



Act 3.4: A toolkit with instruction on how to include the WP3 results into the local/regional plans

This toolkit provides guidelines for heritage sites as planning instrument for the protection, use, conservation and successful development of the sites. However, within the proposed approach, the scope of a management plan has to exceed these purely cultural heritage related objectives of protection, restoration and preservation and also encompass objectives and measures relevant for community development. The toolkit is designed to build a link to local, regional and national plans, which are usually the legal basis for territorial planning and development.

The application of the proposed toolkit in each pilot site means a vital step for testing and extending the Adrifort objectives under practical conditions targeting the development of heritage management plans for each pilot site.

The purpose of this toolkit is to provide concerned entities practical guidance to undertake different levels of participation and to provide guidelines for multi level governance integration in regional/local plans. It outlines the tasks that should be undertaken, and provides appropriate approaches to achieve participation activities. Moreover, the existence of a toolkit ensures the correct understanding of the principles, planning, and implementation of the negotiated policies or issues.

The toolkit attempts to draw step-by-step approach in different methods and frameworks. Therefore, the sequence of a toolkit plays a vital role in the success of implementing participation activities and integrating multi level approach in regional/local plans.

The municipalities and regional officers are expected to be the main end user of the resulted toolkit that guides interested entities to consider the participatory approach in its activities. As a result of integrating this tools into a regional/local plan, updated and multilevel governance oriented plans will be developed.

The following text provides guidance on the proposed planning procedure as part of a project circle built up by several planning phases (involving a number of planning steps) followed by an implementation and monitoring phase.

For preparing a toolkit to include WP3 results into regional/local plans, the following steps are proposed:



1. Defining heritage planning & management coordination

The starting point of the planning process is to define who will coordinate and drive the planning and management process for the cultural heritage site. Undeniably, the heritage planning model coordination should be legitimated and have sufficient resources and capacity to carry out its duties requiring accurate institutional and financial embedding of the planning process. Here, the analysis of the regulatory framework and existing planning instruments can provide useful information for efficiently embedding or interlinking the functions of heritage planning model coordination with existing institutions/authorities (e.g., for community/regional planning and heritage management). Strengths, gaps, and weaknesses in the available institutional environment have to be observed and critically discussed. Moreover, capacity and resources/funding of the appointed person/consortium, including the form of organization and proposal for sources and mechanisms of funding, have to be ensured.

2. Regional/local system analysis

This phase of the planning process is all about comprehensively characterizing the status quo of the community and its site to build the basis for working out development scenarios. This involves collecting general information on the site as well as investigating the situation's perception from point of view of various local/regional stakeholders. Stakeholders are considered relevant if they are expected to be positively or negatively affected by the outcomes of the planning process, able to support/delay the process, or provide information/expertise relevant for the planning process. It is the task of heritage planning model coordination to map out the variety of sectors and levels involved and to select and invite representatives for preparing particular inputs for the planning steps. Therefore, to start with participatory process, it is essential to carefully collect general information on the cultural heritage assets, the community affected, the current heritage legislation, and the regulatory framework/instruments for community development.

Embedding the planning process in the available regulatory and institutional framework is critical for making use of available channels but also for avoiding duplication of efforts. Thus, considering the ultimate goal of this approach, the linkage with local, regional, and national development plans, which are usually the legal basis for territorial planning and development, seems most appropriate. In addition to the theoretical study of the site, main entities, structures and viewpoints of the situation, ongoing processes, and current recognized issues and any potential ones should be explored in close cooperation with local stakeholders. Ideally (e.g., in workshops), different viewpoints present in the system should be identified in order to recognize the variety of issues perceived by different stakeholders. This will help in identifying issues to be tackled and it gives some orientation for the next planning steps.

This section should include information about crucial legislation and policy for the management of cultural heritage (international, national, regional and local), description of the needs and obligations to implement the plan. Responsible organizations and individuals should briefly describe their preparation and participation, to include a list of organizations, individuals, professionals, etc. In the legislative basis only important facts of legislation and regulations should be mentioned, resulting in the preservation of cultural heritage, social, economic and regional development, which is valid and important impact on the achievement of the objectives.

3. Defining visions and scenarios

In the next step, visions and scenarios addressing selected issues should be developed in a collaborative approach. Ideally, in this process different stakeholders (or stakeholder groups) should be involved, whereas their input needs to be compiled in an organized and structured manner. This can be supported through the application of participatory methods such as Word Café, Charette, or Focus Groups on the one hand, as well as tools on the other hand that offer access to information relevant for the planning process (e.g., conventional planning instruments, GIS platforms, etc.). The main idea is to draw a clear distinction between different development options possible in the system as well as to think about relevant steps and players for each option (and the interdependencies between them).

The guidance for engaging stakeholders in the decision making process includes three steps for the process. It starts with the selection of participation level then moves to the selection of participation techniques, which clarifies relations between impact, participation level, and participation techniques. The third part is about the planning of participation.

3.1. Selection of participation level

In order to select the participation level it is necessary to determine the level of impact first. The following table describes the expected levels of participation according to the level of impact. It also proposes criteria for classifying the impact of an initiative.

