International and Interdisciplinary Symposium

Brussels, 4-5 October 2005

URBAN PASTS AND URBAN FUTURES: BRINGING URBAN ARCHAEOLOGY TO LIFE

ENHANCING URBAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS

EUROPEAN UNION

Committee of the Regions

Proceedings

Under the auspices of the European Parliament

Organised in the context of the APPEAR project.
This project is funded by the European Commission, DG Research
5th Framework Programme, Energy, Environment and Sustainable Development Key Action 4: City of Tomorrow and Cultural Heritage
Action 4.2.3: Foster integration of cultural heritage in the urban setting
For more information on the APPEAR project : www.in-situ.be

Deliverable D28 – Contract EVK4-CT-2002-00091

Contents

Introduction

The Symposium, the Proceedings of which are presented here, was organized within the framework of the APPEAR project, this event being its culminating point. The objective was to report on the state of progress of the research undertaken and to collect comments and suggestions on the topic. It was also aimed at extending the field of ideas and experiences before concluding the project, planned for the end of 2005.

Independently of the Symposium, the APPEAR project covered a broad area of investigations on all aspects of the development of archaeological sites in an urban environment. In addition to the initial reviews of ideas relating to both the enhancement of archaeological sites and the harmonious and sustainable development of historic towns, researchers proceeded with a systematic identification of European sites offering an experience that could serve as a model, with particular attention paid to covered sites. Several case studies were undertaken with a view to drawing lessons from significant achievements. Several reports, in the form of "deliverables", were drawn up and, after submission to the European Commission, were gradually placed on line on the Internet site of the APPEAR project: http://www.In-situ.be. In addition, an "APPEAR Guide", currently under way, will propose methods and guidelines for action, a draft having been presented during the Symposium.

The Symposium concentrated on highlighting the inter-disciplinary work that prevailed throughout the research undertaken, and on the close collaboration between the APPEAR partners, archaeologists, architects, town planners, curators-restorers, site managers, economists, municipal officials, and experts in the study of decision-making processes or evaluation of public expectations and reactions. Although it was of course necessary to select a theme for each session, the constant concern was to emphasise the complementarity between the different disciplines and approaches, and to identify the main points between diverging values and objectives.

Likewise, the selection of participants was aimed not only at obtaining the widest possible geographic representation (21 European countries were represented) but also a well-balanced participation of all the disciplines involved. In particular, the organisers of the Symposium sought to draw the attention of "decision-makers" and elected representatives. Fortunately, the authorities of the Regional Committee of the European Union, following a presentation of the APPEAR project before the Commission on Education and Culture, immediately realised the interest of hosting the Symposium within their walls and offered excellent working conditions. Several elected representatives, serving on both the Regional Committee and the European Parliament, followed the discussions of the Symposium and its conclusions, even though their busy schedule did not always allow them to be present all the time.

The number of participants had to be restricted because the meeting room only had a seating capacity for 120, but this was a reasonable size allowing for a genuine exchange of ideas and debate. More than 250 people wished to take part in the Symposium but priority had to be given to those who made commitments to be present for the two full days of discussion. However, in response to the high expectations, it is planned to ensure a wide distribution of the Proceedings of the Symposium.

The APPEAR Project

APPEAR : **A**ccessibility **P**rojects. Sustainable **P**reservation and **E**nhancement of Urban Subsoil **A**rchaeological **R**emains

The APPEAR project is funded by:

European Commission, DG Research, 5th Framework Programme, Environment and Sustainable Development
Key action 4: City of Tomorrow and Cultural Heritage

APPEAR runs for 3 years: January 2003 – December 2005

The project examines all the actions needed to conserve, integrate, and enhance excavated urban archaeological remains in order to open them to the public within a framework of local development. It aims to identify methods to carry out successful integration within towns, together with good conservation of the archaeological remains and their presentation to the public.

The partners of the APPEAR Consortium:

1. ***In Situ***, Centre de recherche archéologique, Liège, Belgique, Scientific Coordination
Anne Warnotte, Marianne Tinant, Pierre Hupet, Mireille Fohn (†)
2. Université de Liège, Centre for Urban Governance Studies, Administrative Coordination
Albert Dupagne, Jacques teller, Sophie Lefert, Catherine Zwetkoff, Tatiana Hachimi
3. Institut de Cultura de Barcelona, Museu d'Història de la Ciutat de Barcelona
Antoni Nicolau i Martí, Noèlia Sanz, Laia Colomer
4. English Heritage, Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England
David Miles, Valérie Wilson
5. Regione Autonoma Valle d'Aosta, Soprintendenza per I Beni e le Attivita' Culturali
Gianfranco Zidda, Francesca Martinet
6. ***In Extenso,*** Préservation des biens culturels, Paris
Pierre Diaz Pedregal, Sandrine Le Bouëtté
7. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Facultad de Psicología
Mikel Asensio, Jorge Ruiz-Jiménez
8. ICOMOS, International Council on Monuments and Sites
Jean-Louis Luxen, Willem Willems, Consuelo León Lozano
9. AVEC, Alliance des Villes Européennes de la Culture
Eszter Sarkadi, Leona Pall

An international Advisory Board monitors the work of the Consortium. It is chaired by Jean-Louis Luxen and composed by:
Sofia Avgérinou-Kolonias (Greece), Charles Bonnet (Switzerland), Renée Colardelle (France), Tamás Fejérdy (Hungary), Teresa Júdice Gamito (Portugal), Danielle Heude (France), Todor Krestev (Bulgaria), Henrik Lilius (Finland), Stefano Pulga (Italy), Danielle Sarlet (Belgium).

A practical guide is in the process of being produced.

Website : http://www.in-situ.be

Acknowledgements

(Original language: French)

The symposium could not have taken place without the decisive support of the Committee of the Regions of the European Union. They provided functional equipment, modern audiovisual support and high quality simultaneous translation in four languages: French, English, Spanish and Italian. On a more fundamental basis, the members of the Commission of Education and Culture showed a very a great interest in the APPEAR Project and for our work that aimed to establish connections with regional and municipal representatives.

We would like to thank particularly the Secretary General of the Committee of the Regions, Mr. Gerhard Stahl, the representatives of the EDUC Commission, in particular Mrs. Marie-Claire Neill Cowper, Head of Unit, as well as Mrs. Ana Kádár and Mr. Christof Kienel, Administrators.
We also wish to express our gratitude to the intern Information Unit, Visits and Petitions, especially Mr. Boris Essender, Administrator. Their support greatly facilitated the organisation of the event.

The President, Mr. Josep Borrell Fontelles, kindly accepted that the conference was held under the aegis of the European Parliament. The President of the Commission of Culture and Education, Mr. Nikolaos Sifunakis, also supported us, as well as Mr Etienne Boumans, Head of Unit of the latter Commission, and Mrs. Constance Itzel, Administrator, who accepted to be rapporteur. Moreover, the Commission of Research of the European Parliament represented by Mrs. Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines followed closely our work. We wish to thank all of them.

Generous financial support has been given by the regional Belgium authorities: for the Walloon Region, the 'Direction générale de l'Aménagement du Territoire et du Patrimoine' (Minister André Antoine, Mrs Danielle Sarlet and Mr. André Matthys) and the 'Commissariat Général au Tourisme (Minister Guy Lutgen); the Region of Bruxelles-Capitale (Ministre Emir Kir) and the Flemish Region (Vlaams Instituut voor het Onroerend Erfgoed, Mr. Jean-Pierre Van der Meiren and Mr. Dirk Callebaut).

We'd also like to thank our partners of the APPEAR Consortium and all speakers for their intellectual contribution to the conference programme, as well as the Chairmen of the different sessions and the rapporteurs, who accepted to make the syntheses of the different sessions

Our gratitude goes also to the Association "Ancien Palais de Charles Quint" and its President Mr. Michel Van Roye for his warm welcome in the archaeological site of the Coudenberg, as well as to the 'Institut du Patrimoine wallon' (Mr. Freddy Joris and Mrs. Séverine Monjoie) for the organisation of the visit of the 'Archéoforum' in Liège.

The students of the Institut Arthur Haulot of Brussels helped with the welcome of the delegates of the conference under the direction of Mrs. Myrna Jonville. We wish to thank all of them.

We would like to express our congratulations and acknowledgements to the members of ICOMOS - BGP who organised the symposium: Mohamed Tazani, Michael Gemmel, who perfectly ensured the audiovisual support and Ana Dieste Barrientos, research assistant, who provided a very efficient help, as well as Anya Diekmann, research fellow at the ULB-IGEAT. We particularly wish to thank Consuelo León Lozano, Coordinator of ICOMOS-BGP, who brilliantly prepared the conference, not only ensuring its intellectual contents, but also its practical organisation: it is she who should take credit for the success of the conference.

Jean-Louis Luxen,
Secretary General of ICOMOS, 1993 – 2002

Programme

Tuesday 4 October: room BEL/51

8:30 - 9:00	Welcome
9:00 - 9:30	**Opening**
	Speaker: *Mr. Giancarlo Gabbianelli* *Member of the Commission for Culture and Education of the Committee of the Regions.* *Mayor of Viterbo, Italy* **Speaker: "EU framework programmes for cultural Heritage"** Mr. Michel Chapuis *Scientific Officer, European Commission DG Research*
9:30 - 11:00	**Session 1** **APPEAR: a method for the integration of archaeological sites in towns**
	Chairman: Ms. Danielle Sarlet *General Director of Town and Country Planning and Heritage, Walloon Region* **Rapporteur:** Ms. Valérie Wilson *Head of Archaeological Archives, English Heritage*
	Presentation: "The APPEAR project: the process" Ms. Anne Warnotte *Project Manager, IN SITU, Archaeological Research Centre, Liege* ***"The APPEAR method: an structured approach"*** Mr. Pierre Hupet *Legal expert and political scientist, IN SITU, Archaeological Research Centre, Liege* ***"The enhancement of urban archaeological sites: the decision-making"*** Ms. Catherine Zwetkoff *Professor at the University of Liege, Centre for Urban Governance Studies*
11:00 - 11:30	Coffee Break
11:30 - 13:00	**Session 2** **Conservation**
	Chairman: Mr. Stéfano Pulga *Independent Conservator, CO.RE, Italy* **Rapporteur:** Mr. Jean-Marc Léotard *Provincial Archaeologist, Walloon Region*
11:30 - 11:50	**Presentation: "Archaeological sites and preservation"** Mr. Pierre Diaz Pedregal *Director of IN EXTENSO, Cultural Heritage Preservation, Paris*
11:50 - 12:10	**Case study: Vésunna, Périgueux, France** **"Architecture and preservation"** Ms. Élisabeth Pénisson *Curator, Museum of Vésunna*
12:10 - 12:30	**Case study: Rose Theatre, London, U.K.** **"Display and Conservation"** Mr. David Miles *Chief Archaeological Advisor, English Heritage*
12:30 - 13:00	**Discussion**
13:00 - 14:30	Lunch

14:30 - 16:00	**Session 3** **Interpretation and Display**
	Chairman: Ms. Danielle Heude *Honorary Inspector General, Directions of Museums of France* **Rapporteur:** Ms. Renée Colardelle *Director of the Archaeological Museum of St. Laurent of Grenoble, Member of ICMAH-ICOM*
14:30 - 14:50	**Presentation: "Interpretation and dispay"** Mr. Antoni Nicolau i Martí *Director, Museum of the History of the city of Barcelona*
14:50 - 15:10	**Case study: Crypta Balbi, Rome, Italy** **"From the excavated site to the museum: historical interpretation and conservation"** Ms. Laura Vendittelli *Director of Crypta Balbi Museum*
15:10 - 15:30	**Case Study: Museums of the itinerary of Caesaraugusta, Saragossa, Spain** **"Interpretation of the Roman villa today"** Ms. Romana Erice *Responsible for Museums, Unit of Culture of the Municipality of Saragossa*
15:30 - 16:00	**Discussion**
16:00 - 16:30	Coffee break
16:30 - 18:00	**Session 4** **Socio-cultural impact**
	Chairman: Mr. Gael de Guichen *Former Deputy General Director of the ICCROM* **Rapporteur:** Ms. Constanza Itzel *Administrator, European Parliament. Policy Department Structural and Cohesion Policies - Culture*
16:30 - 16:50	**Presentation: "Socio-cultural impact"** Mr. Mikel Asensio *Professor at the Autonomous University of Madrid*
16:50 - 17:10	**Case study: Early Christians Cemeteries, Pécs, Hungary** **"Early Christian cemetery: the necropolis of the antique Sopianae in the town of contemporary Pécs"** Mr. Tamás Fejérdy *Vice-President, Hungarian National Office for Cultural Heritage*
17:10 - 17:30	**Case study: Complutum / House of Hippolytus, Alcalá de Henares, Spain** **"Communication and archaeology: training programme for employment and social impact"** Mr. Sebastián Rascón *Chief of the Archaeology Unit, Municipality of Alcalá de Henares*
17:30 - 18:00	**Discussion**
18:30	Bus departure for the Coudenberg site (meeting point at the CoRs' reception at 18:20)
19:00	**Reception at the archaeological site of Coudenberg, Brussels** Mr. Emir Kir *Minister in charge of the Heritage for the Region of Brussels - Capital* Mr. Michel Van Roye *Chairman of Palais de Charles Quint Association*
19:30 - 22:30	Guided visit of the archaeological site and Cocktail - Buffet

Wednesday 5 October: room BEL/51

9:15 - 10:45	**Session 5** **Architectural and urban integration**
	Chairman: Mr. Roger M. Thomas *Head of Urban Archaeology, English Heritage* **Rapporteur:** Ms. Sofia Avgérinou *Professor at the National Technical University of Athens*
9:15 - 9:35	**Presentation: "Urban integration of archaeological vestiges"** Mr. Jacques Teller *Lecturer, University of Liege, Center for Urban Governance Studies*
9:35 - 9:55	**Case study: Plovdiv, Bulgaria** **"Urban and architectural integration and interpretation of heritage"** Mr. Todor Krestev *Professor at the University of Architecture and Civil Engineering of Sofia*
9:55 - 10:15	**Case study: Maastricht, Netherlands** **"Integration of cultural history in town development"** Mr. Win de Heer, *Head of the Urban Planning Unit, Municipality of Maastricht*
10:15 - 10:45	**Discussion**
10:45 - 11:15	Coffee Break
11:15 - 13:00	**Session 6** **Feasibility, economic and social effects**
	Chairman: Mr. Luigi Cabrini *Regional Representative for Europe, World Tourism Organisation* **Rapporteur:** Mr. Jean-Louis Luxen *Secretary General of ICOMOS 1993-2002*
11:15 - 11:35	**Presentation: "Feasibility and economic and social effects: micro and macro economic aspects» effects** Mr. Christian Ost *Rector of Catholic Institute for Higher Commercial Studies, Brussels*
11:35 - 11:55	**Case study: Galerian Complex and Roman Agora of Thessalonica, Greece** **"The axis from Rotunda to the palace complex built by Galerius, through the ancient Hippodrome"** Mr. Janis Chatzigogas *Professor at the University of Thessalonica, Faculty of Architecture*
11:55 - 12:15	**Case study: Archéoforum of Liege, Belgium** Ms. Séverine Monjoie *Director of the Archéoforum of Liege*
12:15 - 13:00	**Round table and discussion**
13:00 - 14:30	Lunch

14:30 - 16:00	**Session 7** **Involvement of Local Public Authorities**
	Chairman: Mr. Marcelino Sánchez Ruiz *Deputy for Culture of the Province of Jaén, Spain* **Rapporteur:** Ms. Sophie Lefert *Engineer/Architect, University of Liege, Centre for Urban Governance Studies*
14:30 - 14:50	**Presentation: "Report on the consultation of local public authorities"** Ms. Consuelo León Lozano *ICOMOS-BGP Co-ordinator*
14:50 - 16:00	**Round Table and discussion**
	Mr. Fernando Cirujano *Deputy Mayor for Culture, Toledo, Spain* Mr. Giancarlo Gabbianelli *Mayor de Viterbo, Italy* Mr. Jean-Pierre Van der Meiren *Deputy for Culture of the Province of East Flanders, Belgium* Ms. Carmen Willems *Mayor of Tongeren, Belgium*
16:00 - 16:45	**Conclusion and closing of the meeting**

Thursday 6 October

Optional visit organised by the Institute of Walloon Heritage

8:45	**Departure for Liege (meeting point: Metro Place Sainte Catherine)**
10:15 -12:00	Visit of the Archéoforum, Place Saint-Lambert (Liege)
12:00 -13:30	Visit of the restoration yard, Saint-Barthélemy (Liege)
13:30 – 15:00	Lunch
16:30	**Arrival in Brussels (with a stop at the airport previously)**

Organised by:

ICOMOS-BGP

In collaboration with the partners of the APPEAR project:

IN SITU, Centre de recherche archéologique, Liege, Belgium, scientific co-ordinator
UNIVERSITY OF LIÈGE, Centre for Urban Governance Studies, administrative co-ordinator
INSTITUT DE CULTURA DE BARCELONA, Museu d'Història de la Ciutat de Barcelona
ENGLISH HERITAGE, Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England
REGIONE AUTONOMA VALLE D'AOSTA, Soprintendenza per I Beni e le Attivita' Culturali
IN EXTENSO (Cultural heritage preservation), Paris
UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID, Facultad de Psicología
ICOMOS, International Council on Monuments and Sites
AVEC, Alliance de Villes Européennes de Culture

Under the Auspices of:

The European Commission
The Committee of the Regions
The European Parliament

Supported by:

The Walloon Region
The Brussels-Capital Region
The Flemish Region - VIOE (Vlaams Instituut voor het Onroerend Erfgoed)

In Partnership with:

Council of European Municipalities and Regions
UNESCO
Council of Europe
ICMAH - ICOM (The International Council of Museums)
WTO (World Tourism Organisation)
International Scientific Committee on Historic Towns of ICOMOS
International Scientific Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management of ICOMOS
EAHTR (European Association of Historic Towns and Regions)
EAA (European Associations of Archaeologists)
Institut Arthur Haulot, Campus Ceria, Brussels

OPENING SESSION
–
SESSION 1
"APPEAR": A Method For Integrating Archaeological Sites In Towns

Chair :
Mrs Danielle SARLET,
General Director of Town and Country Planning and Heritage, Walloon Region

Rapporteur :
Mrs Valérie WILSON,
Head of Archaeological Archives, English Heritage, United Kingdom

Speaker :
Mr Giancarlo GABBIANELLI,
Member of the Culture and Education Commission of the Committee of the Regions - Mayor of Viterbo, Italy

Mr Michel CHAPUIS,
Scientific Officer, Directorate General Research, European Commission

Presentations by :

Mrs Anne WARNOTTE, Project Manager IN SITU, Archaeological Research Centre, Liège, Belgium
Mr Pierre HUPET, Legal expert and political scientist, IN SITU, Archaeological Research Centre, Liège, Belgium
Mrs Catherine ZWETKOFF, Professor, Centre for Urban Governance Studies, University of Liège, Belgium

OPENING SESSION AND SESSION 1:
APPEAR: A METHOD FOR THE INTEGRATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES IN TOWNS

Synthesis by Valérie Wilson
Head of Archaeological Archives, English Heritage

Danielle Sarlet, General Director of Town and Country Planning and Heritage for the Walloon Region of Belgium presided the session and welcomed the delegates to the APPEAR Symposium.

Giancarlo Gabbianelli, Mayor of Viterbo in Italy and Member of the Culture and Education Commission of the Committee of the Regions, recounted how he had been present at a meeting of the Committee of the Regions when the APPEAR Project was first presented and he had endorsed the project and stressed the need for the involvement of local regions.

Cultural heritage is a very important resource in many European countries. It is important to set up a common dialogue between all these countries to move forward in the field of preservation and display of this cultural heritage.

Making this heritage available to local inhabitants and visitors from further afield can have positive consequences on society, culture, education and environment in towns. Urban planning must respect the physical and cultural essence of the archaeological heritage when integrating it into the modern town.

