad. Instead they focus on media coverage of national events. To strengthen the European dimension of the EHD, it is important to advertise how the EHD are celebrated in other countries.

In this connection the reader is referred to the communication strategy document prepared by the Liaison Office, and to the discussion concerning the future workshop on heritage communication to be held in Sibiu – European capital of culture 2007 – in October 2007, on the occasion of the annual meeting of the co-ordinators.

e) Activities for young people

Many countries attach particular importance to interesting the younger generations:

- **Armenia:** EHD organised by the Ministry of Culture and Youth;
- **Austria:** a special European heritage day for schools was organised on 11 October 2006;
- **Belgium:**
 - **Brussels-Capital Region:** “Heritage Monday” for schools;
 - **Wallonia:** “Youth and Heritage” day for schools since 2005 – attempt to revive the operation “let’s adopt a monument”;
- **Bulgaria:** EHD organised in co-operation with the Ministry of Education and Science and the Youth and Sports Department – programmes for young people (lessons on the heritage, competitions, teaching programmes, etc.);
- **Croatia:** programme for children at infants’ schools in Zagreb, with visits to the Andautonija archaeological park;
- **Denmark:** various activities aimed directly at a young audience;
- **Estonia:** articles for teachers in the press;
- **Finland:** many schools are involved in an actual European project and include the EHD in the syllabus;
- **Germany:** special programmes in certain towns and cities – guided tours for children, lectures, etc. – special promotional material (mouse mats, calendars, etc.) – brochures for teachers and a project specifically aimed at schools;
- **Greece:** Friday for schools – numerous activities for young people;
- **Latvia:** drawing competition for schoolchildren and numerous events for young people;
- **Monaco:** the EHD were extended into October with a programme organised specially for schoolchildren - concerts by pupils at the music academy;
- **Netherlands:** special activities for young people (treasure hunts, puzzles, etc.);

- **Spain:**
 - **Catalonia:** 71 activities (literature and photography competitions, workshops, plays, etc.) – 2006 theme: “Youth and Heritage”.

Conclusions

A vast majority of countries participating in the EHD propose a variety of activities for young people and/or schools. Some countries, such as Monaco, analysed attendance at the EHD and discovered that families were well represented. It is very important, therefore, to organise programmes for children.

Some countries actually organise special European Heritage Days for children, outside the weekend usually set aside for the event.

Finally, in 2006 35 countries or regions took part in the “International Heritage Photographic Experience” (IHPE), which has existed since 1995 (they include Armenia, Wallonia, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Catalonia, Latvia, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands and Scotland, amongst others).

f) Free access, financial resources

The national reports reveal that many countries do their best to keep to the principle that access to EHD events should be free of charge.

The following countries explicitly mention this in their reports: Armenia, Bulgaria (in all the museums and galleries under the control of the Ministry of Culture and the participating municipalities), Croatia (museums in Zagreb), Greece (all state museums and archaeological sites), San Marino (free access to all major monuments), Scotland, Monaco (free access or cheap rates), Norway (free access or cheap rates. Some museums which could not afford to open free of charge organised parallel events).

The significant contribution made by volunteers was reported in connection with Hungary, Norway and Scotland.

Some countries still seem to find it difficult to apply the principle of free access, however, and not all countries use volunteers. The Brussels-Capital region in Belgium mentions that volunteers are becoming scarce and that the people who organise the activities are remunerated by the Region.

Other countries or regions, like Greece or Wallonia in Belgium, work with major sponsors who help them to implement their programmes. In Wallonia, the Ethias insurance group and the telephone operator Base are the two official sponsors. The public transport network also organises free tours, with guides in the buses.

So countries are not necessarily equal in terms of their financial means. Malta, for example, was unable to organise the EHD in 2006 because of budgetary restrictions. A more detailed analysis of the participating countries’ budgets and financial possibilities would be extremely interesting to organise for the 2007 edition.

*

3. Overall conclusions

38 national reports were sent to the Liaison Office, from 35 of the 49 countries taking part in the 2006 edition of the European Heritage Days (EHD). As mentioned in the introduction, the reports varied so much in form and content that it is not possible to draw universal conclusions about the 2006 EHD. Certain salient points and majority trends do emerge, however.

First of all, **in terms of both attendance and participation**, the EHD have been a **real success** in the great majority of European countries for several years now.

In 2006, once again, attendance records were easily beaten and it is encouraging to observe that the founding countries of the EHD project are those in which the EHD attract most visitors. This portends many years of increasing success for the EHD in those countries which joined in the initiative more recently.

In 2006 the countries involved numbered 49. Only Malta was unable to organise any special events, for budgetary reasons.

The continuation and future success of the EHD are also guaranteed by the **increasing diversity of themes and methods of addressing them at the national and European/international levels**. Today the EHD concern not only the built heritage but every aspect of the heritage: buildings, landscapes and nature, and also the intangible heritage (oral, artistic, musical, gastronomic, visual, auditory and so on) and, more generally, the different traditions and customs of the participating countries. The cultural and sporting events attract ever larger audiences, as do the numerous activities organised for young people.

Young people make up a large proportion of the public attracted by the EHD and the national co-ordinators are organising more and more imaginative events exclusively for this target group. Several countries have introduced European Heritage Days for schools or young people outside the day or weekend traditionally set aside for the EHD.

The success of the EHD is particularly clear at the **local level**. In most of the participating countries large numbers of local initiatives are organised by the regions or cities. Most of the time the various events are advertised in the local media. People often visit monuments which are close to home and not generally open to the public the rest of the year.

The organisers do, however, emphasise the **European dimension** of the EHD increasingly in their communication campaigns or in the actual themes or events. The most outstanding initiative organised in 2006 was the **pilot project organised by the Nordic countries** (Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), which for the first time organised joint EHD on the same theme and using the same material, with the overall financial support of the Nordic Council of Ministers. It was a very positive

experience for the organising countries and a living example of a successful cross-border EHD initiative.

Initiatives like this deserve to be rewarded at the European level, along the lines of Norway's initiative to award an annual prize to the best event.

The EHD aim at **a very broad audience** who do not necessarily know much about cultural/heritage issues, so they help to increase public awareness of the cultural heritage. They are a genuinely **popular and dynamic action with a highly educational dimension**.

This is illustrated by Estonia, for example, which reports that the EHD generally generate practical fallout. In 2006 the Estonian people's attention was drawn to the country's railway architecture, fuelling an interesting debate on the subject.

The diversity of the EHD in terms of the themes covered, the events and projects staged, the organisation and even sometimes the dates, contributes to their undeniable success. We must now strengthen the European significance and impact of the EHD (through media campaigns and various more resolutely European actions), in order to convince the citizens of the participating countries that "their" heritage has an intrinsically European dimension, and call for increasing European co-operation between the various parties to make sure this heritage is protected for present and future generations.