Table 1: Determination of the level of impact

level of impact	level of participation	required criteria for determination the impact level	examples
high level of impact	consultation decision making initiating actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -affects structural or architectural elements, or interferes in heritage buildings - affects aesthetics of heritage buildings or their context - affects ownership or management of heritage buildings - relies on specific stakeholder(s) for success - affects social and economic statuses in the context - conflicts with interest of a stakeholder 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - major changes to an area - intervention in heritage properties - initiatives affecting other initiatives - initiatives affecting commerce or culture in a specific area
medium level of impact	consultation decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - affects the infrastructure in an area - supports another initiative or project by a stakeholder(s) - has a medium level effect on or by another initiative by a stakeholder(s); potential of future conflict - develops experience in a similar field - requires a review of the local community needs assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - non-physical initiatives that have similar concepts - minor changes to behavioral attitudes (ramps or stairways).
low level of impact	information sharing consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enhances maintenance to existing elements makes small improvements has no risk for conflict with others' interests has no effect on cultural or economic aspects in the context maintains the previous consensus which had been made by stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - beautification initiatives - initiatives of incentives

The participation level of each of the stakeholders is determined according to their analysis. In this phase it is necessary to list all related and expected stakeholders that have interest to the project or the initiative. Analysis of stakeholders, as shown in Table 2, includes clarifying their interest in the project as well as effect of the project on their interests. Their role in the project's success also is a major factor in determining the level of participation required.

Table 2: Stakeholders Analysis Table

stakeholder groups	interest(s) at stake in relation to project	effect of project on interest(s)	importance for success of project	level of impact
listing stakeholders	the interest of stakeholder that has part(s) in the initiative	positive/negative impact of the project on the stakeholder	the stakeholder's ability to support the initiative	degree of influence of stakeholder over project (high/medium/low)

3.2. Selection of participation techniques

Some techniques are appropriate for more than one level of participation. Table 3 lists main groups of participation techniques according to the participation level.

Table 3: Techniques of participation according to levels of participation and impact

participation level	participation technique	considered level of impact		
		high	medium	low
information sharing	media		x	x
	personal contact	x	x	x
	displays		x	x
	website			x
consultation	focus group / mini focus group	x	x	
	interviews	x	x	
	survey/polling	x	x	x
	public meeting / consensus meeting	x	x	
decision making / partnership	focus group / mini focus group	x	x	
	consensus meeting	x	x	
	workshop	x		
initiating actions / mobilization	management committee	x		
	advisory committee	x		
	task force team or party	x	x	

To contact stakeholder related to a heritage building, the appropriate technique relies on various factors as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Techniques of participation for heritage buildings

technique	number of participants	purpose / output	stakeholders	duration	remarks
interviews	up to 10 (individually)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - gathering information - initiating concepts - learning from similar concepts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - municipal / heritage authority - donors - private partners - NGOs - central government - academic institutions 	30-75 minutes	for larger number of interviews for same purpose, a meeting may take place instead
mini focus group	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - initiating concepts - deciding on specific issues - planning for a specific activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - municipal / heritage authority - donors - private partners - NGOs - central government - academic institutions 	90– 180 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> for larger number of participants it is called focus group - agenda should be part of the invitation - if the required time exceeds 180 min. then a workshop might be conducted
consensus meeting	more than 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - getting consensus on a plan, initiative, or activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - municipal / heritage authority - donors - private partners - NGOs - central government - academic institutions 	60– 120 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - engagement of a stakeholder in facilitation gives easiness in the discussion - specify issues for discussion
planning workshop	15 -25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - developing a plan for specific initiative, project, or activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - municipal / heritage authority - donors - private partners - NGOs - central government - academic institutions 	1-3 days based on its design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - larger number of participants is possible with more facilitation effort - stakeholders and sponsors prefer a one- day workshop

4. Discussing and prioritizing fields of action, goals, and results

Once several development options are formulated, a structured discussion of these options can help facilitate activity plans for implementation. The impacts of these options should be discussed and their appropriateness, feasibility, effectiveness, efficacy, and efficiency evaluated. Like the variety of stakeholders and interests presented in the system, these options may turn out to be conflicting. The discussion process should ideally end up in an »accommodation« between the different parties – that is, finding options that all participants can live with. It is the main task of heritage planning model coordination to carefully initiate and facilitate this process and to identify which solutions are accepted well by a majority of actors. The involvement of external experts can be helpful for more clearly seeing the consequences, advantages, and disadvantages of the options and thus more easily prioritizing the ideas. Ultimately, the discussion should result in a selection of fields of action for a management plan for the community and its site. Each field of action should be specified in terms of the issue(s) addressed, expected results/impacts of respective activities, relevant stakeholders to be involved, and funding and resources available/required for implementation.

5. Towards implementing interventions

After having narrowed down the fields of actions, the implementation of corresponding measures can then be supported through actual action and business planning. Action planning deals with creating a precise work plan for implementing a measure. It also names the institutions/stakeholders involved and defines their respective responsibilities. For a better idea of the time horizon for implementation, a distinction can be made between short-term, medium-term, and long-term activities. With business planning, financial aspects such as expected investment, operation, and maintenance costs as well as means for financing should be covered.

6. Implementing and monitoring interventions

Following implementation of interventions, the heritage planning model coordination should collect monitoring information from the institutions responsible for each field of action and present it to the relevant stakeholders. This information should not only enable evaluation of implementation for the intervention itself, but also its impacts. This should also involve the comparison of actual impacts with the »expected impacts« originally formulated in the participation process. Based on discussions of interventions' results and impacts, the planning consortium (stakeholders and environmental planning model coordination) should decide on further planning and management activities.