Michel Chapuis, of the Directorate General Research of the European Commission, gave an overview of the EC Cultural Heritage activities and related research issues.

He outlined the context of EC research as applicable to the environment and cultural heritage in the 5th and 6th Framework Programmes. This is led by a number of guiding principles or "policy-drivers" on sustainable development embodied in the Treaty establishing the European Community, the Lisbon Strategy (2000), the European Council of Göteborg (2001) and the Barcelona EU Council (2002).

The 5th Framework Programme's key action "City of tomorrow and cultural heritage" has emphasized the importance of four inter-related themes: urban governance, cultural heritage, sustainable building and sustainable mobility. About 140 projects, including APPEAR, have come under this key action and have concentrated on the development of improved holistic urban planning and cultural heritage research.
The aim of the projects is to establish best practice methodologies for the assessment, conservation and restoration of cultural heritage assets.

In 2000, the EC launched the ERA (European Research Area), its new strategy for closer integration of EU political and scientific initiatives and greater co-ordination between national and European programmes. The 6th Framework Programme aims to achieve a greater focus on issues of European dimension through increased partnerships between the various actors.

Resources and opportunities available in the 6th Programme for research on the tangible cultural heritage have been more limited. One important initiative was the London Conference on Cultural Heritage Research in September 2004 which drew up a Declaration stressing the importance of cultural heritage on other EU policies and calling for better recognition and increased political and financial support from the EU, particularly for the 7th Framework Programme.

The 7th Framework Programme will cover the period 2007-2013. The thematic programmes have been agreed but budgets are still being discussed. Cultural heritage research has been included in a Focus Area within the European Construction Technological Platform (ECTP), which is structured into 6 Working Groups in which archaeology would easily be accommodated. Calls for project proposals for this programme will be issued shortly.

Anne Warnotte, Project Manager for *IN SITU* archaeological Research Centre in Liege presented an overview of the APPEAR Project.

She recounted how the project was conceived when a group of young archaeologists working to enhance an urban archaeological site beset with problems turned to other examples in Europe for answers. They discovered that although many such projects had been undertaken, with varying degrees of success, many had also endured the same process of trial and error without learning from others.

The APPEAR Project was designed to unite all these disparate experiences. The three-year project was launched in January 2003 and is due to finish in December this year.

APPEAR. Accessibility projects. Sustainable preservation and enhancement of urban subsoil archaeological remains.

The term “accessibility projects” (enhancement projects) relates to all the actions which aim to conserve, integrate, enhance and exploit the urban archaeological remains in order to make them accessible to the greatest number of people with a view to sustainable development of the town.

The nine project partners from six European countries (Belgium, France, Hungary, Italy, Spain and the UK), representing the various disciplines usually found in enhancement projects, were introduced.

An overview of the background to the issue of enhancement projects was given. Since the 1960s numerous excavations in historic European towns have raised the following questions: When is *in situ* preservation of the remains desirable? How can these remains be integrated into the contemporary urban environment and made accessible, understandable and enjoyable to the widest possible audience? Our buried heritage has the potential to act as a driving force for the sustainable development of towns.

The APPEAR Guide (presented during this Symposium as an incomplete working document) aims to provide a framework and methods of action for carrying out enhancement projects. It does not pretend to offer ideal solutions but to help those involved find answers adapted to the specific situations they face.

Pierre Hupet, legal expert and political scientist, working for *IN SITU* Archaeological Research Centre in Liege, gave a detailed overview of the APPEAR method.

The APPEAR Method is based on strategic management adapted for the specific needs of enhancement projects on urban archaeological sites. The general aim is to help all those involved, taking into account all the players and issues likely to interact throughout and providing an efficient management for the process.

Those involved in the process can be split into four categories, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive: political and administrative, economic, specialists and the urban community.

A number of more or less complex issues falling into **six fields of expertise** are addressed:

- ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT
- CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION
- ARCHAEOLOGY
- ARCHITECTURAL AND URBAN INTEGRATION
- PRESENTATION OF THE SITE TO THE PUBLIC
- CULTURAL MANAGEMENT

The APPEAR method also follows a sequential process consisting of six phases:

- ASSESSMENT
- FEASIBILITY STUDIES
- DEFINITION OF PROJECT OPTIONS
- PROJECT DESIGN
- EXECUTION
- SITE MANAGEMENT

Each phase is divided into **three stages:**

- PLANNING: identification of the players and their interactions; choosing and setting up the working structure.
- EXECUTION: definition and execution of key actions to supply all the information required to make informed decisions.
- REVIEW: analysis and synthesis of the results and correction of the decisions made.

A series of inter-related tasks or **key actions** are designed to take the project forward.

The whole system hinges on the players considering the issue to be dealt with, the objective that needs to be reached and the methods to be used to achieve it before undertaking any actions. This is embodied in the setting of short-, medium- and long-term objectives. The process is a conscious and continuous management activity which helps highlight the compulsory elements, the unavoidable key moments, and the issues to which the decision-maker will have to pay particular attention.

The APPEAR method is designed to:

- Reduce uncertainty by developing the ability to anticipate.
- Reduce confusion by enhancing the effectiveness of the methods of operation to reach the objectives.
- Reduce diversity by encouraging convergence of differing viewpoints.
- Involve the players in the execution of the tasks they have planned.

Catherine Zwetkoff, Professor at the University of Liege, Centre for Urban Governance Studies, then explained the decision-making process as it relates to enhancement projects.

An enhancement project is a complex process because of the number of people involved and the length of time it takes. This raises two points which are addressed in this presentation:

1 What are the issues relating to the decision-making process for an enhancement project?

Three elements are considered:

I*ncreasing the capacity of the process to involve the players in satisfying the decision-maker's need for information about unknown and complex issues.* Involvement means identifying the stakeholders then making them participate in defining the values of the site and in assessing the constraints and possibilities for enhancement.

Optimising the way of thinking of the players to enable them to consider the issue at the right level of complexity. This helps avoid over-simplification of problems and resistance to change through a system of working together.

Combining the two elements above without slowing the overall decision-making process. Increasing the diversity of the stakeholders also increases the time it takes for them to participate but it is important to avoid conflict through inappropriate methods of participation which might prove a hindrance to the project.

Working together demonstrates the value of a comprehensive and integrated approach. Although it can prove more costly, this learning structure is the only way to benefit from the wealth of knowledge, experience and skills held by its members.

2 How do the strategic management model and the sequential model help the decision-maker deal with these issues? What needs to be taken into account in order to maximise the advantages and minimise the disadvantages of these two models? How and why go beyond strategic planning?

These two models were used as a natural starting point because they are based on good practice or accepted standards. The research concentrated on minimising the disadvantages and maximising the advantages of both models taking into account the reality on the ground as observed through the case studies.

The advantages and disadvantages of the two models were compared.

The recommendation is to adopt a strategic way of thinking and acting without confining oneself purely to a strategic planning process. The project manager can adopt one of three methods to build a strategy:

- A centralised and interventionist process based solely or mainly on technical expertise. This approach generally leads to disappointing results.
- A strong project with a daring vision. This less formal strategy is pushed forward by the charisma of its promoters.
- Gradual adjustments as the project progresses based on perceived changes to the setting and a learning process. This is the pragmatic approach.

In reality, the strategy finally adopted is usually a combination of all three.

Centralised planning based exclusively on expertise is no longer considered viable.
Experience shows that a project is more likely to succeed if it is activated by a leader with a clear vision, supported by a coherent and watertight programme, and mindful of building an efficient and dynamic consensus.

Whatever the method used, its success rests on the quality of the "working together" element which will make the steering group a structure that learns, alone capable of usefully exploiting the range of knowledge and experience of its members.

OPENING SESSION

Giancarlo Gabbianelli
Member of the Culture and Education Commission of the Committee of the Regions
Mayor of Viterbo, Italy

(original language : English)

The key factors are concerned with the availability of archaeological ruins from both local and foreign population: this can be obtained trough a concept of territorial and physical continuity between archaeological heritage and urbanistic emergencies that came after the accomplishment of the archaeological heritage in the strict sense of the word.

The realisation of open archaeological areas could allow its recovery, enhancement, learning, even through stages involving people of different cultural levels.
The interactivity between these areas will surely have positive consequences in socio-cultural and educational, environmental and urbanistic terms, considering a territorial level that is not only identified with the archaeological area, but spreads in a cultural way to uniform areas under the historical and environmental point of view.

Every intervention of city planning must have, as a guiding line, respect and requalification of the pre - existing archaeological heritage and of its proximity, not only in a physical sense, but also in a cultural one, with the new expectations that will have to put remedy to incompatibility situations that took place during the years. In this process it is very important to take great care of citizens' sensibility towards the argument, not thinking only of the natives.

The discussion of these themes during the international and interdisciplinary conference of October will surely carry out the great quality and usefulness of the APPEAR project, so that it will be a focal point for the next development of the treated themes.

Cities of the future can only be the continuity, with innovation, of those of the past.

OPENING SESSION
"EU FRAMEWORK PROGRAMMES FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE"

Michel Chapuis
Scientific Officer, Directorate General Research, European Commission

This presentation will provide a brief introduction to co-operative activities of EC DG Research on the "tangible" part of cultural heritage research which has been addressed by the successive EU Framework programmes (FPs) since 1986–but especially the last FP5 and FP6; it also underlines the policy impacts of this activity especially in the economic, social, cultural and environment fields

Since its origin, this research- covering both the movable and the immovable cultural heritage- has been implemented through more than 100 EC projects involving more than 500 stakeholder organisations including scientists and researchers as well as end-users, practitioners, conservators, SMEs etc. All these EC projects aim to set up and select the best methodologies and practices for the assessment, conservation and restoration of cultural heritage assets. To summarise, this research aims to a better understanding of the materials, modelling and predicting their behaviour, analyse environmental factors deteriorating cultural heritage and monitor the changes, as well as improve the management and the integration of the cultural heritage in the urban and rural setting, and to prevent damage and frauds.

So far, most of the projects can be mainly grouped in a few clusters: air pollution and climate change effects on cultural heritage; the damage to historic buildings; the environment inside museums, the historic buildings and libraries, microbiology and cultural heritage; the integration of cultural heritage in the urban setting, including archaeological issues with the APPEAR project in particular.

Some recent orientations recommended for European research will be briefly reminded while stressing the specific role of the Member States and the EU for cultural heritage research, the calls for proposals in the context of the FP6 "Specific Support to Policy" programme; finally, the integration of cultural heritage research within the “European Construction Technology Platform”, and the state of preparation of the 7th FP, possibly including the cultural heritage research under the environment research programme will be mentioned.

SESSION 1 - APPEAR: A METHOD FOR INTEGRATING ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES IN TOWNS

Anne Warnotte
Project Manager *IN SITU*, Archaeological Research Center, Liege, Belgium

Pierre Hupet
Legal expert and political scientist, *IN SITU,* Archaeological Research Center, Liége, Belgium

Catherine Zwetkoff
Professor at the University of Liege, Centre for Urban Governance Studies

(Original version in French)
European cities show in their subsoil signs of occupation by the different people who have lived there through centuries. This buried heritage is destroyed as these cities are changing. The main reason for this is the rapid and large-scale development of a real underground town planning. However, every archaeological site is unique, limited in space and cannot be renewed. Their destruction, either by excessive use, mistake or inappropriate action, deprives current and future generations of the benefits deriving from these sites and of their right to enjoy them.

The intrinsic value of the remains and the opportunities their use offer force us to address the issue of their integration in the urban setting. While the motives and approaches of the various stakeholders concerned in the management of archaeological resources (decision-makers, experts, citizens, etc.) are usually diverse, they share the same objectives: to protect, conserve, get to know and enhance these resources.

The APPEAR guide aims to facilitate the design and implementation of enhancement projects for urban archaeological sites. It provides an implementation framework and measures useful for managing these projects. The guide has been conceived to meet the expectations of the different stakeholders, whatever their activity. It does not pretend to offer ideal solutions, but to help them find concrete answers adapted to the questions they have when faced with specific situations.

All enhancement projects are complex and generate a lot of uncertainties: their subject – the archaeological site – is not stable, their components – objectives, means and impact – are multiple and interdependent, the stakeholders involved are diverse and numerous, their approach implies various partners and disciplines, they focus on the long term aspect and the building of these projects comes within a turbulent environment and raises new problems. The management method proposed by the APPEAR guide is inspired by the model of strategic management as it responds to this complexity and makes it possible to undermine the uncertainties that dissuade decision-makers from committing themselves in such projects.

This method consists of six phases: assessment, feasibility studies, definition of the project options, formulation of the project design, execution, and implementation of management plan. Each phase is characterised by three key components:

- how stakeholders understand the context they are faced with and within which they are to operate;
- the definition of the objectives to be met;
- determining the way to meet these objectives.

These key components raise a number of questions to be addressed concerning the stakeholders, organisation and strategic management of the phase. Thought must be given to the guiding principles of the action plan that needs to be put in place to meet the set objectives. This action plan is composed of a number of tasks to be carried out, whose outcome – once validated – will make it possible to take well-founded decisions at the end of the phase and to plan the next phase.

The method is enriched by the experience of various professionals consulted in the framework of case studies. The suggested process and the results of these studies should be wisely used according to the specific features of the situations at hand. Our objective is not to impose a work context, but to provide strong benchmarks and enlightened examples for the conduct of an enhancement project.

SESSION 2
PRESERVATION

Chairman :
Mr Stefano PULGA,
Independent Conservator, CO.RE, Italy

Rapporteur :
Mr Jean-Marc LEOTARD,
Provincial Archaeologist, Walloon Region, Belgium

Introductory lecture :
"Archaeological Sites and Preservation"
Mr Pierre DIAZ PEDREGAL,
Scientific Director *IN EXTENSO,* Preservation of Cultural Properties, Paris, France

Case study :
"Vesunna, Gallo-Roman Museum of Périgueux"
Mrs Elisabeth PENISSON,
Curator of the Vesunna Museum, Périgueux, France

Case study :
"The Rose Theatre, Bankside, London"
Mr David MILES,
Chief Archaeologist Advisor, English Heritage, United Kingdom

SESSION 2: CONSERVATION

Synthesis by Jean-Marc Léotard
Provincial Archaeologist, Walloon Region of Belgium

(Original language: French)

Is there a more difficult challenge for a Curator than to ensure the future of an urban archaeological site? This implies a set of highly diversified structures, of anthropic and natural origin (from the wall to the sediment, and of course the objects contained in the site), rooted in a geological substratum (a sedimentary or rocky mass), frequently topped by a contemporary cover and usually set in the heart of an urban "macrocosm" (the contemporary environment: museum-type infrastructures in all forms in relation with the position of the site).

Each of these contexts consist, in turn, of a series of components, a list of which cannot be exhaustive because it is impossible to apprehend certain parts of their contents (a drain forgotten in the midst of the sediment, an out-of-reach archaeological horizon, a radioactive rock, etc). Furthermore, the distinct and highly varied physical and chemical properties of the substances composing this melting pot generate a series of interactions that are often inadequately documented, and even pathogenic. Finally, it should be noted that unlike a museum where it is possible to isolate problems, particularly since the objects can usually be moved, in this case we are faced with a set of structures and elements that cannot be moved or separated from each other, and which consequently require a degree of adaptation.

In an effort to untangle the web, Stefano Pulga suggests that we first broach the subject by theme, establishing an order of priority and examining it in a theoretical way. Initially, it is necessary to sort out and select what will be preserved. This necessarily implies a good knowledge of the vestiges, a diagnosis of their condition, an identification of the deterioration factors and, finally, a list of the measures to be taken to slow down the process of degradation.

As far as the sorting process is concerned, Pierre Diaz Pedregal points out that the task comes up against the "three dimensional dilemma": the need to preserve, study and disseminate information about the same vestiges in the same place at the same time. Success will depend on finding the necessary balance between these three aspects throughout the duration of the project.

When drawing up a diagnosis, the basic difficulty tends to be more the identification of elements that could become factors of deterioration than the resulting characterisation. As Pierre Diaz Pedregal states, once these elements are clearly identified, they have an objective character and it then becomes possible to measure and quantify them.

And it is precisely when it is a question of developing urban archaeological sites that this modus operandi must incorporate the necessary knowledge of the cover in which the vestiges will evolve. At this stage, the shoe often pinches because the structure covering the vestiges is usually constructed without taking into account the specificity of the context (limited, poorly transmitted, or even lack of, knowledge concerning the taphonomy of the vestiges on the one hand, and the interaction between the site and its content, on the other).

It should be pointed out that the notion of cover usually implies the only built architectural structure but it is also imperative, of course, to take into consideration the geological, sedimentary and hydro-geological context of the site on the one hand, and the "atmospheric" context, the urban environment to which it belongs, on the other.

In addition to the problem of these contents, it is also necessary to take into account the way of using and, therefore, equipping the site, with a view to developing it (presence and circulation of the public, establishment of various infrastructures, from air conditioning to the scenography; including bookshops, cafeterias and toilet facilities).

The geometric character of the imbrication, especially the structures, components and elements mentioned, are behind the notion of "interlocking" areas" proposed by Pierre Diaz Pedregal.

Urban vestiges lie at the heart of specific areas (internal environment, architectural envelope, urban environment, global environment) within which and between which a series of pathogenic exchanges occur. To understand them, it is necessary not only to identify the deterioration factors but also to determine the direction of their actions, and finally, to introduce the appropriate type of remedies and controls relating to them, and in the right order. The real challenge is to be able to cope with the variety of deterioration factors and their propensity to interact.

Several examples given by Pierre Diaz Pedregal have enabled us to understand the influence of the selected options (in terms of architecture, museography, air control, utilisation, management of the site, etc) that, considered one by one, appear to be opportune but once applied together, turn out to be totally harmful and contribute to triggering off irreversible destructive processes. Faced with such difficulties, one can only advocate introducing procedures for identification and structured management, developed within the framework of a preliminary and permanent dialogue between all the partners responsible for developing a site. They should form a structured management team to initiate clear-cut programmes that contribute to bolstering and imposing a "quality plan" guaranteeing compliance with required procedures. In actual fact, since it is a question of using a good that is fragile and non-renewable by nature, the problem of preservation and restoration arises at all stages in the elaboration of the concept, implementation of the project, utilisation of the site and its development.

As soon as the case study on the Vesunna site in Périgueux was presented, mention of the name Jean Nouvel immediately conditioned the audience. And yet the meticulous description of the post-excavations history of the site brings out other realities, unearthing the difficulties in managing a classified monument, the property of a town that for a while had no objective on the matter. The abandonment of the site subsequently brought "Verdun" (sic) to mind.

Apparently, despite the "oblivion" suffered by a certain number of archaeological vestiges and structures, development options have been taken, based on a standard and seemingly rigorous administrative organisation, composed of a feasibility study, architectural competition, choice of architectural options and content of the messages. According to this presentation, the opinions of the archaeologists and curators of the site do not seem to have been considered in the decision-making process, added to which are the effects of another structural difficulty: the dichotomy between the archaeologist and architect of historic monuments.

The running of a building site that is respectful of archaeological vestiges, seems to have been well prepared but only partially successful due to the deplorable lack of human resources, especially among archaeologists, to monitor the work site.

The weak impact of the project on the vestiges is presented as an asset both in terms of their legibility and their short-term preservation, short-term because most of the preservation problems emerged after the site was covered and were not anticipated. Remedial methods were gradually applied. Elisabeth Pénisson concluded that it was a "very sick patient who required someone to sit at the bedside all the time", which is another way of saying that either the patient is still sick or can fall ill again or, more generally, that the disease was badly diagnosed and inadequately treated.

The analogy with "Verdun" is over, and now comes "Vietnam" (sic) as related by David Miles in describing the Rose Theatre of London. He does not mince his words, and the warning is clear. This is a site that is too emblematic, too much in the media spotlights; the situation has turned into a nightmare that still continues. David Miles described the history of the Elizabethan theatre in detail, thus contributing to an understanding of its importance from the social and cultural points of view. The impact was such that when the projects to destroy the site emerged, the initiative with regard to preservation was initially private. The authorities concerned only gave their views at a late stage, perhaps when they were obliged to do so, but in any event without much conviction. The result was preservation measures in the basements of a building of vestiges that turned out to be complicated. In a subsequent stage, again on the invitation of the public and on its insistence, the local authorities, after many further hesitations, invested in a development and management project that was perceptibly fragility, according to David Miles. The technologies used were expensive and fragile, the staff unstable … The site only remained open for two years.

It has now been observed that it is vital to lay all the cards on the table and examine the fundamental questions that might appear on the eve of a development project. Should fragile vestiges be placed in the open air? Is it worthwhile? Should a part be reconstituted? Should the site be filled in and mention made of the discovered structures? This is a nightmare with a beginning at the end!

While the clarity and rigorous presentation of this session and the general overview of Pierre Diaz Pedregal were appreciated by the gathering, the selection of case studies raised a few questions, mainly with respect to the message that their presentation was supposed to convey. Furthermore, it appears from this analysis that is necessary to be structured, rigorous and procedural in relation to eminently interactive indices, and that a balance between antagonistic values must be found. I myself would like point to the major risk of inconsistency and lack of management continuity. Irregularity is very negative because simple occurrences, even if occasional, and structured actions can lead to a belief in the introduction of a rational process. Is this the intangible component of the object treated, the difficulty in understanding it, the impossibility of establishing its value once and for all, the variability of the meaning given to it, that permits laxness in this field more than in any other?

SESSION 2 – ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES AND PRESERVATION

Pierre Diaz Pedregal
Scientific Director of IN EXTENSO, Protection of Cultural Property,
Paris, France

(Original language : French)

Unearthed from oblivion, the archaeological remains have much to tell us. To the professionals, first. To a large extent, protected by the covering ground, the footprints of our history has much to fear from the new environmental conditions. If we do not pay attention, our efforts to bring back to life past civilisations could lead to the total loss of the existing testimonies. Therefore, the responsibility of the archaeologists and of the site managers is important to prepare, organise and monitor the preservation of the remains of our past.

Preservation actions look like a permanent fight against all the factors contributing to the deterioration of the heritage elements of a site. This fight will be all the more effective in the every day practice if the dangers have clearly been identified and the methods will have perfectly been adopted.

First, the main degradation factors have to be identified by those in charge of the preservation. The causes of degradation can be apparent through different mechanisms that can be very complex. The factors can be of physical, chemical or biological nature. More over, these factors can have an interaction, making their examination more difficult.

Once all the degradation factors have been identified, each one of them has to be examined. This assessment is to be organised according the following main sequences :

- identification of the parameters characterising the factor being considered,
- analyse of its mode of action,
- definition of the preservation means and of corrective and monitoring measures,
- implementation of the preservation means and of corrective and monitoring measures.

Of course, these sequences should be part of a general project aiming at opening the site to public access. The preservation aspects cannot really be dealt with independently from the global project. For instance, an inappropriate use of glass in the envelope designed for a site can lead to the rapid destruction of heritage elements through direct action of light on coloured pigments or by proliferation of pathogenic flora. The museographic options can also have disastrous effects. Wood, a material which has the favour of many designers is a well identified source of volatile organic components which, in recombination with water steam, generate acid steams that can harm many archaeological materials.

For a project to be successful, some basic principles are to be respected. In the first place, it is the responsibility of the owners, most of the time public authorities, to set up clear and well documented programmes so that all the intervening parties can rely on clearly formulated questions. Of course, the owners should entrust to project managers the responsibility of a permanent supervision of the necessary studies and their implementation, so that, at each stage, a quality control will make it sure that the final result will meet the initial requirements. In this respect, improvisation and amateurism are unacceptable. What is at stake is the preservation of a precious and fragile heritage for the future generations.

SESSION 2 - CASE STUDY: VESUNNA GALLO-ROMAN MUSEUM OF PERIGUEUX, FRANCE: « ARCHITECTURE AND PRESERVATION »

Élisabeth Pénisson
Curator of the Vesunna Museum

(Original language : French)

Vesunna, the Gallo-Roman Museum of Périgueux, has been open to the public since July 2003. Its architecture, the work of Jean Nouvel, protects and enhances the vestiges of a vast Gallo-Roman house, the *domus* of Vesunna, which was occupied between the middle of the first century and the end of the third century A.D.

Owned by the town of Périgueux, this archaeological site was discovered in 1959 and has been listed as a historic monument. Given this status, it was protected during the excavations (until 1977) thanks to funds received from the State: corrugated iron roofs, covers for wall tops, etc. But over the years, this temporary protection eventually deteriorated and was no longer appropriate for receiving the public. In 1993, the city council launched a competition, and the architect was able to come up with a discreet but very strong and efficient project.

The central part of the *domus* (2,400 m^2) is protected by a huge umbrella, closed on three sides by glass walls providing a view of the park and the neighbouring archaeological vestiges. Museographic tools explaining the site, its décor and the life of the former inhabitants have been installed on the circulation footbridges. To the west, a long building houses the public reception area and a permanent exhibition on the antique town.

During the different phases of study and project implementation, the problem of preserving the archaeological site and collections was indisputably the most difficult one to handle. It was necessary to find solutions, accept compromises and consult partners on the following points:
. how to install the museum building without undermining the underground archaeological site?
. how to organise the construction site without deteriorating the vestiges?
. what approach should be adopted to restore this antique site?
. how to put back on the antique walls the mural paintings deposited at the beginning of the 1960's?
. what climatic conditions should be introduced inside the building and how to control them?
. how to ensure effective preservation measures for the collections with limited resources?

The decisions had to take essential parameters into account: not exceeding the financial allocation initially granted, restricting eventual running expenses, scientific reliability, esthetic quality, etc.

In order to obtain the best solutions, the Curator was obliged to keep alive, and sometimes impose, a constant dialogue between the numerous parties concerned: the Direction des Musées de France (Department of Architecture, C2RMF…), the Direction régionale des affaires culturelles d'Aquitaine (Regional Archaeological Service, Museum Adviser, Regional Preservation of Historic Monuments), The project owner, responsible for restoring the site (Ph. Oudin, Chief Architect of Historic Monuments), the project owner responsible for construction and museography (Ateliers Jean Nouvel), the companies in charge of restoring the collections and archaeological site, the consulting firms and companies in charge of the construction and museographic equipment, the technical services of the City of Périgueux (project owner) and the Scientific Committee.

Discussions and compromises made it possible to find a final and satisfactory equilibrium but it continues to be carefully monitored.

SESSION 2 - CASE STUDY: THE ROSE THEATRE, BANKSIDE, LONDON. "DISPLAY AND CONSERVATION"

David Miles
Chief Archaeological Advisor, English Heritage

The Rose Theatre was the first of the group of playhouses which stood on the south bank of the Thames, opposite the City of London, between1587 and the Civil War. It is an iconic site as the birthplace of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama. Plays by William Shakespeare and Christopher Marlowe were staged here and, as a young man, Shakespeare himself acted on the stage of The Rose. The leading man, though, was Edward Alleyn, whose archive has survived and is the richest source of documentary evidence about Bankside theatres.

The Rose Theatre was established in 1587, remodelled about 1592, and demolished in 1605. At that time most of its building materials were removed for re-use, leaving only the foundations *in-situ.* Nearby stood the Swan Theatre and the Globe which were modelled on the prototype Rose. In the 1950s an office block was built on the site of The Rose. Although the position was marked on maps no provision was made for archaeological recording and piles were driven through the remains without observation.

In September 1988 the London Borough of Southwark granted outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the site. The developer entered a voluntary agreement to allow the Museum of London two months to excavate the site. At that time it was not known if any remains of the Rose Theatre survived. In February 1989 the excavators found the theatre foundations and the Museum contacted English Heritage. The developers were already letting contracts for the proposed new building. An extension to the excavation was negotiated. By late April1989 the Rose had become a *cause celebre* and the theatrical community, with intense media interest, demanded the preservation of the remains. English Heritage advised against the Scheduling of the site, in view of the compensation implications (the development was valued at £60 million).

Eventually agreement was reached to preserve the remains *in-situ* in the basement of the new building. The Rose Theatre Trust was established on 2 June 1989 to care for and promote the site in the new basement. The owners of the site, under a Section 52 Agreement, deposited £180k (plus an extra £50k) with the local authority, towards the preservation of the theatre remains. In spite of the enormous interest in the site there have been continuing problems, several of which remain unresolved:

- The archaeology was not sufficiently assessed or considered prior to planning consent being granted.
- The remains are fragile and present conservation problems. They are also not dramatic in themselves.
- There is an unresolved debate as to whether the rest of the remains should be excavated. This would provide more information but less authenticity on site, as excavation would involve removing original material.
- The initial estimate of 120 – 150k visitors per annum was optimistic. The site was opened to the public but was not, in its present state, financially sustainable. An estimate for a more ambitious proposal of excavation and presentation is currently £7.9 million.

The Bankside Area has seen dramatic regeneration with the opening of the Globe Theatre, Tate Modern and the Millennium Bridge and various other attractions. While these draw people to the area of the Rose, they also provide competition. Any future proposal for the Rose Theatre needs to integrate conservation and presentation with a coherent audience development strategy.

SESSION 3
INTERPRETATION AND DISPLAY

Chair :
Mrs Danielle HEUDE,
Honorary Inspector General, Directions of Museums of France

Rapporteur :
Mrs Renée COLARDELLE,
Director of the Archaeological Museum of St. Laurent of Grenoble, France
Member of ICMAH-ICOM

Introductory lecture :
"Interpretation and Display"
Mr Antoni NICOLAU I MARTI,
Director, Museum of History of the City of Barcelona, Spain

Case study :
"The Crypta Balbi : from Excavation to Museum, Historical Interpretation and Display"
Mrs Laura VENDITELLI,
Director, Museo Nazionale Romano *Crypta Balbi*, Rome, Italy

Case study :
"The Museums of Caesaraugusta : Interpretation of the Roman City today"
Mrs Romana ERICE LACABE,
Chief of Museums, City of Zaragoza, Spain

SESSION 3 – INTERPRETATION AND MUSEOGRAPHY

Synthesis by Renée Colardelle
Heritage Curator (Departmental Council of the Isère)
Director of the Archaeological Museum of St. Laurent, Grenoble
Member of the ICMAH-ICOM Committee

(Original language: French)

The findings of a study undertaken by APPEAR are based on an analysis of cases of European urban archaeological sites that have been developed. A file was drawn up incorporating a vast database constructed by ICMAH in the last twenty years (a task force co-ordinated by Michel Colardelle, and then by Myriame Morel-Deledalle). More in-depth studies of specific cases completed the information. To illustrate the theme currently under examination, it is useful to make reference to the Museum of the History of the City of Barcelona, mentioned by Antoni Nicolau i Martí in his presentation at Session n° 3, the Crypta Balbi in Rome submitted by Laura Vendittelli and the Caesaraugusta Museums in Saragossa described by Erice Lacabe.

The purpose of this paper is not to summarise the presentations but to pinpoint, underscore and eventually clarify the ideas and orientations resulting from this session.

The presentations, in particular, have highlighted the complexity of the process linked to the development of an archaeological site, as well as the absolute need to bring together all the skills required and initiate a respectful dialogue that is attentive to the sometimes diverging "interests" of the various players involved.

Above all, it is a question of being aware of the fact that an archaeological site is an in situ witness of the phases of cultural acquisition, of which present-day humanity is the product. Its study is inevitable but its development should not be an end in itself. "Heritage only has value because of the testimony it provides" and the transmission of this testimony does not necessarily pass through its preservation in situ. It needs to be the object of a collective and carefully considered decision.

First of all, it should be preceded by a preliminary evaluation of the site but it must also depend on the social and economic imperatives to carry out works that are more or less destructive. On this particular issue, advance knowledge, if only about the presence of vestiges, is vital from both the economic and scientific points of view. Areas involving "archaeological risks" should be identified and mapped out. Such measures would make it possible to define sectors for which town planners must be informed of the risks that could be incurred in terms of time and money. A decision to carry out such works should only be taken with full knowledge of the facts.

There are several possible scenarios:

- The works and archaeological excavations are not carried out owing to the constraints imposed by the presence of vestiges. The land is set aside and turned into an "archaeological reserve".
- The works are carried out after a preliminary phase of archaeological research. This phase should be long enough to enable a meticulous and well- documented study to be

undertaken, as this would be indispensable for an accurate interpretation of the site. The results would help to take a decision as to whether to destroy or to develop.

- A decision may be taken to destroy the site, which in that case only survives through publications.

- The initial project may be modified (a change in the route of a tramline, as in the case of Grenoble for instance) to preserve and present the archaeological site or to incorporate it harmoniously in the planned amenities.

Why develop? The functions of a site as a witness of history and culture

The nature of the messages

Experience shows that the possible messages are complex and come in many forms and meanings, and that they are usually timeless and cross-cultural. They also reveal modern man and his research, which evolves along with all the disciplines and methods of thinking. It is vital for the transmission of the messages to build bridges between the different generations and cultures, and to guide reflection towards a specific approach aimed at heightening awareness and arousing curiosity. It is important to make every effort to help visitors grasp the message easily. The difficulty lies in the diversity of the visiting public.

The constraints linked to the functions of the site

An archaeological site is a document in the same way as a parchment. Researchers and urban planners should handle it with respect and modesty. To emphasise this particular point, a site that has been the subject of an in-depth and published study is preferable to a site that has been hastily examined and damaged by works considered to be necessary for its presentation to the public. Admittedly, the solution of the site that has been carefully studied and developed is ideal provided the urbanism of the town permits it. But this solution has its price.

The presence of vestiges is invariably a source of constraints. They must be recognised, accepted and taken into consideration. First of all, an archaeological study is as essential as the preservation of the vestiges if it is decided to present them to the public. It is true that the document constituting the archaeological site gives abbreviated information about the contemporary reality of its use. And it is also true that the modifications imposed, sometimes over several centuries, before the site is finally abandoned, are frequently very complex. But this complexity is significant. There is a duty to preserve an authentic site and to deliver it to the public, and its presentation should in no way distort the document irreversibly.

The following paradox should be pointed out: a site cannot exist unless the community identifies it as such. Occasionally, however, interest is aroused only after it has been studied and “appropriated”. Sometimes, it is actually along the road that it becomes necessary to modify the initial construction project that was at the origin of the discovery. It should be borne in mind that a site only exists as a result of constantly reactivated research, and this implies that the development project should be able to evolve during its implementation and even afterwards.

The interpretation of vestiges is the fruit of a multidisciplinary archaeological study. It can make progress thanks to perfected techniques of investigation and analysis. This is why the museography and scenography used to reflect this interpretation should not, under any circumstances, change the vestiges as they have come down to us. All means should be used to encourage visitors to understand and "appropriate" them, while at the same time protecting their authentic nature.

Works connected with the development of the site, such as circulation, museography and scenography that respect the material setting of the site, have nothing to fear of bold architecture. It marks the new function of the site without actually having to spell it out. There are numerous and varied educational elements, ranging from artifices and lighting to audio-visual effects and models. Reconstitution can be a problem because it introduces confusion between the original and the imitation. It is imperative for all interventions to be reversible.

A site preserved in this manner, as a source of emotions and sometimes of questioning on the part of visitors, can also be a means of social sharing and serve as a setting for shows and various events. It provides an opportunity for an uninformed public, often from the neighbourhood, to discover the path leading to museums. Sensitive of the aesthetics of the site, which is linked to their protected authenticity, the attention of the public is caught by an appealing and explicit museography that remains discreetly in the background of the vestiges, and visitors therefore frequently return to acquire more information.

An archaeological site can become an excellent instrument for cultural action. It helps to guide the public from the concrete to the concept, provided it goes beyond relating its own history.

SESSION 3 : INTERPRETATION AND DISPLAY

Antoni Nicolau I Martí
Director, Museum of the History of the city of Barcelona

(Original language : Spanish)

One of the basic aims in archaeological heritage's preservation is its long-term cultural, social and economic benefits. In this sense, conservation is not to be done *per se*. Except in especial cases, such as conservation needs or scientific research facilities, all archaeological sites preserved should be opened to the public in order to be wide known. Heritage benefits will be maximised through any effective interpretation plan that reveals site's authenticity and its particular historic character

The opening of a site needs to be accompanied by an interpretation programme which will make understandable (*legible*) all the archaeological remains under exposure. In any case, an interpretation programme needs to result from a participative decision process under which site managers take into discussion all the interpretation options, either from a strongly educational oriented programme to a free-interpretation visits to reinforce the beauty sense of the archaeological ruin, or from a scientific oriented interpretation, product of strong archaeologist stewardship, to a wide public contested debate on heritage values, including nostalgic or alternative visions of the past. Therefore the type of interpretative solutions adopted should reflect the particular opportunities and constraints inherent to the heritage place (physic constraints and possibilities of the site, preventive conservation policies and cultural significance assessments) and also a broad understanding of potential public's cultural knowledge and interests.

Interpretation becomes thus a key element in this process of preservation and public opening of sites. Museum facilities and services provided for this purpose are seen today as important factors for the conservation and education, directly affecting the management and protection of archaeological sites. On this ground, different appropriate design and technological means should be employed to faithfully archaeological site's values interpretation.

The MHCB, as member of the project APPEAR, had been developing a set of recommendations and good-practice guidelines for the interpretation decision process applied to urban archaeological sites. I will outline some of these key elements, while the case studies selected for this Session will provide some insight examples of applicability and good practices.

SESSION 3 - CASE STUDY: THE CRYPTA BALBI - "FROM EXCAVATION TO MUSEUM: HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION AND CONSERVATION"

Laura Venditelli
Director, Museo Nazionale Romano *Crypta Balbi*

(Original language : Italian)

In 1981, the Soprintendenza archeologica di Roma (Archaeological Superintendence of Rome) sponsored the excavation of an abandoned city block in the historical centre of the city, within the Campus Martius. In antiquity, the *Crypta Balbi* stood in this area. The Crypta was a vast colonnaded courtyard annexed to the theatre erected by Lucius Cornelius Balbus in 13 B.C.,. The portico was surrounded on the east side by a nucleus of *insulae*. These *insulae* are depicted on the marble *Forma urbis* and are included within the perimeter of the modern city block.

Urban archaeology
The excavations at the Crypta have revealed that life on the site continued after the ancient period. A series of transformations and reuses of the monument extended without interruption through the Medieval and Renaissance periods down to the present day.
This urban archaeological site investigated all of the phases of this city sector. As a result, the complex of the *Crypta Balbi* offers extraordinary evidence for the manner in which Rome evolved on top of its ancient foundations in the course of centuries.

Museo di Roma nel Medievo (The Museum of Rome in the Medieval Period)
A new exhibition site of the Museo Nazionale Romano, the first section of the Museo di Roma nel Medievo (Museum of Rome in the Medieval Period) has been installed in the building already restored. Thus, the first portion of the project for the restoration and display of the entire city block has been concluded. The museum itinerary is laid out within the historical buildings, with access to the vast archaeological area below. It is set out in two sections. The first section, *Archaeology and history of an urban landscape*, illustrates the transformations that this central sector of the urban landscape underwent from antiquity through the 20th century. The second section, *Rome from antiquity to the medieval period*, depicts the evolution of the city's culture between the 5th and 9th centuries.

Project for the excavation and restoration of the entire complex
The project for the entire block envisions a total of five functional lots of excavation, restoration, and display that are contextually viable. The archaeological itinerary will be completed and, the installation of the Museo di Roma nel Medievo (Museum of Rome in the Medieval Period) from the 10th through the 15th centuries will continue within the palaces of medieval date. The museum will always be connected in function with the archaeological activity that continues to be carried out in the area. In addition, it currently has laboratories, storerooms, and study rooms at its disposition. The construction of a hall/auditorium, on which work is about to begin, is projected in the Renaissance rooms of the Conservatorio di S. Caterina della Rosa, on the west side of the complex.

The excavations and restoration work in progress
Excavations are in progress in the *insulae* to the east of the portico. The remains of a Mithraeum, established there at the beginning of the 3rd century, were found in one room of the ancient building. An exhibition, currently on display in one of the rooms of the museum, recounts the events that took place in these rooms from the period of their construction in the Trajanic period through their abandonment at the beginning of the 7th century. An enormous accumulation of debris then filled the rooms to a height of *circa* seven meters. Excavation and restoration is also on-going in the medieval palaces erected between the 11th and 12th centuries that abut respectively on the north and south perimeter walls of the Crypta. In particular, in the palace attached to the north side of the Crypta, in the process of the work, excavation was completed of the underlying ancient building of the Domitianic period. The structure has been identified as a water cistern fed by a branch of an aqueduct, probably the *Aqua Marcia*.

SESSION 3 - CASE STUDY: THE MUSEUMS OF CAESARAUGUSTA « INTEPRETATION OF THE ROMAN VILLA TODAY »

Romana Erice Lacabe
Chief of Museums, Cultural Service of the City of Saragossa, Spain

(Original language: Spanish)

The colony of Caesaraugusta was founded in the Iberian town of Salduba around the year 14 B.C. Its favourable geographical situation on the banks of the Ebre, at a place where the orography made it easy to build a bridge, soon led to the development of a network of roads in the surrounding region that would spread across the valley of the Ebre. As a result of this excellent position, the town, the only one in the Roman Empire to bear the full official name of the Emperor who had founded it, expanded rapidly. Only a few traces remain of the very first phase of the colony because it is clear that its widespread urbanism occurred during the first quarter of the first century of our era and later. The archaeological vestiges that have been preserved and presented as a museum come from the public buildings of the Roman town (the forum, baths, river port and theatre) and are situated along the north-south axis inside the antique town. The criteria adopted for the museum presentation of these vestiges were conceived to demonstrate the use made by the Romans of each building, as well as their daily life. Hypothetical reconstructions were therefore created, using various museographic media: audiovisuals, audio-guides, models, and slide shows.

<u>The Caesaraugusta Forum Museum</u> was inaugurated in October 1995 and was devoted to the big building of the city forum, erected round a rectangular square and surrounded by double porticoes. It stood near the river and along one of the main streets, the Cardo. The vestiges on display show the impressive foundations and large drain going back to the reign of Tiberius, as well as the cellars of commercial premises.

<u>The Cesaraugusta Public Baths Museum</u> was inaugurated in May 1999. The only remaining vestiges of the big public baths, between the forum and the theatre, occupy the site of a group of latrines that were still used at the end of the first century A.D. and were dismantled to make place for a large open air pool surrounded by a portico. The Museum tries to give the public access to the different rooms belonging to the baths and the various routes that could be taken, as well as to inform visitors about how they were run and the everyday life that took place there.

<u>The Caesaraugusta River Port Museum</u> was opened to the public in March 2000. The commercial area that has been preserved is composed of a series of arches that were part of a spectacular façade facing the river, with access through a hall and staircase leading from the port embarkation to the forum. The museum is devoted to the intense navigational and commercial activities that took place on the river Ebre, as well as the founding legions of the town that have left their marks on its walls.

<u>The Caesaraugusta Theatre Museum</u> housed the best preserved public building of the Roman town. It was inaugurated in May 2003. The museological discourse is divided into two complementary approaches. The first concentrates on the Roman theatre itself, referring to its architectural and decorative aspects, the staging of plays, the management of the theatre, the transmission of ideological and religious ideas, and the cult of the emperor. The second approach is devoted to the history of the development of the block of houses (Manzana del solar) up to the inauguration of the museum.

These museums have made it possible to create the *La ruta de Caesaraugusta*, which describes the historical reconstitution and interpretation, aimed at both specialists and the general public, enabling them to acquire a better knowledge of the political centre and the emblematic public buildings of this Roman town, as well as the surrounding area where many of the colony's commercial activities flourished.

SESSION 4
SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACT

Chairman :
Mr Gael de GUICHEN,
Former Deputy General Director of the ICCROM, Rome, Italy

Rapporteur :
Mrs Constanze ITZEL,
Administrator, European Parliament, Policy Department Structural and Cohesion Policies – Culture

Introductory lecture :
"The Socio-cultural Impact"
Mr Mikel ASENSIO,
Professor at the Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain

Case study :
"Early Christian Cemetery, the Necropolis of the Antique Sopianae, in the Contemporary City of Pécs"
Tamás FEJERDY,
Vice-President of the Hungarian Office of Cultural Heritage

Case study :
"Complutum, the House of Hyppolitus : Communication and Archaeology, Training Programme for Employment and Social Impact"
Mr Sebastián RASCON MARQUES,
Chief of the Archaeological Service of Alcalá de Henares, Spain

For information :
"Closer to the Public : Alternative Ways of Presenting Urban Archaeology"
Mr Christoph OLLERER,
Archaeologist at the City of Vienna, Austria

Introduction to the evening visit to the archaeological site
"Charles the Fifth's Palace, at the Coudenberg"
Mr Michel VAN ROYE,
Chairman of the Association "Palais de Charles Quint", Brussels, Belgium

SESSION 4: SOCIAL AND CULTURAL IMPACT

Synthesis by Constanze Itzel
Administrator, European Parliament,
Policy Department Structural and Cohesion Policies - Culture

(Original language: French)

The development of archaeological sites can produce a series of different types of impacts on the social and cultural environment of a town. These impacts are a decisive factor that should be taken into consideration during the planning process aimed at exploiting an archaeological site. The challenge for the planning team is to clearly understand the social and cultural potential of a site in order to focus its development on creating a social and cultural impact of a high quality that could, eventually, have positive effects on the site itself.

THE APPROACHES

In keeping with the interdisciplinary nature of the APPEAR method, the fourth session of the Colloquium brought together the various approaches to this question.

From the social psychology side, Mikel Asensio, Professor at the Autonomous University of Madrid, demonstrated the importance of assessing the expectations of the public vis-à-vis an archaeological site, as well as detailing the modalities.

His presentation was followed by two case studies dealing with the positive experiences of effectively integrating the social surroundings into the development of the site. The first one is by Sebastián Rascón Marqués, Chief of the Archaeological Service of Alcalá de Henares, Spain, who presented the case of the Complutum site at Alcalá de Henares, and the second by Tamas Fedjérdy, Vice-President of the National Office of Cultural Heritage of Hungary, who described the old Necropolis of Sophianae, at Pécs.

A written paper on urban archaeology in Vienna by Christoph Öllerer, an archaeologist attached to the Service of Archaeology of the City of Vienna, completed the picture.

A lively debate on these topics followed the different presentations.

THE RESULTS

The results of this Session consisted mainly in acquiring a general awareness of the importance of creating a link between an archaeological site and its public. The Colloquium revealed how the public, whose role is usually under-estimated or over-estimated, can contribute to the preservation and development of a site, provided its expectations and needs are analysed and taken into account. This analysis can be carried out through inexpensive and efficient instruments, such as interviews, questionnaires or commentary cards. The advantage of this type of tool is that it can improve the museography, adaptation of educational programmes and implementation of effective communication campaigns, being adjusted to the targeted public.

The successful development of an archaeological site would therefore be more likely if the expectations and prejudices of the public, potential public and non-public are identified in advance with a view to defining the orientations that should be adopted in order to respond adequately to the demand. When a decision needs to be taken about whether to cover a site or present it to the public, it appears to be particularly important to consider the views of the people living nearby, to make sure that they would genuinely appropriate the place in question. After developing the site, a study on the public could provide precious information about how the presentation is perceived, and it could also lead to other decisions at a later stage. The study could serve as a basis for drawing up a policy on the public that would enable the site to play a meaningful cultural role while generating the expected social and economic consequences.

The sites of Alcalá and Pécs show to what extent archaeological sites can foster social and cultural development, play an educational role, and maintain or increase profitable economic activities.

In Alcalá, a town that has suffered from serious economic and unemployment problems, a major part of the recovery of the Roman town was carried out through training and employment programmes. These programmes enabled young participants to acquire professional experience in the areas of preservation, promotion, museology and the environment. The archaeological site was able to generate jobs and contribute considerably to the development of the region thanks to its school-workshop programme. Given the fact that several of these occupations are not taught elsewhere in Spain, the training provided in Alcalá helps students to enter the employment market.

Furthermore, the archaeological site has enhanced its cultural and educational attraction for the local public as well as the inhabitants of the metropolitan area around Madrid. It has also reinforced and promoted the specific personality of a town that had suffered from considerable identity problems due to its proximity to the Spanish capital.

The site of the old Necropolis of Pécs is another positive example. In Pécs, the development of the archaeological site contributes significantly to improving the urban environment. By attracting tourists, the site has become a determining factor in the much hoped for urban development. It gives the inhabitants a sense of identity and an opportunity to meet each other. Knowledge is disseminated on the site through a variety of programmes adapted to different types of visitors. While the inhabitants and tourists, whose awareness has been raised through the media and neighbourhood meetings, benefit from the organisation of musical performances, “open days” and other events, the youth of Pécs are entitled to specific attention.

Thanks to ongoing co-operation with schools, pupils are offered a basic educational programme on the heritage of the town at the beginning of their school year. This not only contributes to strengthening the knowledge of young people about their heritage but also creates emotional ties with their town. Other educational activities are designed for different groups of the local population, including continuing heritage management training for adults, in collaboration with the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Pécs, courses for participants from tourist services, etc.

Part of the concept of urban archaeology in Vienna includes a special focus on different groups of the public. The schools of the city, for example, are offered opportunities to spend a day at excavation sites or to visit a restoration workshop. Interested adults can even participate as volunteers in excavations or in restoration workshops.

THREE SITES, THREE DIMENSIONS

The three sites in question follow the approach based on segmentation of the public advocated by M. Asensio. They function on the basis of a solid knowledge of the different types of visitors by offering them appropriate action.

The examples cited above reveal the intelligent way of linking the need for dissemination with the imperatives of preservation. Although archaeological sites are intended for the public, offering historical information, opportunities for local development, a more attractive urban environment and a strong sense of identity, the public in turn makes it own contribution through their respect for heritage and active participation in its preservation and even study (attending training courses offered on the spot, volunteer work at the sites: study of the site in the case of the University of Pécs). This direct involvement of large groups of the population contributes to a broad circulation of knowledge about the sites among the beneficiaries of the training programmes and their close circles.

In consequence, the three sites offer efficient ways of escaping from the "three-dimensional dilemma" mentioned during the second session of the Colloquium when describing the difficulties in reconciling preservation, study and dissemination. By using dissemination for preservation purposes and vice versa, these sites prove that it is indeed possible to balance the three forces to the point of eliminating their contradictions.

SESSION 4 : THE SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACT

Mikel Asensio
Professor at the Autonomous University of Madrid

(Original language : Spanish)

With the passing of time and experiences observed, nobody questions the enormous socio-cultural impact of urban archaeological sites. The transformation of the sites into a museum and their access to the public revives the urban fabric and cultural offer, and exerts a fundamental influence of the cultural, educational and tourist possibilities of the town.

And yet numerous case studies have demonstrated that the socio-cultural impact and its treatment are the independent factors of the scientific, historic or archaeological aspects of the site, and that these two factors set in motion political and social considerations and consequences that affect the viability and development of the project itself, encouraging or hindering the chances of obtaining public or private resources. Advanced societies have become aware of the fact that developing heritage can be a double-edged knife with both positive and negative effects. On the one hand, heritage can be considered as a launching pad for cultural, educational and tourist development provided it is developed through a rational and sustainable use of appropriate heritage resources. But on the other hand, heritage can be used politically and exploited in such a way as to produce pernicious and negative cultural and economic effects, having an urban impact that would be difficult to rectify. Today, no one questions the importance of planning and adequate evaluation of heritage projects, and the fact that various specialists should collaborate in these plans through in-depth studies that would guarantee the global viability of the project.

An important aspect of the process is the management of visits and their impact, which should be based on a rational, empirical, qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the real possibilities of socio-cultural incidences both on the actual and on the potential public, or even the lack of a public. Visitor surveys and their impact help to determine the expectations, profiles and segments of the public, the reasons for their visit, the effect on various groups, how the messages are understood and learned, the influence of these messages on feelings of identity, and the perceived and non perceived intellectual and emotional impacts.

The results make it possible to clarify the model and implementation of museological projects, and they also contribute to quantifying their economic impact and analysing their viability, with a view to a more effective adaptation, and public and educational programmes. Incidence studies on visitors (the public) are a practical planning tool that contributes to savings on economic and human resources by directing the representational and communication measures more directly.

Communications can show an original model for evaluating the socio-cultural impact, centred on the problems of transforming urban archaeological sites into museums. The fundamental objective of the model is to remedy any methodological shortcomings in this field and to propose a tool to measure these impacts applicable to any type of site in the planning and/or operating phase. The model has been tested at a series of sites and has proved to be adaptable to different types of projects and social contexts.

SESSION 4 - CASE STUDY - « EARLY CHRISTIAN CEMETERY: THE NECROPOLIS OF THE ANTIQUE SOPIANAE IN THE TOWN OF CONTEMPORARY PECS »

Tamás Fejérdy
Vice-President of the Hungarian Office of Cultural Heritage
(Original language: French)

1. Introduction: the historical and urbanistic context
Since the Roman Empire, and through the Middle Ages and Turkish domination, the town has gone through an eventful cycle of development phases alternating with recession. Continuity was ensured by the religious function and the presence of relics in the Early Christian cemetery.

2. Heritage to protect – the "scientific" period
Although the discovery and preservation of archaeological elements goes back to the 1700's, this activity has always been secondary to urban development. The underground vestiges, found separately by different individual owners in an uncoordinated way, have not been the object of an integrated system of protection. With the intention of preserving these vestiges and making them accessible, the following question was considered: How to harmonise the inter-relationships between the different historical layers or to visualise the "fourth dimension" (time) in space, without undermining the values of the site?

3. Universally owned heritage – "revealing" actions
The safeguarded sector of the town was known for its wealth of constructions belonging to successive periods in the history of architecture, forming an exceptional urban ensemble. The Early Christian underground heritage, as such, had never played a crucial role. Since only components of the old Necropolis of Sopianae were included on the World Heritage List, a new order of priority has been given to the historic values, with preference for the archaeological rather than urbanistic and architectural values.

4. Learning about heritage – living with heritage
After a long period of decline of the Early Christian tombs, the archaeological heritage of the town has become increasingly more interesting. The City Council has initiated dynamic methods to manage these sites, including their socio-cultural impact through various educational programmes, especially at primary and secondary school levels, leading to very useful surveys.

5. Heritage to admire
To meet new needs, especially the increased number of visitors, a new presentation approach has been adopted, one that is more "visitor-friendly" and more "spectacular".

6. Heritage, the foundation for local development
The town of Pécs (a candidate to be the European Cultural Capital in 2010) has reformulated its objectives concerning the preservation and presentation of its Early Christian archaeology. Thanks to financial support from the European Structural Fund, it is in the process of broadening its already "holistic" presentation of the underground sites by incorporating physical and visual links in the urban context, as well as in the spiritual life of the town. The aim of this ambitious project is to attract visitors (local and foreign) by resorting to the advantages of an "intelligent house" system. This project is also part of the postgraduate curriculum of the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Pécs.

7. Heritage and partnership – the challenge of sustainability
Underground archaeological property involves several owners and institutions, including the City Council of Pécs and the Catholic Diocese. Touristic (and, in general, economic) development, as well as the promotion of the spiritual content of this heritage and the moral and physical right of access of the public have become strong federating forces.

SESSION 4 - CASE STUDY: COMPLUTUM – THE HOUSE OF HYPPOLYTUS, "COMMUNICATION AND ARCHAEOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL IMPACT"

Sebastián Rascón Marqués
Chief of the Archaeological Service of Alcalá de Henares, Spain

(Original language: Spanish)

The Roman town of Complutum, the present day Alcalá de Henares, is an important urban archaeological site, one of the best known, situated in the centre of Spain.

Complutum, designed as a suburban archaeological park, was very much affected by the growth of Alcalá de Henares during the decade of the 1970's. A large parcel of land of 20 ha was set aside for an archaeological park to display, under museum conditions, significant vestiges of private houses, a forum, baths, an interpretation centre, etc. In 1999, the Casa de Hyppolytus was opened to the public. It used to be a "college" for young people of the town of Complutum.

In addition to its features of a strictly museum and scientific nature (programmes for preservation, research and dissemination), the archaeological programme of Alcalá de Henares is characterised by its social dimension. The Mayor of Alcalá and the Department of Historical Heritage of the Community of Madrid joined forces to implement this project. The city council introduced a large number of measures linked to the urban environment, having a considerable impact on the inter-relationship between archaeology and its citizens.

In the first place, the historic heritage of Alcalá is a showpiece for the collective efforts to develop the town, based on the cultural and educational influence it can exert not only over its own citizens but also people from the immediate environment, including Madrid and its vast metropolitan area composed of various satellite towns.

Secondly, in addition to the considerable aid received (for example, from the Spanish Institute of Historical Heritage), much of the recovery of the Roman town was carried out through training and employment programmes, linked mainly to the Spanish programme for school-workshops (Escuelas Taller) and Casas de Oficios, programmes financed by the European Social Fund, thanks to which several hundred young people were trained during the last few years in disciplines related to archaeology: archaeological assistants, quarries, mosaic workers, graphic artists and 3D operators … Several of these professions, which can only be learned in Alcalá, facilitates the insertion of students in the employment market.

SESSION 4 - CASE STUDY: VIENNA - "CLOSER TO THE PEOPLE: ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF PRESENTING URBAN ARCHAEOLOGY".

Christoph Öllerer
Dr. Phil. M.A. Archaeologist, Stadarchäologie Wien

The Stadtarchäologie Wien is an institute for excavation and research of the archaeological remains and the history of our city. Since the seventies we are excavating a roman *vicus* by annual campaigns for exclusively scientific reasons. The main part of our work concerns rescue excavations of remains found during construction works. Nowadays, it is more and more important to present the results of our work to a large audience in order to be noticed and to get a positive feedback from the public.

It is obvious, that roman archaeology is hardly present in Vienna. There is no archaeological museum, and only two sites concern roman time: the excavations of the *scamnum tribunorum* on "Hoher Markt", and some workshops of the *canabae legionis*, to be seen in a big trench on "Michaelerplatz". Therefore, we had to look for other activities to approach urban population and colleagues from other countries and institutions.

As far as high school students are concerned, we have installed "portable museums", the so-called "Roman Suitcase" and the "Medieval Suitcase". These are boxes, in which original finds and copies of objects on different topics are collected. Schools and classes can request for them. On demand, one of our team brings them along and gives an introduction to the time and the circumstances of living.

One step further goes the initiative "junior archaeology". In summer, we have an excavation of a roman *vicus* in the south of Vienna, in Unterlaa. High school students are invited to come along and to pass a day on this site, working as archaeologists and getting to know where and how the pieces in our museums are collected. To a smaller extent a visit to our restoration – workshop is possible as well. The same initiative we offer to "senior archaeologists", who help on this excavation as well as in the restoration. The Stadtarchäologie Wien gains a lot of their work, washing and signing the finds, the senior archaeologists have social contact and get a lot of archaeological information from our colleagues.

Our every-day work is published in our periodical "Fundort Wien" which appears every year since 1998. It gives space to information about our excavations as well as to current projects, to articles about outstanding founds and reviews of new publications as well as events of the previous year. We consider it our duty to keep the standards of international archaeological publications, but at the same time to use a language, which is also understandable for interested laymen.

The series "Monografien Stadtarchäologie Wien" on the other hand present the results of large excavations or studies on certain groups of material on a very high scientific level. Apart from that, we have a close cooperation with several Viennese and Austrian mass media in order to be present and broadcast our ideas and our needs. A very big success was a CD with the virtual reconstruction of the Viennese legionary camp, which was produced by a private enterprise under archaeological supervision of members of the Stadtarchäologie Wien.

Additionally, we help prepare exhibitions in different museums in Vienna and organize presentations on certain topics for private companies.Of course all this has to be paid for. But as we are part of the magistrate of Vienna, we do have a certain budget we can work with. The income we have by our rescue-excavation is very useful support for this.

The city of Vienna has no archaeological museum. Therefore we are convinced that it is absolutely necessary to be proactive and to try to reach people by approaching them and in this way bringing urban archaeology to life.

INTRODUCTION TO THE RECEPCION AT THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE OF COUDENBERG, "CHARLES THE FIFTH'S PALACE"

Michel Van Roye
Chairman of "Palais de Charles Quint" Association
(Original language : French)

The history of the former Palace of Brussels is well known. Originally erected as a castle by the Counts of Leuven and the Dukes of Brabant, it dominated the city from its position on Coudenberg hill, the highest area within the original city walls. It was gradually converted into a home fit for princes, becoming, through a series of marriages and successions, the main residence of the Dukes of Burgundy, then of Charles the Fifth, and subsequently of the governors who represented the Spanish and Austrian sovereigns in Belgium. It consisted mainly of the Magna Aula, the throne room built by Philip the Good, the chapel erected on three levels by Charles the Fifth and the main building, extended and embellished by the governors, including the Infante Isabelle, daughter of Philippe II, and her husband Archduke Albert of Habsburg. In 1731, this huge, prestigious palace was accidentally destroyed by fire.

The construction of the current Royal Palace, place Royale and Brussels Park from the 18th century onwards gradually caused the existence of the former palace to be forgotten. The district retained its royal calling, but its classical style no longer reflected the composite air and sloping relief that characterised the area before the fire. In fact, when constructing the royal district, the architects of the 18th century took pains to flatten out the site and fill in all the differences in level, in some cases to a height of ten meters. However, they retained everything that could still be used as cellars and foundations. The walls that had not been destroyed by the fire were razed to the level of the paving stones in the square and used as a basis for the new buildings. This is why visitors to the site are struck by the contrast between the 18th century architecture of the place Royale and the vaults, columns and walls they discover beneath the ground, which were constructed between the 12th and the 16th century. The successive occupants of the buildings in place Royale were of course aware of the state of their cellars, but memories of the palace gradually faded, giving way to the myth of the 'underground passages of the place Royale'.

The Brussels-Capital Region, having become the owner of the Hôtel de Grimbergen, began renovating its cellars, bringing to light in the process the base of the chapel built by Charles the Fifth and part of the rue Isabelle. As regards the Magna Aula, it was easy - once someone had thought of it - to determine where the remains of its great walls lay beneath the place Royale. Successful probing in 1995 was the prelude to five years of excavations that opened up a quarter of place Royale. Since the year 2000, this archaeological site, the museography of which is not yet complete, has attracted over 40,000 visitors a year.
A second phase in the work, scheduled to continue until 2007, involves the Hôtel d'Hoogstraeten, on the other side of rue Isabelle, the remains of which, like those of the palace, were used as the base for the construction of one of the buildings in place Royale. This phase will double the area covered by the archaeological site.

Finally, in addition to the current access via the Bellevue museum, basement openings will lead into the Centre for Fine Arts and the Museum of Musical Instruments. Once complete, this site will therefore guide visitors through the various phases of urban development in Brussels, from the 12th century (central building of the original palace), via the 15th century (Magna Aula), the 16th century (chapel) and the 18th century (Barnabé Guimard's place Royale) to the 20th century (Victor Horta's Centre for Fine Arts and Saintenoy's Museum of Musical Instruments).

By 2007, all the development work will have been completed and Brussels will have a significant archaeological site. In fact, it was Philip the Good's decision to settle on Coudenberg hill and build the Magna Aula there, rather than in Louvain or Malines, which established the residence of successive sovereigns and gradually transformed the city of Brussels into the major capital it is today.

SESSION 5
ARCHITECTURAL AND URBAN INTEGRATION

Chairman :
Mr Roger M. THOMAS,
Head of Urban Archaeology, English Heritage? United Kingdom

Rapporteur :
Mrs Sofia AVGERINOU,
Professor at the National Technical University of Athens, Greece

Introductory lecture :
"Urban integration and Archaeological Vestiges"
Mr Jacques TELLER,
Lecturer, CUGS, University of Liège, Belgium

Case study :
"Plovdiv : Urban and Architectural Integration, Interpretation of the Heritage"
Mr Todor KRESTEV,
Professor at the University of Sofia, Bulgaria

Case study :
"Integration of Cultural History in Town Development"
Mr Wim de HEER,
Head of Department of Town Development, Maastricht, The Netherlands

SESSION 5: URBAN AND ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRATION

Synthesis by Sofia Avgérinou Kolononias
Professor at the National Technical University of Athens

(Original language: French)

Three papers were presented in the course of the 5th session of the Colloquium on "Towns of the Past, Towns of the Future", which took place under the chairmanship of Mr. Roger Thomas (Director of Urban Archaeology, English Heritage). The first one, by Mr. Jacques Teller, Professor at the University of Liege, was on the theme "Urban Integration of Archaeological Vestiges" by way of a preamble. This was followed by two case studies dealing with the problems and modalities of finding a solution, to enable the ensuing debate to move from the general to the specific, and from the theoretical method to its application and effects.

The two case studies dealt with the topics "Plovdiv, Bulgaria, Urban and Architectural Integration and Interpretation of Heritage" by Mr. Todor Krestev, Professor of Architecture at the University of Sofia, and "Maastricht, The Netherlands, Insertion of Historical Culture in Urban Development" by Mr. Wim de Heer, Director of Town Planning of the city of Maastricht.

The main objective of the session was to set in motion a debate on the measures required to successfully integrate archaeological sites in an urban environment, as well as in the social and economic life of historic towns.

It is obviously not a simple question relating to the process of urban and architectural planning. The aim is to introduce complex inter-disciplinary measures to be applied successively, ensuring not only the protection of the archaeological site but also re-establishing the relationship between the site and a rapidly changing contemporary urban environment. An in-depth knowledge and interpretation of the archaeological site is a fundamental condition for the successful achievement of the projects pertaining to it. This requires systematic and profound research into the historical identity, aesthetic and architectural value, social significance and economic importance of the archaeological site in question.

Within the framework of this reflection, the research team of the APPEAR Guide recommended, through the intermediary of the first speaker, Jacques Teller, a working method and analytical tool based on a study of typical cases from eight different European countries. The cases examined were classified into categories and subsequently recorded in a database of architectural references.

The architectural proposals concerning the protection of the archaeological site, the climatic and geological data, and the specific features of the urban setting of the archaeological site form the principal parameters of the typology referred to above.

Based on the above-mentioned methodology, the APPEAR research team proceeded to examine the comparative advantages and disadvantages of archaeological sites that have either been covered or left open, whether they have been transformed in a museum or not.

In addition, a comparative investigation was also carried out on several projects concerning access, as submitted in the cases of towns, which are either of a different size (small, medium or large) or of a different tourist level.

Cases relating to the urban location of an archaeological site are also just as varied. The advantages and disadvantages differ according to whether its position is central or peripheral, and whether the site comes under a historical tourist region or one suffering from a slowdown, and even decline, in its development, etc.

As disclosed by the presentation of the survey's findings, the basic condition for a successful diagnosis is to combine several different parameters through an inter- and multidisciplinary approach to the various questions. On this particular point, the theory could be advanced that the diagnostic method proposed seems to be suitable for general application and could, in consequence, become an established procedure of a practical nature, even at institutional level.

There is nevertheless a wide diversity of cases. As shown by the cases examined, the solution to problems based on a project for the architectural and urban integration of an archaeological site in an urban environment must be specific in every case.

Urban planners are therefore confronted by the following dilemma:

- The protection and preservation of the authentic character of the archaeological site, followed by a postponement of initiatives of architectural creation, or
- A free architectural intervention at the expense of the function and protection of the archaeological site.

The presentations of the two case studies relating to Plovdiv and Maastricht respectively have made useful contributions to the reflection proposed for discussion.

More precisely, these cases have demonstrated that despite obviously different starting points, the final decisions on integrating archaeological sites in an urban environment are not of a strictly technical nature involving specialised architects and town planners. Frequently, the projects introduced are mainly the result of management decisions taken by the central government or by the local authorities, depending on the prevailing situation, itself the consequence of economic interests or social pressures, or even both at the same time.

In the case of the historic town of Plovdiv (Philippopolis), it has been observed that the successive strata go back to the second millennium B.C., the Roman Empire, the Byzantine period, up to modern times. History is therefore omnipresent in this town. The archaeological sites have had to face particularly acute problems of protection during the transition period of the last fifteen years. The principal reason is the lack of efficient urban integration instruments and town-planning strategies aimed at obtaining a balance between preservation, urban development, and public and private interests.

The need to protect the heritage of Plovdiv started to be tackled following the study and implementation of a pilot project launched in 2002, with a view to the urban and architectural integration and interpretation of old Plovdiv. This pilot project involves an entire network of partners and is based on a framework and regulations aimed at an urban and architectural integration that would complete the protection of archaeological sites, taking into consideration both the imperatives of protecting archaeological sites and the need for economic development. The management of the project has now led to the first positive results, and this has created favourable prospects for the actual implementation of the project.

The town of Maastricht, the oldest in the Netherlands, was founded by the Romans 2,000 years ago. Today, the town has an architectural heritage reflecting all periods, and given the fairly large number of recent architectural and urban interventions being undertaken, the question has evidently arisen about the integration of archaeological vestiges.

Recently, the public authorities of the town decided to adopt the Model of Maastricht by combining "business and pleasure". Having to face urban development pressures from the surrounding region, to which the town belongs, the municipality, was obliged to concentrate on conquering back the "old town". This decision was inspired by the principle that in some cases, the preservation of antiquities in their initial form is possible, but in the long run this implies a new function and a new vocation.

Based on this hypothesis, and within the framework of the eleven contemporary urban interventions that have taken place in Maastricht, an evaluation policy is being drawn up, together with the order of priorities and final options for protecting the archaeological and architectural heritage of the town. In addition to the local authorities, this approach also incites private entrepreneurs to invest in this initiative.

The debate following the presentations brought to the fore the comments submitted by the audience, thus confirming the working theories emanating from the research undertaken within the framework of the APPEAR Guide.

The following main points ensued from the debate:

- It was acknowledged that the construction of a database on architectural references was an important contribution to the documentation and comparative research between the different cases. A database of this type should provide scientific information of a historical and technical nature, and also inform users (experts, decision-makers and the public) about the various practices in force. The good and bad effects of these practices could turn out to be a very useful guide for future projects.

- The need to draw up one single technical method permitting the systematic study of cases of integrating archaeological sites in architectural and urban plans was confirmed.

- It was observed that the safeguarding measures that should be adopted as the essential objective of urban planning, as well as the architectural protective works (the covering), should be in keeping with the function and identity of the archaeological site while being in harmony with it.

- Finally, it was recognised that the role played by the partnership, established around a scientific approach to produce proposals for integrating archaeological sites in an urban environment, was a decisive factor. Any project, however complete it may be from the technical and scientific points of view, cannot have a comprehensive or successful application unless it is backed by an indispensable collaboration and alliance between all the parties involved in its application.

SESSION 5 - « URBAN INTEGRATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL VESTIGES »

Jacques Teller
Lecturer, CUGS-University of Liege

(Original language : French)

The integration of archaeological vestiges in a contemporary urban system is considered to be necessary both by heritage experts who perceive it as an advantageous solution ensuring continuity with the past, and urban executives who are invariably preoccupied by the functioning and development of the town. Even the public is becoming increasingly aware of the need for the preservation and presentation *in situ* of witnesses of the past. Finally, archaeological vestiges tend to be of considerable importance to local authorities because of the spectacular development of the economy of tourism.

A town is much more than the sum of its parts, and what characterises the condition of being urban is, in actual fact, the interdependence between its activities, players and processes, whether they are of a social, economic or cultural nature. Looking upon a town as an eco-system in its own right should lead to envisaging the feasibility of enhancing archaeological vestiges in a much broader ensemble and focusing on the relationship between the site and the rest of the urban fabric. The goal is to avoid at all costs the formation of an *archaeological ghetto,* a sort of foreign body settling in the town without ever interacting with the other components of the urban structure.

Having said this, it is now acknowledged that in most cases an optimal preservation of archaeological vestiges cannot be achieved in the absence of a protective cover. The concept of a protective architectural cover should therefore be envisaged as a complex process aimed at responding to the needs for protecting and preserving archaeological vestiges, and for operating the sites (use, accessibility, safety, etc), as well as the demands for visual and formal integration into the urban environment. It would be appropriate to insert the site in its contemporary setting, that is to say, to create a link with the other structures of the town, in terms of including it in the landscape, sign-posting and legibility, while respecting the criteria for authenticity and « distinguishability ».

The architectural cover must frequently meet numerous, and sometimes conflicting, requirements, such as a cover for the site and the traffic circulation area. This cover is rarely optimised on the exclusive basis of preservation criteria and, in this context, the priority given to design raises a number of difficulties. The development process can lead to a difficult arbitration between visual impact, archaeological preservation, and easy access for the general public.

Finally, it should be noted that the link between historic consciousness based on the scientific rigour of research and the multi-sectoral requirements connected with the implementation of the project can sometimes create a problem. It can happen that the architectural intervention moves away from the objective of the project – to highlight the vestiges – to become an end in itself. There is, in that case, a risk of the vestiges being relegated to second place, thus becoming a « post-modern trompe l'oeil » through a strange effect of placing them in a void. Should one, therefore, give priority to mediocre architecture in order to make sure it does not steal the limelight ?

SESSION 5 - CASE STUDY: PLOVDIV "URBAN AND ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRATION, INTERPRETATION OF HERITAGE"

Todor Krestev
Professor of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy at the University of Sofia, Bulgaria

(Original language : French)

The town of Plovdiv, standing at the cultural crossroads between the East and the West, offers a rich stratification of archaeological layers: Thracian (the oldest date back to the 1st millennium B.C.), Roman (the town of Philippopolis, capital of the Roman province of Thrace, 1st and 2nd centuries) and medieval. This heritage has been the object of archaeological excavations and preservation measures in the last 70 years. It is protected by strong legislation. Solid experience has been acquired through its urban and architectural integration, as well its interpretation (for instance, the antique theatre, the antique home of *Eirene* in the underground « Archaeological » passage, the Odeon, Hissar Kapia, etc.). However, several problems have emerged, particularly during this period of social and economic transition in Bulgaria. There is a lack of efficient instruments for urban integration ; a balanced urban strategy between preservation, archaeological excavations and urban planning, as well as between public and private interests ; adequate management of the archaeological structure ; etc. All this constitutes a threat to the integrity of the archaeological system of the town, the public interest, the quality of archaeological interpretation and the archaeological substance itself (for example, the antique Forum, the archaeological site of Nebet Tépé).

A pilot project was launched in 2002 on the urban and architectural integration of the most precious part of the town's cultural heritage – the reserves of *Ancient Plovdiv,* listed as a World Heritage site, where the oldest archaeological layers are to be found. The project, which is under way, is founded on the interdependence and complementarity between urban integration and architectural integration in terms of preservation, museography, interpretation, socio-cultural impact, economic aspects, management, etc. Instruments have been proposed to achieve a balance between preservation and sustainable urban development, as well as concrete partnerships between the public authorities and other players (especially civic society associations). It has therefore been possible to define the imperatives of integrated preservation and interdisciplinary operations, within the framework of a General Preservation Plan. On this basis, and as a result of the partnership between the public authorities and the Bulgarian and Japanese Committees of ICOMOS, a UNESCO project (the Japan Trust Fund) entitled *Preservation of the Monuments of Culture in the Ancient Plovdiv Reserve,* was launched and is currently in progress,. Opportunities were also defined for cultural tourism, covering different cultural circuits - urban, national and transnational - within the framework of South East Europe and the project on *The Cultural Corridors of South East Europe* (Regional Forum, Varna, 2005).

The project illustrates the possibilities offered by an urban and architectural interpretation with an interdisciplinary approach involving an entire network of partners, and based on a clear strategy and efficient management.

SESSION 5 – CASE STUDY - "INTEGRATION OF CULTURAL HISTORY IN TOWN DEVELOPMENT"

Wim de Heer
Head of Department of Town Development
Division of Urban Planning and Community Estates, Community of Maastricht

Maastricht is the oldest, continuously occupied city in the Netherlands. It was founded by the Romans some 2000 years ago. Maastricht nowadays is a relatively small town of 122.000 inhabitants. It is located in the very southern part of The Netherlands and is part of a very urbanized international region with cities like Liege, Aachen, Heerlen, Sittard-Geleen, Hasselt-Genk. This region with a diameter of about 50 km's includes about 3,7 million inhabitants.

Maastricht is an old and historic town. It contains 1650 "national" (recognized by the Dutch Government) monuments, houses, churches, fortifications, etc... and about 1000 other interesting historic buildings, structures etc…Besides that, under the surface there are many archaeological remains, some of them already are integrated in town-developments in recent periods. This circumstance, the overwhelming historical background and the fact that the city of Maastricht has already (since long) reached its spatial limits and therefore has limited possibilities to expand, forced the community of Maastricht to combine "business with pleasure", to restructure, reuse, renovate the old city in order to provide new space and possibilities to grow. As a consequence of this we developed step by step our own approach of doing things and that is what we call the Maastricht Model.

The Maastricht Model is a way of working, based on a long experience, aiming at *Integration, Cooperation* and *high Quality urban environment,* in order to establish a Solid, Sustainable and Sound (well-balanced) urban development.

We only are able to preserve our cultural heritage, above and under the surface, if we can find a new destination or function for it and thereby integrate it new and dynamic developments. Sometimes we have to excavate and remove historical and archaeological remains, sometimes we can preserve monuments in their original state, but most of the time we have to find new destinations for it.

To be successful it is necessary to establish a broad inventory of historical objects and remains and to formulate policies on what is important and what needs to be preserved.
How we do this and what procedures are developed, will be presented and explained as well as some results and projects.

SESSION 6:
FEASIBILITY AND ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL EFFECTS

Chairman :
Mr Luigi CABRINI,
Regional Representative for Europe, World Tourism Organization, Madrid, Spain

Rapporteur :
Mr Jean-Louis LUXEN,
Secretary General of ICOMOS 1993-2002, Paris, France

Introductory lecture :
"Feasibility and Economic and Social Effects : Micro and Macro Economic Aspects"
Mr Christian OST,
Rector of ICHEC (Business School), Brussels, Belgium

Case study :
"The Axis from Rotunda to the Palace of Galerius, through the Ancient Hippodrome"
Mr Yanis CHATZIGOGAS,
Professor at the University of Thessalonica, Greece

Case study :
"The Archeoforum of Liège"
Mrs Séverine MONJOIE,
Director of the Archeoforum, Liège, Belgium

SESSION 6:
FEASIBILITY AND ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL EFFECTS

Synthesis by Jean-Louis Luxen
Secretary General of ICOMOS 1993 - 2002

(Original Language: French)

In general, the issue of financing arises from the very first phases of the development of an archaeological site or a heritage site. It is a question of justifying the mobilisation of the resources required from public authorities or private institutions solicited by many other projects. Every day, the social reality illustrates the need to define a better allocation of rare resources, in the general interest, to satisfy needs that are, in fact, unlimited.

Christian Ost shows how an economic analysis can give invaluable assistance in this regard, by highlighting all the costs, direct or indirect, but also all the positive spin-offs, also direct or indirect, of developing heritage. This analysis combines an examination of macro-economic aspects, relating to the general economic life of a town, province or region, with a study of micro-economic aspects relating to the development of the archaeological site itself. It helps to obtain a general picture and verify to what extent investments directly linked to the site can generate economic and social spin-offs on a broader scale.

It should be clearly understood that it is a matter of helping to make a decision, which comes within the scope of elected representatives. It is necessary to provide them with a maximum of data and figures, bearing in mind that the quantitative data must be completed by more qualitative considerations, centred on the cultural and social interest of a heritage project. Certain situations make it possible to draw up a positive economic assessment, thanks in particular to a controlled growth of cultural tourism. They can vary according to the level of the public's recognition of heritage, whether it is local, national, or even international. In other cases, this assessment is negative but depending on the intangible values attached to the site, elected representatives may nevertheless go ahead, in their belief that these intangible values justify the cost to the community. These social and cultural considerations are described in the English-speaking world as « intangibles ».

In Europe today, cultural heritage is duly considered as a common good. Hence the restrictions imposed on the right of possession and the obligation to ensure preservation or restoration in accordance with strict procedures. And hence, too, the justification for subsidies or direct expenditures on the part of public authorities. Preservation is a process of public interest.

The macro-economic approach takes into account and quantifies the collective costs and advantages of a development project, and highlights their inter-relationship. Experience shows that investments in the area of cultural heritage have a considerable "multiplier effect" on income, employment, and the general economic activity of a town or region. The analysis can go as far as quantifying the inputs and outputs of each activity. It also has the advantage of taking into account, beyond direct spin-offs, whether they are positive or negative, the induced effects, also positive or negative, with a view to maximising the former and minimising the latter.

The micro-economic approach can measure, as far as possible, the expenditures and revenues of a specific development project. It distinguishes between the different phases and types of expenses to help pinpoint the corresponding financing possibilities. It incorporates the options related to its daily management and maintenance right from the conception phase of the project. Several cost/profit models can be applied, sometimes connected more to a financial analysis or study of the incidence on the community. In general, the starting point is to identify all the agents involved in a project. The next step is to quantify all the predictable financial flows to determine the various options for development. Finally, the most favourable option is selected, by completing the monetary data with cultural considerations.

The development and management of an area in the vicinity of a heritage site makes it possible to establish a liaison between the macro- and micro-economic dimensions. This liaison is particularly important in an urban environment.

It is nonetheless important to bear in mind that while running an archaeological site, many unpredictable elements may crop up, sometimes leading to significant repercussions both on the costs and on the spin-offs. Hence the need for a certain flexibility in the planning procedure, with the possibility of adjustments in the analysis and implementation of the project.

In his paper on urban developments in the city of Thessalonica, Janis Chatzigogas demonstrates to what extent architectural and archaeological heritage can turn out to be major resources. But at the same time, they are also fragile resources subject to much deterioration unless development and management plans exist and are respected. It is sometimes difficult to persuade municipal authorities of the importance of an active and integrated preservation policy, and the reality of macro-economic spin-offs.

And yet a manifest recognition of the economic and social interest of investments in heritage development projects is demonstrated by the systematic funding of archaeological work sites by the Regional Development Fund of the European Union. If these work sites are located in a region that is eligible for European structural funds, they are financed by the Union, which has a positive outlook about the economic, social and cultural spin-offs of such projects, especially because of the growth of tourism.

However, this external aid should not lessen the responsibility of elected representatives and local professionals, and the principles of preservation should continue to be respected. Experience has often shown that the administrative procedures for granting structural funds to archaeological sites short-circuit the services in charge of preservation and can lead to irreversible preservation errors.

Sévérine Monjoie has illustrated the micro-economic approach by describing the development and activities of the Archéoforum in Liege. The intangibles had great importance in the eyes of those who took the decisions. A detailed breakdown of the total cost of the works (5,771,000 €) was produced, making a distinction between the preservations of the vestiges, the scenography, development of the surroundings, opening of an art shops, fees, etc

The recent opening, in November 2003, only permits a prudent analysis even though data on its management are available. The number of visitors reflects the interest shown in the site. They are mainly local visitors or school groups. Efforts have been made to establish partnerships with other museums, as well as the restaurant sector.

In terms of management, and at this particular stage in its operation, the Archéoforum generates an income of about 10,000 € a month, for running expenses (excluding amortisation) amounting to some 40,000 €. Several speakers in the debate pointed to this imbalance, which could continue to evolve. According to the reasoning that dominated the session, the intangibles amount to 30,000 € a month. Is this amount too high? Furthermore, it has been noted that the resources attributed to this development would be much needed for other archaeological missions (inventories, salvage excavations, planned excavations, publications, etc). Another pertinent question is whether a public debate took place at the time the decision was made to invest. What is the involvement of civil society? The visitors must also be taken into consideration. Where do they come from? What are their contributions to local economic activities? Why are they interested in discovering the site and what is their degree of satisfaction after the visit?

An economic analysis of a development project provides quantitative data that are very useful for taking decisions. However, this analysis, as we have seen, retains its own cultural, social and political logic.

SESSION 6 - « FEASIBILITY AND ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL EFFECTS: MICRO AND MACRO ECONOMIC ASPECTS »

Christian Ost

Rector of the ICHEC (Institut catholique des Hautes Etudes Commerciales), Brussels

Chairman of the ICOMOS International Economic Committee

(Original language : French)

Preamble

The economic point of view and the role played by economists today in the area of the economy of heritage and preservation.

First Part

Macro economic aspects consider the global operations of preservation. They take into account the diversity of the players, the different interests and the various impacts of an operation or a project.

This covers:

1.- Economic effects: the multiplier effects of expenditure, income and employment. These factors can be clearly identified under certain hypotheses (tourism, for example).

2.- Social and cultural effects, including the awareness of a community regarding the value of heritage and its preservation. These factors, which are described as intangible, can nevertheless be calculated approximately through a range of indicators.

3.- Urban planning effects, in other words, the dimension of space created by impacts that are direct, indirect or resulting from the immediate (or sometimes distant) environment surrounding the site. The interactions between the site and its environment, including the already mentioned conflicts of interest, are also involved in terms of space

Second Part

Micro economic aspects deal more with the operation in question and envisage the point of view of the public or private operator.

Micro aspects concern:

1.- The costs and profits of the operation (operating and maintenance budget). Financial measures must take into account the long-term dimension of an operation and its after-effects.

2.- The management of the operation, how to ensure meetings between the players involved and carry out operations within an efficient organisational framework (especially from the viewpoint of public operators).

3.- The budgetary and taxation aspect of the operations : effects for the public authorities, economic justification of subsidies, positive and negative impacts of the operation on other missions undertaken by the public authorities (hygiene, security, mobility, etc).

Conclusions and links with practical cases.

SESSION 6 – CASE STUDY : THESSALONICA - "THE AXIS FROM ROTUNDA TO THE PALACE COMPLEX BUILT BY GALERIUS, THROUGH THE ANCIENT HIPPODROME"

Janis Chatzigogas
Professor at the University of Thessalonica, Faculty of Architecture

(Original language : English)

The walk from Rotunda to Kamara and the palace of Galerius, the Hippodrome and the seaside, is an important monumental perspective. West represents Rome, East, Constantinople, the new Rome, along Via Egnatia. North is the Balkan peninsula and South, the Mediterranean sea. Thessaloniki has been the meeting point of these axes, vertical and horizontal, for the last 2350 years, Thessaloniki is a living, historic city, that has experienced many metamorphosis and transformations. Greek, Macedonian, Roman, Ottoman, Venetian, Catalan, Balkan, Jewish, Armenian, Modern Greek etc. influences have left their marks on the image of the city, positively and negatively. However, its present image is very poor, without respect for the values of such a great cultural heritage.

Projects have been developed and some initiatives have been taken, for instance, the excavation of the Roman palace complex and the octagon of Galerius, in order to make all the qualities of the site visible again. Given the perspective of regional economic development, mainly through tourism frequentation, important public funds have been invested, with a massive support of the Regional Funds of the European Commission. Based on the same reasoning, over the last few years, works at most of the archaeological sites in Greece have been funded by EU, in order to make them open to visitors. Everybody is convinced that this is a good investment for the future.

However, even if we share that conviction, we must consider that serious problems are to be faced. There is a lack of coordination between the different "responsible" agencies. The cultural heritage professionals are not appropriately involved in the projects. There is a lack of common rules and goals in the interventions. Since the money is coming from exterior sources, the local agencies do not feel being properly involved and do not really care for an integrated, balanced project. There is no harmonious decision on such important aspects as the circulation and the parking, the advertising, the management of public spaces. The social dimension is not taken into account, creating frustration and rejection from many citizens.

Yes, archaeological sites and cultural heritage can represent real resources for local development. However, the working methods are to be reconsidered. The most urgent priority is the creation of a comprehensive project, based on recognized principles and values and on public participation.

SESSION 6 - CASE STUDY: THE ARCHÉOFORUM OF LIÈGE, Belgium

Séverine Monjoie
Director of the Archéoforum

(Original language : French)

The Archéoforum of Liège is a vast underground infrastructure below the Place Saint-Lambert, a central area of the town of Liège. It preserves archaeological vestiges that cover a long and uninterrupted period between 7000 B.C. and the end of the 19th century. This underground site contains the vestiges of a succession of religious buildings dedicated to Bishop Lambert who died here around 700. It consists mainly of the foundations of a huge Gothic cathedral, destroyed by the revolutionaries at the end of the 18th century.

Since 22 November 2003, the Archéoforum of Liège has been opened to the public who can now « plunge » into nine thousand years of history. Among this target, particular attention is paid to schools, which account for 25% of our visitors. For them, the Archéoforum has turned out to be an open book about the past and a tool to reflect on the techniques of history. In brief, it is an exceptional educational centre, especially since the visit is « supported » by a contemporary scenography using sound and images to amplify the emotional power of a site from where the town of Liège actually emerged.

In total, the Archéoforum, in its present form, has cost 5.7 million €, 1.7 million of which was earmarked for the actual scenographic circuit, 1.4 million for measures to protect the area of the vestiges, and 1.7 million for the areas outside this section (eastern entrance, multifunctional room, ticket office-boutique), the remainder being spent mainly on fees.

Undertaken in 2000, the first phase of the works concentrated on building the eastern entrance and the structure for receiving the public; it was co-financed at 50% by the European Fund Objective 2.

The total cost of the works carried out during the second phase of the project, which started in January 2003 and finished in November of the same year, was divided between the Heritage Department and the Walloon Heritage Institute. The former took over the costs to protect and study the vestiges, while the latter covered the costs related to developing the site and running the Archéoforum.

The operating budget for the first year of activity, 2004, amounted to 587,000 €, half of which was for the salaries of a staff of nine people responsible for the administrative and technical management of the site (4 people) and for receiving visitors who were systematically accompanied by guides (5 people), carrying out eight visits a day throughout the year.

SESSION 7
INVOLVEMENT OF LOCAL PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

Chairman :
Mr Marcelino SANCHEZ RUIZ,
Deputy for Culture, Province of Jaén, Spain

Rapporteur :
Mrs Sophie LEFERT,
Ingénieur/Architecte, Centre for Urban Governance Studies, University of Liège

Introductory remarks :
"Report on the Consultation of Local Authorities Representatives"
Mrs Consuelo LEON LOZANO,
Co-ordinator, ICOMOS-BGP, Brussels, Belgium

Participants :

Mrs Carmen WILLEMS,
Mayor of Tongeren, Belgium

Mr Giancarlo GABBIANELLI,
Mayor of Viterbo, Italy,
Member of the Commission for Culture and Education of the Committee of the Regions

Mr Fernando CIRUJANO,
Deputy Mayor for Culture, Toledo, Spain

Mr Jean-Pierre VAN DER MEIREN,
Deputy for Culture, Provice of East Flanders, Belgium

SESSION 7: THE INVOLVEMENT OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

Synthesis by Sophie Lefert
Engineer/Architect, University of Liege, Centre for Urban Governance Studies

(Original language: French)

Local authorities are becoming increasingly involved in economic competition by creating the appropriate conditions for development and by attracting companies that can generate employment. Their urban planning policy, an expression of their dynamism and identity, is a determining factor in the success of the efforts they undertake to cope with competition from other towns. This policy can prove its effectiveness and create the dynamics for renewal, especially through the management of heritage resources.

To this end, the integration of archaeological vestiges in the contemporary urban system appears to be an asset for the town in terms of social, cultural, economic and environmental consequences. As for the process of protecting, preserving and developing these vestiges, it should be looked upon as one of the dimensions of an urban development policy.

It is not a question of preserving or freezing urban development but of including it in a sustainable logic. A historic town is a living organism that should develop and adapt to the conditions of modern life. In other words, the town of the future should be the product of a continuous innovation of the town of the past. Consequently, one of the main challenges is to find a way to reconcile the authenticity of a town that "lives" with the authenticity of a site that needs to preserve its values and integrity.

These two elements – the town and the archaeological site – should be exploited in such a way as to encourage citizens to appropriate them. This appropriation by citizens is one of the major factors in favour of the preservation of heritage. How can citizens contribute to safeguarding a site if they are not aware of its values? The construction of a society's future can only be founded on a knowledge and respect for its past.

This knowledge is, naturally, based on adequate information made available to the public. It is up to the local authorities, from the first to the last phase of the project, to inform the local population. Without the support of the population, the project cannot be successful. These are the motifs that incite local authorities to implement an information and communication policy, specifically adapted to the project intended for the inhabitants but also for public and private partners.

Finally, within the framework of this information and communication process, it is also important to underline the importance of the media given their ability to highlight specific aspects of a project. In this way, the media can also contribute to achieving a greater acceptance of the interventions by the public.

The fact of discussing the preservation of a site, the values of a town and the heritage it contains, clearly implies the notion of long-term prospects. Yet, it must be acknowledged that the concept of time is a factor that is particularly difficult to handle in the context of projects to develop archaeological vestiges. Whether it is the entrepreneur, the town planner, the politician or the archaeologist, all these players have their own concept of time, in keeping with their particular tasks. The period required for the excavations will be considered by some as a factor of economic and social risk, and by others as a necessary precaution.

Elected representatives stress the difficulty of reconciling political imperatives, due to elections, with considerations relating to the introduction of development projects that are long-term in nature. However, they also insist on the importance of consultations that would permit the structural handling of a project over time, as well as the adoption of a long-term view of the community they represent.

The major challenge for public authorities is to establish a dialogue between the different parties involved, to take into account the contribution of cross-assessments by experts from the sector and partners engaged in the operation, and to ensure co-ordination and synthesis in order to obtain the best final results for the community.

It is the responsibility of the local authorities to respond to the needs of the moment while seeking to anticipate changes in the use of urban space. When it is a question of urban archaeology, the establishment of adequate documentation appears to be a crucial phase in the context of proactive measures concerning archaeological excavations.

An archaeological map gives coherence to the work carried out by archaeologists by assembling information collected in a unified document, and in this regard, it gives full meaning to the notion of urban archaeology. An archaeological map helps to determine in which areas it will be necessary to undertake excavations before initiating the development works. However, the absence of details about a given area merely indicates a lack of information, and there is consequently a considerable risk of creating confusion. This is why determined efforts to identify and manage potential risks as early as possible in the decision-making chain are the most direct path towards ensuring respect for the principle of precaution which, it should be remembered, is one of the pillars of sustainable development.

It is therefore in this spirit of forecasting, and even anticipation
, that the elaboration of tools to provide an overall view of the situation is at present one of the principal preoccupations of public authorities. Incorporated in legal instruments, these tools are a particularly efficient way to fully integrate archaeology in the urban planning process.

If a concern for precautionary measures prevails over the tasks of municipalities, reflection on what happens after the excavations continues to be a priority for local authorities because archaeological vestiges can become a valuable resource for the town as a means of strengthening its identity and improving its attraction.

This is why a distinction should be made between local visitors, who gain access to their own heritage, and external visitors. Some towns have to reconcile the tension between the appropriation of a heritage that belongs to the identity of a town and the appropriation of the very same heritage that falls within a broader context (at world level, for example), which the community is obliged to share with other citizens. Under these circumstances, the town is obliged to receive both local and external visitors, and to satisfy these two types of public, if it is to achieve any success.

Concerning this particular point, it is useful to stress the importance of communication, which should reach out to both the local public and to external visitors.

As already stated, archaeological vestiges tend to acquire considerable importance for local communities due to the spectacular development of the economy of tourism. In this regard, the micro and macro aspects of the economy, even though complementary, should be evaluated separately and then together in order to ascertain whether they take into account both direct and indirect impacts. Similarly, the evaluation of consequences requires long-term examination, taking into consideration both the positive and the negative effects. The development of an archaeological site can lead to inconveniences and additional management costs for the town. Here again, the problem of tourist frequentation is a key factor.

It is necessary, in connection with these economic calculations, to determine the financing mechanisms that can be mobilised to ensure the development of archaeological sites. An archaeological site should be developed with a view to boosting tourism, in a controlled manner, and should be looked upon as a profitable investment capable of promoting the local economy.

If a site is not expected to guarantee its self-sufficiency, the local authorities are responsible for taking over the difference between the economic costs and social profitability. The concept of profitability is measured globally by considering the economic, social and political dimensions all together. The economic dimension is, in actual fact, closely tied to the human dimension since economic development has an impact on the creation of jobs, entailing reflection on the underlying quality of the employment. Each dimension should therefore incorporate a long-term management and development plan for the town in order to determine what investments need to be made.

The role of the local authorities is to ensure the leadership of joint action mobilising the intervention of numerous players. To start with, it should mobilise local technical and financial resources, focusing on those that would lead to spin-offs at local level.

Furthermore, development strategies should also incorporate prospects of spin-offs at a broader regional level. To achieve this, partnerships at regional, national and even European levels are essential in certain circumstances.

It is vital to realise that it is difficult for public funds to cover the needs. These should be used preferably to set in motion private investments. It is therefore more at this level that financing mechanisms can be mobilised so that companies, real-estate promoters, and professional and trading associations can assume their responsibilities for the property they own.

Local public authorities should be backed by a multidisciplinary team of experts, whether they belong to the services of the local authorities or not, depending on their size. Collaboration with universities and research centres can also turn out to be very useful, especially within the framework of study or back-up missions for public management.

It is, of course, necessary to emphasise the importance of the participation of civil society. And it is equally important to distinguish between the participation of citizens and associations, companies and small business, as well as tourist agencies (transport companies, restaurants, hotels, etc), given the vital role played by tourism in the issue under examination. Once such a partnership has been set up, it is up to the public authorities to focus on the general interest by smoothing away the diverging views and conflicts of interest.

In conclusion, as far as the principle objective of the APPEAR project is concerned, that is to say, the production of a Guide intended for political decision-makers, this would give them an overall view of the measures to be implemented.

What has ensued from the discussions is that no comparable document about the" market" exists for the moment. It should therefore be seen as an incentive since this measure seems to fulfil a genuine need on the part of the political class.

This tool should be realistic, operational, accessible, practical and flexible. The purpose is not to supply a rigid model with ready-made solutions but to create a tool containing the resources required to guide decision-makers in their search for solutions to the situation confronting them. In other words, the need is more for the production of means of assistance, a synthesis that can be adapted to the specific nature of each case.

Given this context, it is important to provide a statutory framework, and the parties concerned will have to obtain information on the national and regional legislation applicable to their country. However, it is also useful to give examples of legislation that appear to be positive.

Finally, it seems that the Guide will tend to become a progressive tool that can be enriched continuously through the experiences of each party and through illustrations of concrete cases drawn from reality.

SESSION 7:
REPORT ON THE CONSULTATION OF THE LOCAL PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

Consuelo Leon Lozano
Co-ordinator, ICOMOS-BGP

Context

ICOMOS is the partner in the APPEAR project responsible for evaluating the results produced throughout the research phase, as well as for disseminating them. An evaluation procedure has been set in motion to ensure regular consultations between the two complementary, multidisciplinary and multinational groups - the Advisory Board and the Representatives of Local Authorities – in order to guarantee a relevant final result that can be applied in the field and adapted to specific local needs.

The Advisory Board is composed of ten experts from nine different European countries. Their role is to evaluate scientifically the resources produced at key moments during the project.

The representatives of the local authorities, elected councillors and other local executives of numerous European towns and regional communities, were consulted throughout the project to ensure that the results produced were in keeping with the reality in the field and the various needs.

Methodology

Many representatives of European public authorities (at national, regional, provincial and municipal levels), elected councillors (political officials) and other technical executives (responsible for cultural heritage, urban development, regional planning, tourism, etc) were consulted as soon as the project was initiated by the various partners, within the framework of the ongoing research (identification of needs and case studies, in particular).

The data relating to the consultation were collected and analysed by ICOMOS as of October 2004. A summary document was drawn up to reflect the viewpoints of the local authorities consulted. This "reference document" served as a basis to launch another consultation, which took place from January to March 2005. Documents in four languages explaining the procedures, and including the reference document, were submitted for consultation (direct interviews and/or written reactions) to:

- The regional, provincial and municipal representatives (elected officials, technical executives, decision-makers) of 50 towns and regional communities in 15 European countries.
- ICOMOS through the Scientific Committees on Historic Towns and on Archaeology.
- Committee of the Regions through the Commission for Culture and Education: 250 regional and communal delegations in Brussels, were also contacted.
- Council of European Municipalities and Regions, through their network of local authorities.
- EAHTR (the European Association of Historic Towns and Regions).
- The Council of Europe, CCPAT and the Congress of Local Authorities
- HEREIN (the European Heritage Network).

Results

A new summary document was drawn up in May 2005 and adapted to the state of progress of the project, incorporating key issues identified during the previous consultation. This new document was submitted to a smaller number of elected officials, including the participants in the round table. The conclusions will be described in the presentation:

- Ways to reconcile long-term preservation with the improvement and opening to the public of urban archaeological sites.
- Economic and social effects: the feasibility of the project (micro-economic aspect) and the economic and social impact for the town and region as a whole (macro-economic aspect).
- Urban integration (traffic, mobility, layout, environment, housing, tourism, social, cultural and economic activities, security, etc).
- Decision-making process and the sequencing of the different phases.
- Participation of all the parties concerned (local authorities, experts, owners, private investors, financial institutions), including the population and associations.
- Identification and resolution of conflicts of interest.

SESSION 7 - LOCAL AUTHORITY INVOLVEMENT

Marcelino Sánchez Ruiz
Deputy for Culture, Province of Jaén, Spain

(Original language: Spanish)

As part of the collective, public and imprescriptible heritage; archaeological heritage forms part of the responsibilities incumbent on public administrations which are therefore part of the locally elected representatives' responsibilities. This is particularly true when these responsibilities occur in modern cities, as they are collective property and so they are of general interest. Not only should political leaders pay attention to them to a greater or lesser extent, but they also must receive attention from a purely legal imperative as they form an inseparable part of the general interest which we must manage.

Urban archaeology is an activity which goes beyond city management and therefore the actions of local representatives, whose job it is to draw up a plan for archaeological issues plus any other urban, social, cultural or financial matter.

Decisions about archaeology in a city must be taken on the basis of their consequences and effects which have to occur or be avoided, both from a heritage standpoint and a social or urban standpoint etc. This inevitably requires a lot of very well researched information.

The local representatives' mission which has to be drawn up for archaeological issues within the urban framework, must be, above all, to prepare and to carefully research all information which will allow an option to be followed. It is vital that this information is descriptive and forward looking so that the locally elected representative can reflect and take decisions using all of the available information, including possible proposals and consequences for each of the possible options.

For this decision-making process, it is necessary to have suitable tools which are very different in nature, legal tools of course, but also tools in the form of professional, qualified human teams with an interdisciplinary outlook with the ability to plan their actions, the ability to modulate their actions and to achieve effective, resolute results for the public. At the same time, these results must integrate the different cultural, heritage, social, financial, urban, technical and communication interests to be reconciled. Etc.

Many of the current problems, which are doubtlessly archaeological problems in modern cities, are not being considered as being archaeological, but are clearly being considered in isolation. There is a dichotomy between city planning and the inclusion of the city's past in planning urban expansion and reforms. Where this unavoidable question affecting many cities in 21st century Europe has been taken into account, it has been a clear success both because of conflict avoidance and for the opportunities which have been opened up to expand the resources for the city itself for development, plus the new opportunities for creating urban initiatives of every kind, where heritage plays a large dynamic role including thinking and not only for the activities or finances in the form of income which it may generate.

Therefore I believe that it is vital both from the social, heritage, territorial standpoint and the political point of view, that urban archaeology is a normal part of city management. From the point of view that it is an obligatory requirement for local elected representatives to take decisions on this matter, the most effective way of making it normal is to include archaeological heritage in the overall planning for the city. This planning position may allow planning for activities, planning and generating resources, laying out urban areas and attractions, correcting problems or problem avoidance.

From a procedural point of view and to include archaeology in urban management, local legislation giving legal protection to local participants is indispensable. This legislation should frame the obligations of local businesses and developers and, at the same time, delineate how far private initiatives may go in terms of using urban land containing archaeological remains and also indicate where public obligations ensuring the defence of the general interest start.

This in reality determines a regulated process of interdisciplinary budgeting, planning, forecasting and risk prevention actions as well as providing opportunities. In order to do this, the inclusion of archaeological cards is a useful tool for territorial planning. These cards warn of the certain or possible presence of archaeological remains, will allow the necessary investment to be regulated both for the source of financing, excavation and conservation and for its evaluation.

To do this, use may be made of the same or similar mechanisms which urbanism makes available to generate financial resources for large infrastructure works, green areas, etc. One may talk of a distribution of responsibilities which are created for one area or another, whenever these are planned in advance.

In this sense, the inclusion of prevention and planning procedures is very valuable in order to prevent archaeology coming a surprise to intervention issues and urban redevelopment. Instead it is a discovery which has been planned during preliminary management and based on specialised and interdisciplinary knowledge.

I believe that from this way of looking at matters, the APPEAR method, which must be the conclusion of this seminar, has an enormous value, because it offers proposals for excellent joint solutions. It is a method and model for structural, daily, ordinary and non-extraordinary operations which include the following aspects:

- To include municipal ordinances and regulations.
- To consolidate local, institutional, interdisciplinary equipment included in the forecasting, planning, supervision and control of activities.
- To build an archaeological "discourse" for the local area using scientific rigour and discipline to connect with a comprehensible spread of knowledge to the whole public.
- To propose a presentation-interpretation programme for archaeological heritage being included in the city's attractions; making it more attractive and regaining one of its distinctive features of its distant past.
- To work out a sustainable management and operational model which will generate income to be reinvested in conservation, presentation and accessibility improvements.

Political leaders, locally elected representatives have a great responsibility and a particular importance at certain times in the evolution of urban archaeological management compared to the technical and professional managers with whom they have to have a joint action plan. While locally elected representatives act on legal, planning and administrative aspects to set up management models, citizen and business alliances, generate and gather resources, deciding on priorities and courses of action; the responsibility of the professionals and experts are concentrated on documenting, excavating, maintenance, use, evaluation and revision procedures.

In this sense, there is an obligation and responsibility by either side, the politicians and experts to construct this joint action plan agreeing on and matching technical time and political/administrative time to management time, decision making time, operational time, commercial time and electoral time. Doubtlessly, the issue of matching time to the demands of the different participants is another point of conflict generation whenever planned and forecast archaeology appears in modern cities.

It is vital that someone who is standing as a locally elected representative to govern a city with archaeological traces in its area and subsoil must include archaeological issues both in the city's design and planning, as well as in his/her action policy programme and of course in his/her electoral contract in the form of a manifesto at the elections.

The model of a proposed city must include heritage as part of the city's heart, as a vital part of the city's policy plans, as part of the indispensable strategies for creating citizenship from learning how to allow the past coexist alongside the present, ensuring its role in the future. This means making heritage and of course urban archaeological heritage an axis of local government and therefore power:

- Changing legal obligations into strategic opportunities.
- Converting problems and obstacles into collective challenges.
- Transferring archaeological costs to capital investment in new urban resources.
- Changing conflicts of interests and misunderstandings into opportunities for honest dialogue and negotiation where the all the city and its citizens are winners.
- Converting the oldest physical remains in our cities into modern ways of building a city and allowing its citizens to understand the differences.
- Including planning and forecasting in decision making to also transversalise participation from political leaders through experts and civil servants, social agents, businessmen, heritage protection associations, neighbourhood associations , visitors...

In the APPEAR-discussion seminar, we have seen that it is possible to have significant successes in different locations in Europe, in different contexts and with different difficulties, limits and also with all forms of support and cooperation. Applying recipes for success is the task of locally elected representatives and the experts. Learning and adapting the different proposals may be recommended in each situation in order to ensure the future of the past in our cities without mortgaging the options and placing all available resources for social and economic progress at the disposal of the citizenship.

We have to thank the developers and collaborators in the APPEAR project who have started and created this method of participative work. Without a doubt we have learned how to apply the good and avoid the bad. There is a lot and it will be very useful for the tasks of each manager.

Doubtlessly the APPEAR method will be an immediately applicable instrument, so I believe its final managers have the suitable professional sensitivity and sense to make it a tuned and diverse tool to allow it to be effectively applied in every situation. This is the great merit of the method, it is not tramlines, but it seeks to be process diagrams and a structure for stages and recommendations for everyone so that they can adapt it to their style, to their options, openings, etc.

I thank you for placing your trust in my opinion and I offer you my most sincere congratulations.

Conclusions

4 OCTOBER 2005

Synthesis by David Miles
Chief Archaeologist Advisor, English Heritage

The EU may have economic, practical and security problems, but it is nevertheless a great pleasure and benefit to have opportunities such as this to mix with colleagues from so many countries, to learn from each other, to swap stories – and get very little sleep.

These two days have complemented each other. Yesterday (Day 1) provided an introduction to the EU position and thanks to Michel Chapuis, an insight into opportunities for the future.

Anne Warnotte provided a background to the APPEAR project and its origins in the complex problems which confronted the presentation of archaeology in Liege. Three of yesterday's presentation gave us the legal, theoretical and social background. Perhaps some of this seemed rather abstract and a little alarming. I would emphasise, though, that as an archaeologist who has had to deal with hundreds of archaeological projects – often large, expensive, complex and usually integrated into major developments such as airports, roads and urban reconstruction – the APPEAR approach based on multidisciplinary co-operation, partnerships, clear goals and strategic project management is absolutely essential.

Thanks to this approach archaeology need not be seen as a problem by developers; it meets its deadlines and its academic and financial goals. This approach delivers. It avoids the most vivid image conjured up in our seminar by Pierre Hupet – the conflict of Vietnamisation. However, it is important that this underlying theory does not dominate APPEAR's guide. "It sounds demanding and hard work," warned Danielle Sarlet, yesterday's Chairman. Most of the users will welcome clear, practical and pragmatic guidance; and examples of real life situations, both good and bad.

Yesterday's case studies were fascinating. Barcelona and Saragossa provided us with examples of strategic urban planning where historic sites have been integrated into the fabric of the city to promote identity, a sense of place and an attraction for tourism.
At Saragossa we can see a city learning by doing. When I visited it was particularly instructive to see how the presentation improved with each successive project. Others can learn from the good practice of Saragossa and Barcelona.

Yesterday, however, we were given little economic information. That discussion developed today on Day 2. I would, nevertheless, welcome more detail about the capital expenditure in Spain, the running costs, income and the results of visitor surveys.

Recently in Chester, an historic town in North West England, English Heritage and Chester City Council have been working together on a plan to present the city's archaeology and historic environment. For the past two years we have excavated the Roman amphitheatre, we have carried out visitor surveys and estimated the economic impact of the extra visitors attracted by our project – the added value of the archaeology and 'the intangibles' to which Christian Ost referred. Chester City Council sees its archaeology as its Unique Selling Point, which attracts tourists. And in that sense there may be a case for archaeological presentation as a 'loss leader.'

However, the APPEAR guide needs to be very clear about economics. Some of our colleagues see the heritage as a communal good. And I would agree with them. But I have lived with politicians for thirty years so I am also more circumspect. Mr Van der Meiren of East Flanders, with his exemplary Ename project and the other political representatives who have joined us today are great supporters of heritage. Nevertheless we are competing for resources with health services, education, transport and the police – and we are not always high on the political agenda. So we need to be realistic about the costs, income and sustainability of our projects. This means being clear and frank with each other.

Yesterday I described the problems of the Rose Theatre in London. One contributor quite rightly declared that we should see the public as our allies. Archaeology is intrinsically interesting and many people are fascinated by it – if it is well presented in an accessible and imaginative way. But the public, as at the Rose, can be carried away on a tsunami of enthusiasm.
In my experience it is archaeologists themselves who often provide a dose of realism. In most cases, with my own excavations, I have advised against enhancement and presentation. Many sites are simply not sustainable in practical terms.

So we need to be hard headed: does it make sense to invest energy and resources in enhancement? Most of our case studies have been of substantial stone-based sites, often in Southern Europe. The experience of northern archaeologists is different: mostly cold and wet; post-holes normally - waterlogged wood if we are lucky. When I was a student my Austrian professor despairingly referred to British archaeology as “two stones in a muddy field.” Sometimes, though, we don’t have the stones at all. Presentation of such sites presents particular problems of conservation and interpretation.

Comments were made about industrial sites. APPEAR mainly deals with buried archaeology, revealed by excavation. But as we saw today at Maastricht any enhancement is best within the context of a wider strategic approach which includes the built environment.

In England we have developed the APPEAR approach in advance, as you might say, in the Birmingham Jewellery Quarter. APPEAR promotes an integrated informed approached to conservation, and it is applicable to the whole historic environment, to the regeneration of industrial buildings, housing and churches. People like the historic environment; it creates a sense of identity and makes economic sense not just for tourism but also through higher rental values.

In conclusion: yesterday we heard about the development of APPEAR. The co-operative, structured approach needs to be presented in clear straightforward language. As archaeologists we must be clear about our motives and ethics and our responsibilities to future generations. We must also be willing to communicate with stakeholders and form partnerships for the benefit of our communities as a whole. It has been a pleasure to work on APPEAR but I will now disappear and hand over to our colleague Jean Louis Luxen.

5 OCTOBER 2005

Synthesis by Jean-Louis Luxen
Secretary General of ICOMOS 1993-2002

The presentations and deliberations of this second day have highlighted the political aspects of enhancing archaeological sites and developing towns, such as urban planning, allocation of public investments, control of tourist frequentation, social harmony, etc. Constant reference was nevertheless made to the themes discussed during the first day: efficient preservation of the sites, public presentation, and handling of visitors. This has confirmed the fundamental need for an interdisciplinary approach and co-operation between all the players concerned if an enlightened decision with long-term effects is to be made.

The logic followed is no other than that of the now widely acknowledged "integrated preservation". Heritage sites must play a harmonious role in modern life in terms of town planning, cultural projects, economic activities and social relations. However, there is a tension between the objective to preserve an archaeological site as it stands and the necessity to take into account the constant changes of a town, which is, after all, a living organism. The presentations also revealed the wide diversity of situations that vary according the specific characteristics of each town or region. It is vital to avoid general prescriptions and instead stress the singular nature of each development project.

Several examples were submitted to illustrate the architectural and town planning aspects. An overall view has prevailed over both Plovdiv and Maastricht, based on the historical data forming the framework for programming specific operations. Maastricht is an impressive example owing to its efforts to rationalise analysis and methodology in its action plan, and it was reassuring to hear Wim de Heer explain that the recommendations of the APPEAR Guide were in fact applied to the letter! We have noted that the development of a heritage site, especially if it includes new constructions, such as a cover for archaeological vestiges, must be adapted in a flexible and cautious way to the architectural and urban planning context. Such interventions must be of a high standard both in terms of their concept and the materials used. And the authors of projects are certainly on the right track if they display a sense of modesty by placing themselves at the service of the site rather than seeking personal glory.

However, there are more fundamental values, already mentioned frequently during the first day, which have to do with art history and testimonies of the former living conditions and culture of previous generations. These cultural values are the driving force behind preservation measures, and everything should be done to safeguard their authenticity and integrity. It is not only a question of physical preservation but also of respecting the intangible aspect. Danger can, after all, also arise from a clumsy intervention or from an excessive number of visitors. These cultural values contribute to forging the identity of a town and represent a "capital" that should be protected in the long term because of its contribution to collective consciousness, the attraction of the town, and the dynamism of the local community. It cannot be repeated often enough that it is vital to have good documentation about the history of the town and an atlas of its archaeological heritage. Nor can it be stressed strongly enough that it is extremely important for citizens to be well informed about these heritage values, especially since their appropriation by the population is the best guarantee of their respect and effective preservation.

Just as there is a tension between the freezing of an archaeological site and the need for a town to evolve, we can also observe, in the frequentation of a site, a tension between the interests of the inhabitants or immediate neighbours and those of outside visitors or tourists.

Positive examples were proposed by Jacques Teller in his introduction, and in the cases of Polvdiv, Maastricht and Liège. But negative examples have been observed in Thessalonika unfortunately. These examples reveal the importance of a good presentation / interpretation of the cultural values of a site or a town not only for the inhabitants but also for visitors from the outside. Failing this, the opening of a site to the public and to tourists can undermine cultural and heritage values.

While on the subject of tourism, a connection can be made with the working session introduced by Christian Ost. He has demonstrated how an economic analysis can be useful in taking a decision and contributing to a justification of both the public and private financing required to develop a heritage site. Two approaches have been identified and they each deserve to be explored separately before being combined. One is a micro-economic analysis centred on the costs and revenues linked to the development of a site, and the other a macro-economic analysis focusing on its positive and negative consequences for the economic and social life of the town and region. To be pertinent, these two approaches should take into consideration a maximum of data, direct and indirect, in order to draw up a reliable economic appraisal. They should also consider the successive phases of the project: studies, implementation and day-to-day management. Once these economic data are put together, they can then be made to interact.

Experience usually shows that a micro-economic appraisal, linked to data related to a site as such, tends to be negative because the revenues do not cover the expenditures. On the other hand, a macro-economic appraisal, based on collective spin-offs, is positive and can sway the decision to invest. The productive character of investments in the area of heritage is widely recognised by the World Bank and the European Regional Development Funds, which generally accept to finance heritage projects. All the archaeological sites of Greece, Portugal and the South of Spain receive assistance from these Funds.

However, purely economic calculations do not suffice. The real "social profitability" of a project must also take into account the cultural values and social dimension, what English-speaking countries call intangibles. This intangible dimension often justifies a decision to go ahead with a development project, even when the overall economic appraisal is negative. This is obviously a question of moderation and in no way exonerates the imperatives of rigorous management.

Finally, integrated preservation also covers social aspects that are, in fact, part of the above-mentioned intangibles. Several elected representatives, notably Mr. Gabbianelli, have emphasised the human dimension and the contribution made by cultural heritage to the quality of the living environment and way of life. With regard to economic aspects, it has been observed that cultural tourism generates employment, a positive contribution to the local social environment. However, training programmes need to be developed at the same time in the areas of restoration and management, as well as mediation in heritage affairs. We have learned about the extraordinary initiative of the Escuela Taller in Spain, and it is also interesting to note that the University of Viterbo has introduced a training programme for heritage managers.

Integrated preservation calls for a synthesis on the part of elected representatives that would ensure the general welfare in view of the wide range of frequently diverging and sometimes even contradictory values and interests. In other words, a master plan for urban management should lay down coherent and long-term prospects to fulfil the need for sustainable human development. A number of historic towns have drawn up such a plan. We have seen the work in progress in Plovdiv and have been given an opportunity to appreciate the 20-year plan of Maastricht. As Tamas Fejerdy has pointed out, this kind of plan is required by the World Heritage Convention for towns recognised as belonging to world heritage. The need for such a synthesis, or integration, has been echoed constantly throughout these two days of discussion.

We have consequently raised the issue concerning the responsibilities of decision-makers. It has been made clear - and reaffirmed by highly motivated elected representatives who have taken part in the round table - that the main decision lies with the local public authorities, who must exercise their leadership in the matter. But the need to work through partnerships has emerged just as clearly.

A partnership is necessary between local, regional, national and even European authorities, to ensure coherent action and mobilisation of the necessary resources, both for the enhancement of a site and for the implementation of an urban development plan. The public and private sectors should join forces since public financing helps to initiate and encourage funds from owners and companies of all sizes. There should also be a partnership with experts and professionals who can guide the decision-making process and carry out the necessary studies, works and management tasks. And finally, there should be a partnership with civil society, including protection associations whose vigilance and support can be invaluable, as well as players in economic and social life who are active in professional bodies, chambers of commerce, or social and cultural services, and even the private services involved in tourism. In all likelihood, the most delicate mission is to set in motion a constructive dialogue between all the parties concerned throughout the implementation of a project or plan. But this also guarantees mobilisation of good will and resources to achieve a local harmonious democracy.

Special attention was paid both by the round table and by the participants to the different goals and deadlines that these partners could have. Heritage professionals have a tendency to focus on the imperatives of preservation and enhancement in the long term. Likewise, the fruits of a policy on heritage can only be gathered in the long run, in keeping with the urban development plan. Businesses and companies, on the other hand, are frequently anxious to earn profits from their investments immediately. And the prevailing impression is that elected representatives usually have the next municipal elections in their sights. Once again, dialogue and co-operation between the various partners involved is highly recommended as a way to overcome these tensions.

Judging by all the presentations made in the course of these two days, the APPEAR Guide, currently being prepared, meets a real need for both decision-makers and the different parties involved in a development project. Too often, each side is obliged to proceed by trial and error, resulting in wasted energy and possible errors. Everyone acknowledges the need for a methodological guide to systematically identify and analyse all the problems to be solved. The preference is for a practical document that can serve as an operational guide. Admittedly, it is not a question of prescribing ready-made solutions but, rather, to highlight the questions requiring a solution and to supply the keys for analysis, with concrete examples and references to good practices. It has been seen how every situation has its specificity. It is also necessary to take into account the statutory and institutional framework surrounding a development project.

List of Participants

First name	Surname	Occupation / position	Organisation	E-mail
Açayla	Alpan	Urban planner – Graduate student	Middle East Technical University of Ankara, Turkey	e110524@yahoo.com
Mikel	Asensio	Profesor	Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España	mikel.asensio@uam.es
Sofia	Avgerinou	Professeur associé	Université Technique Nationale d'Athènes, Grèce	skolonia@central.ntua.gr
Sylvie	Balcon	Maître de conférences en archéologie et histoire de l'Art	Université de Paris IV Sorbonne, France	Balconweb@aol.com
Julia	Beltrán Heredia	Conservadora	Museu d'Historia de la Ciutat de Barcelona, España	jbeltran@mail.bcn.es
Caroline	Bolle	Architecte, maître en restauration,	Bureau Indépendant, Liège, Belgique	cbolle@skynet.be
Luigi	Cabrini	Représentant régional pour l'Europe	Organisation Mondiale du Tourisme, Madrid, España	lcabrini@world-tourism.org
Dirk	Callebaut	Directeur	Flemish Institute for the Heritage, Brussels, Belgium	dirk.callebaut@lin.vlaanderen.be
Michel	Chapuis	Scientific Officer	DG Research, European Commission	michel.chapuis@cec.eu.int
Janis	Chatzigogas	Professor of Architecture	University of Thessaloniki, Greece	chatzigo@arch.auth.gr
Fernando	Cirujano	Concejal de Patrimonio Cultural	Ayuntamiento de Toledo, España	concecultura@ayto-toledo.com
Renée	Colardelle	Directrice	Musée archéologique St-Laurent, Grenoble, France	r.colardelle@cg38.fr
Fernad	Collin	Directeur	Préhistosite de Ramioul, Belgique	collin@ramioul.org
Laia	Colomer	Arqueóloga	ICUB - Museu d'Historia de la Ciutat de Barcelona, España	lcolome@mail.bcn.es
Gaël	de Guichen	Former Assistant to the Directeur Général	ICCROM, Roma, Italia	gaeldeguichen@libero.it
Wim	de Heer	Head of town planning	Municipality of Maastricht, The Netherlands	wher@wxs.nl
Lidewij	De Koekkoek	Head of the Department of Monuments and Archaeology	Municipality of Dordrecht, The Netherlands	lk.de.koekkoek@dordrecht.nl
Anne	de San	Historienne de l'Art, Secrétaire Général	Membre de la Commission Royale des Monuments et Sites de la Région de Bruxelles Capitale	Anne.desan@pro.tiscali.be
Frederik	De Smedt	Architect / Master in sustainable urban planning	EmA – Emigrating Architects, Belgium	frederikdesmedt@yahoo.es

Ann	Degraeve	Archéologue	Direction des Monuments et Sites, Région de Bruxelles Capitale, Belgique	adegraeve@mrbc.irisnet.be
Paul	Delaisse	Professeur d'Architecture	Institut supérieur d'architecture de Mons, Belgique	paul.delaisse@mons.be
Stephane	Demeter	Historien-Archéologue, coordinateur Cellule Archéologie	Région de Bruxelles-Capitale	sdemeter@mrbc.irisnet.be
Françoise	Descamps	Architect, field projects manager	Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, USA	Fdescamps @ getty.edu
Werner	Desimpelaere	Architecte et Urbaniste / Conseil	Groep Planning, Brugge, Belgique	Brugge@groepplanning.be
Pierre	Diaz Pedregal	Directeur	IN EXTENSO – Préservation de biens culturels, Paris, France	pierre.pedregal@conservationpreventive.com
Anya	Diekmann	Lecturer / Cultural tourism	IGEAT, University of Brussels, Belgium	adiekman@ulb.ac.be
Ana	Dieste Barrientos	Attachée de recherche	ICOMOS BGP	ana.dieste@cfwb.be
Wim	Dijkman	Archaeologist – Curator	Municipality of Maastricht, The Netherlands	wim.dijkman@maastricht.nl
Karen	Dorn	Consulting Editor	Academy projects (Archaeology * Architecture) LLP, London, U.K.	kd@academyprojects.com
Asya	Engovatova	PhD in Sciences and Archaeology, Chief of Department of rescue excavation	Institute of Archaelogy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia	Engov@mail.ru
Romana	Erice	Arqueóloga, Técnico de Museos, Servicio de Cultura	Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza, España	cultura-museos2@zaragoza.es
Tamás	Fejérdy	Vice-Président	Office National du Patrimoine culturel de Hongrie	tamas.fejerdy@koh.hu
Isabel	Fernández del Moral	Arqueóloga, Tecnic Adjunt Conjunt Monumental Plaça del Rei	Museu d'Historia de la Ciutat de Barcelona, España	ifernandez@mail.bcn.es
Gervasio	Fernández Riol	Licenciado en Derecho – Gerente	Consorcio de la Ciudad de Toledo, España	Gervasio-f@consorciotoledo.org
Pablo	Ferrand	Licenciado en Historia del arte y periodista	ABC de Sevilla, España	pabloferr@hotmail.com
Kalliopi	Fouseki	PhD Graduate Student in Heritage Management	University College London, U.K.	k.fouseki@ucl.ac.uk Kalliopifousenaki@yahoo.gr
Giancarlo	Gabbianelli	Maire de Viterbo, Membre de la Commission de la Culture et de l'Education	Comité des Régions de l'Union Europenne	giancarlogabbianelli@libero.it
Jean-Christophe	García-Baquero	Técnico, Política comunitaria de Cultura	Junta de Andalucía, delegación Bruselas, España	jcgarcia@junta-andalucia.org
Michael	Gemmel	Assistant	ICOMOS BGP	Michael.gemmel@cfwb.be

Marie-Jeanne	Ghenne	Archéologue	Commission Royale des Monuments, Sites et Fouilles, Chambre provinciale de Hainaut, Belgique	mj.ghenne@mrw.wallonie.be
Martin	Goalen	Architect	Academy projects (Archaeology * Architecture) LLP, London, U.K.	mg@academyprojects.com
Cristina	Gutiérrez-Cortines	Dr en historia del Arte, Eurodiputada	Parlamento Europeo	cgutierrez@europarl.eu.int
Tatiana	Hachimi	Chercheuse	CUGS, Université de Liège, Belgique	thachimi@ulg.ac.be
Ken	Hamilton	Archaeologist, Great Yamouth Archaeological Map Officer	Norfolk Landscape Archaeoloy, County Council, U.K.	ken.hamilton@norfolk.gov.uk
Danielle	Heude	Inspecteur Général honoraire	Direction des Musées de France	danielle.heude@wanadoo.fr
Anne	Hoffsummer-Bosson	Attachée	Division du Patrimoine, Région wallonne, Belgique	a.hoffsummer@mrw.wallonie.be
Lene	Host-Madsen	Museum Curator and Archaeologist	Copenhagen City Museum, Denmark	bs.kbm@kff.kk.dk
Pierre	Hupet	Juriste, politologue	Asbl IN SITU, Centre de recherches archéologiques, Liège, Belgique	pierre.hupet@netram.net
Andy	Hutcheson	Head of Archaeological planning	Norfolk Museum and Archaeological Service, U.K.	andy.hutcheson@norfolk.gov.uk
Alain	Irlandes	Directeur des Expositions et des Relations internationales	Ville de Tours, France	drie@ville-tours.fr
Dickon	Irwin	Architect	Irwin Kritioti Architecture, Nicosia, Cyprus	irwin@ika.com.cy
Constanze	Itzel	Administrateur	Parlement européen, Département thématique Politiques structurelles et de cohesion – secteur Culture	citzel@europarl.eu.int
Javier	Jiménez Gadea	Arqueólogo, Jefe de Sección de Actuaciones Arqueológicas	Dirección General de Patrimonio Histórico, Comunidad de Madrid, España	javier.jimenez.gadea@madrid.org
Teresa	Júdice-Gamito	Professeur d'Archéologie	Université de Faro, Portugal	tgamito@ualg.pt
Anna	Kádár	Administrator, Commission for Culture and Education	Committee of the Regions of the European Union	anna.kadar@cor.eu.int
Cosku	Kocabiyik	City Planner + Master student	Middle East Technical University of Ankara, Turkey	cosku12@yahoo.com
Marc	Kocken	Archaeologist, Heritage management Consultant	ADC Heritage, Consultation Office, The Netherlands	m.kocken@adcheritage.nl
Todor	Krestev	Professeur d'Architecture	Université de Sofia, Bulgarie	tkrestev@dir.bg
Maria	Krini	Conservator- restaurator, museologist	Directorate of Conservation of Ancient and Modern Monuments - Ministry of Culture, Greece	mariakrini@hotmail.com
Margarita	Kritioti	Architect	Irwin Kritioti Architecture, Nicosia, Cyprus	mk@ika.com.cy

Dora	Kusan	Archaeologist, Curator	Archaeological Museum of Zagreb, Croatia	Dkusan@amz.hr
Marie-Christine	Laleman	Directeur du Département d'Archéologie Urbaine	Ville de Gand (Gent), Belgique	Marie-christine.laleman@gent.be
Guido	Lassau	Archaeologist, Head of the Archaeology Unit	Kanton Basel Stadt, Switzerland	guido.lassau@bs.ch
Sophie	Lefert	Ingénieur- architecte de recherche	LEMA, Université de Liège, Belgique	sophie.lefert@ulg.ac.be
Consuelo	León Lozano	Coordinatrice	ICOMOS BGP, Bruxelles, Belgique	bgp@cfwb.be
Jean-Marc	Léotard	Archéologue provincial	Région wallonne, Belgique	jm.leotard@mrw.wallonie.be
Marie-Clotilde	Lequoy	Conservateur en chef du patrimoine	DRAC de Haute Normandie, Service régional de l'archéologie, France	marie-clotilde.lequoy@culture.gouv.fr
Jean-Louis	Luxen	Ancien Secrétaire Général	ICOMOS, Paris France	luxen@cfwb.be
Margaret Pearl	Malcolmson	Retired University Lecturer, Local governement consultant	Royton Local History Society, UK	mpearlm13@hotmail.com
Daniel	Marcolungo	Archéologue	Division du patrimoine, Région wallonne, Belgique	d.marcolungo@mrw.wallonie.be
Francesca	Martinet	Archéologue	Regione Autonoma Valle d'Aosta, Italia	francescamartinet@jumpy.it
André	Matthys	Inspecteur Général	Division du Patrimoine, Région wallonne, Belgique	a.matthys@mrw.wallonie.be
Robina	McNeil	County archaeologist and Director of GMAU	Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit, University of Manchester, U.K.	Robina.mcneil@manchester.ac.uk
Juan	Meneses Revenga	Licenciado en Humanidades - Técnico	Consorcio de la Ciudad de Toledo, España	juan-m@consorciotoledo.org
David	Miles	Chief Archaeological Advisor	English Heritage, U.K.	david.miles@english-heritage.org.uk
Lee	Minaidis	Coordinator for Development and European projects	Organisation of World Heritage Cities, Quebec, Canada	lee@rhodes.gr
Sylvianne	Modrie	Archéologue	Direction des Monuments et Sites, Région de Bruxelles Capitale, Belgique	smodrie@mrbc.irisnet.be
Petter	Molaug	Researcher Archaeologist, Head of archaeological excavations	Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research	Petter.molaug@niku.no
Séverine	Monjoie	Directrice	Archéoforum, Liège, Belgique	s.monjoie@archeoforumdeliege.be
Seamus	Murrey	President of the Commission for Culture and Education, Meath County Council Cullenra, Ireland	Committee of the Regions of the European Union	smurray@members.meathcoco.ie
Siri	Myrvoll	Director of Heritage management	City of Bergen, Heritage Management Office, Norway	siri.myrvoll@bergen.kommune.no

Dorica	Nemeth	Archaeologist, Museum Advisor	Archaeological Museum of Zagreb, Croatia	dnemeth@amz.hr
Antoni	Nicolau i Martí	Director	Museu d'Historia de la Ciutat de Barcelona, España	anicolaum@mail.bcn.es
Katerina	Nikolaidou	Archaeologist – Museologist	Museum of Byzantine culture, Thessaloniki, Greece	Katerinanikolaidou@hotmail.com
Christoph	Öllerer	Archaeologist	Stadarchaologie, Vienna, Austria	oel@m07.magwien.gv.at
Christian	Ost	Professeur d'économie	Recteur de l'ICHEC, Bruxelles, Belgique	christian.ost@ichec.be
Léona	Pall	Chercheuse	Association des Villes Européennes de la Culture, Pécs, Hongrie	secretariat@avecnet.net
Pierre	Paquet	Archéologue, Directeur de la Restauration	Région wallonne, Belgique	p.paquet@mrw.wallonie.be
Isidre	Pastor i Batalla	Arqueólogo	Museu d'Historia de la Ciutat de Barcelona, España	ipastor@tinet.fut.es
Teresa	Patricio	Architecte, Assistante indépendante	Katholiek Univeristy of Leuven - Raymond Lemaire Centre for Conservation	teresa.patricio@asro.kuleuven.ac.be
Roberto	Pella	Member of the Commission for Culture and Education	Committee of the Regions of the European Union	robertopella@libero.it
Élisabeth	Pénisson	Conservatrice	Musée gallo-romain de Vesunna, Périgueux, France	vesunna@perigueux.fr
José Vicente	Pérez Palomar	Licenciado en Historia, Técnico en Patrimonio Histórico	Ayuntamiento de Alcalá de Henares, España	tear@complutum.com
Marnix	Pieters	Chief Archaeologist / Soil scientist, scientific collaborator VIOE	VIOE, Flemish Institute for the Heritage, Brussels, Belgium	marnix.pieters@lin.vlaanderen.be
Maxence	Poirier	Architecte	BLP Architectes, Bureau Indépendant, Reims, France	maxence.poirier@wanadoo.fr
Elena	Pol	Investigadora	Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España	
Stefano	Pulga	Restaurateur indépendant	CO.RE, Italia	spulga@coresnc.191.it
Sebastián	Rascón	Jefe del Servicio de Arqueología	Ayuntamiento de Alcalá de Henares, España	tear@complutum.com
Denis	Ricard	Secrétaire général	Organisation des Villes du Patrimoine mondial, Québec, Canada	Secretariat@ovpm.org
Silvana	Rizzo	Archaeological Director and Coordinator	Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Rome, Italy	silvanarizzo@libero.it
M del Carmen	Rojas Cerro	Arquitecto, Jefe del Dto. de Patrimonio Histórico Dirección General de Patrimonio Cultural	Ayuntamiento de Madrid, España	rojascmc@munimadrid.es
Jorge	Ruiz-Jiménez	Arqueólogo, Investigador	Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España	jorge.ruiz@uam.es
Eduardo	Salas Vazquez	Historiador, Director del Museo de San Isidro	Ayuntamiento de Madrid, España	salasve@munimadrid.es

Marcelino	Sánchez Ruiz	Diputado de Cultura	Diputación Provincial de Jaén, España	marcelinosr13@yahoo.es culturasecretaria@promojaen.es
Soledad	Sánchez-Chiquito de la Rosa	Arqueóloga responsable del Departamento de Arqueólogía	Consorcio de la Ciudad de Toledo, España	soledad-s@consorciotoledo.org
Caroline	Sandes	Archaeologist - PhD Graduate student	Institute of Archaeology University College London UK	caroline@sandes.freeserve.co.uk
Noélia	Sanz	Arqueóloga	ICUB-Museu d'Historia de la Ciutat de Barcelona, España	nsanz@mail.bcn.es
Irena	Saprykina	Archaeologist, Science-assistant, Department of rescue excavation	Institute of Archaelogy – Russian Academy of Russia	dolmen200@mail.ru
Danielle	Sarlet	Directeur général	Direction Générale de l'Aménagement du Territoire et du Patrimoine, Région wallonne, Belgique	sarlet@mrw.wallonie.be
Cyrille	Savin	Historien, Chargé de mission	Service des Sites et Monuments, Luxembourg	cyril.savin@ssmn.etat.lu
Ellen	Schraudolph	Archéologue, gestionnaire de projets	Commission européenne, DG Education et Culture	Ellen.schraudolph@cec.eu.int
Bi	Skaarup	Museum curator and Archaeologist	Copenhagen City Museum, Denmark	bs.kbm@kff.kk.dk
Mark	Spanjer	Senior Archaeologist Department of Monuments and Archaeology	Municipality of Dordrecht, The Netherlands	m.spanjer@dordrecht.nl
Slawomir	Swieciochowski	Architecte	Equipe de restauration de la Cathédrale de Tournai, Belgique	slawomirswieciochowski@wanadoo.fr
Jacques	Teller	Chargé des cours	LEMA, Université de Liège, Belgique	jacques.teller@ulg.ac.be
Roger M.	Thomas	Head of Urban Archaeology	English Heritage, U.K.	rogerm.thomas@english-heritage.org.uk
Marianne	Tinant	Archéologue – Coordination scientifique du projet APPEAR	Asbl IN SITU, Centre de recherches archéologiques, Liège, Belgique	insitu@win.be
Norbert	van den Hove	Architecte / urbaniste, Administration provinciale de l'aménagement du territoire	Administration provinciale du Brabant flamand, Belgique	norbert.vandenhove@vl-brabant.be
Jean-Pierre	Van der Meiren	Député pour la Culture	Province de Flandre Orientale, Gent, Belgique	jean-pierre.van.der.meiren@oost-vlaanderen.be
Michel	Van Roye	Président	Association "Palais de Charles Quint", Bruxelles, Belgique	michel.vanroye@skynet.be
Laura	Vendittelli	Director	Muzeo Nazional Romano Crypta Balbi, Roma, Italia	l.vendittelli@tin.it
Anne	Warnotte	Chef de Projet – Coordination scientifique du projet APPEAR	Asbl IN SITU, Centre de recherches archéologiques, Liège, Belgique	insitu@win.be
Carmen	Willems	Bourgmestre, Directrice du Musée Gallo-romain de Tongres	Ville de Tongres, Belgique	carmen.willems@stadtongeren.be

Jim	Williams	Regional Archaeological Science Advisor	East Midlands, English Heritage, U.K.	jim.williams@english-heritage.org.uk
Valerie	Wilson	Head of Office	Archaeological Archives, English Heritage, U.K.	valerie.wilson@english-heritage.org.uk
Gianfranco	Zidda	Archaeologist officer	Regione Autonoma Valle d'Aosta, Italia	g.zidda@regione.vda.it
Catherine	Zwetkoff	Professeur	Centre of Urban Governance Studies, Université de Liège, Belgique	czwetkoff@ulg.ac.be