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**Conclusions**

1. ***Background***

The Council of Europe has been addressing issues related to industrial heritage since in its 1985 Granada Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe and its 1992 Valletta Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage. Industrial heritage sites constitute an important element of European urban and rural landscapes as defined by the Florence European Landscape Convention 2000. They are one of the building blocks of European contemporary identity and as such a part and parcel of common heritage of Europe as defined by the Faro Framework Convention of the Council of Europe on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society 2005.

At the same time, industrial heritage in its tangible and intangible aspects has been in many parts of our continent, due to the new "developmental challenges" of restructuring the economy, under threat and could be lost forever at even greater extend regardless of its intrinsic and social values and development potential. International organisations, such as TICCIH in the first place, have dedicated much of their concerns and activities towards raising awareness of decision-makers and general public about the importance of industrial heritage for our societies and about the risks this heritage has been exposed to. The main TICCIH document in this vein is the 2003 Nizhny Tagil Charter. Some of the visible results of ICOMOS and TICCIH joint endeavours was the International Day of Monuments and Sites in 2006 dedicated to industrial heritage, and above all, the adoption of a joint policy document, the so called Dublin Principles (Principles for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage Sites, Structures, Areas and Landscapes) in 2011.

Recently, also the European Union raised voice in favour of European industrial heritage as one of the main catalyst of creativity and growth, especially stressing its economic potential for the development of cultural tourism and related economic activities. In this regards, the Communication from the Commission “Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe” (COM (2014) 477 final), and the Council Conclusions on cultural and creative crossovers to stimulate innovation, economic sustainability and social inclusion (2015/C 172/04) can be mentioned.

The Council of Europe’s early positions towards industrial heritage were a reaction to the consequences of the industrial decline in western Europe, and the principles were further developed in Recommendations of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in 1987 and 1990 [R(87)24 and R(90)20]. In 2013, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted the Resolution 1924 (2013) on Industrial Heritage in Europe, which draws attention to the most recent issues relevant for the integrated conservation, intelligent rehabilitation and sustainable revitalisation of industrial heritage sites and landscapes of Europe. One should also mention the constant alerts coming from the side of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe to strengthen the local authorities’ role in the preservation of industrial heritage “in situ”. Lately, the initiative about European Industrial and Technical Heritage to be used as one of the central themes of European Heritage Days 2015 was put forward and actually implemented in many European countries.

On the other side, ICOMOS SI as an active member of ICOMOS International and ICOMOS Europe has dedicated an important part of its expertise towards international cooperation and pooling forces in the field of industrial heritage protection. Joining forces with the Council of Europe builds synergies in following-up the Council of Europe conventions with revisiting these references and taking stock of the new challenges and issues at stake. Our common goal is to integrate innovative ideas, define new positions and open new perspectives with the aim to give this important dimension of our common heritage of Europe the role it deserves in the future multilateral and trans-frontier co-operation.

***II. Issues of concern***

Discussions in the symposium raised the following issues of concern:

1. Industrial heritage encompasses the following aspects: industrial and adjacent structures and sites together with machinery, movable and immovable fixtures and fittings, archaeological remains of industrial activities, museum and archival collections, industrial urban and rural landscapes, and intangible heritage in the form of technical skills, expertise and know-how in technologies and processes, traditions and collective memory of heritage communities associated with industrial heritage. This palimpsest of different aspects and values contribute to the complexity of challenges connected with heritage protection and management. On the other side, industrial heritage properties are flexible and therefore suitable for *variety of new uses*, including mixed-use schemes, small businesses and creative industries. Other uses including community, museum and gallery uses may be contemplated, in some cases commercial office and residential use may be considered. A minimalist approach to change will help to respect the original structure and retain the industrial character;
2. There are evident lacunae in documenting, understanding, listing and protecting these assets, especially in the Central and South-Eastern European and neighbouring countries. In addition, the documentation, knowledge and competences related to industrial heritage are often fragmented, different institutions do not exchange information and collaborate on a regular basis. Open access to information and interdisciplinary approach need to be enhanced;
3. Economic and political circumstances are constantly and increasingly challenging the survival of industrial heritage - even “listed” monuments. Public interest is not always sufficiently expressed in decision-making process. The same is true about expectations of heritage communities associated with industrial heritage which still have little means of being expressed and taken on board;
4. Loss of intangible dimensions of industrial heritage, evidence of technology and production process, everyday social life of workers;
5. There has been an increasing trend of exploitation industrial heritage from which the traditional professional institutions are excluded because they are self-limited to their classical “protection” role instead of developing management approach.

The nature of changes affecting industrial heritage and its role in society require new responses and innovative solutions. Responses to these issues emerged during the discussions and include among others the following considerations:

1. Cooperation between the Ministries responsible for cultural heritage (and associated heritage institutions) and other Ministries, in the first place the Ministry responsible for economic development and tourism, should be strengthened with the view to develop pilot projects for industrial heritage rehabilitation and promotion;
2. New governance models should be encouraged and put in practice where the expression of public interest and direct participation of industrial heritage communities and other interested stakeholders complement the decision-making processes;
3. When protected but no longer in use, the industrial heritage should be regarded as an asset with potential for beneficial use through constructive conservation and rehabilitation for reuse or development where a commercially viable solution can be found, or as an industrial archaeological asset with potential for museum use or as a working museum, including with tourism potential.
4. Relevant industrial heritage sites should be safeguarded from destruction with the help of pro-active policy of regeneration. Such policy should stimulate feasible (acceptable) and financially interesting new types of interventions. Most successful schemes for industrial sites require a "*vision*", to see how the risks of a reuse scheme can be overcome, and *entrepreneurial activity*, to take on the risk. There must be sufficient capacity in the acting organisation to undertake necessary works. The *potential high costs* of conversion, and sometimes decontamination, should not be under-estimated;
5. Existing legal standards should be revisited in the light of necessary improvements tailored to the needs and specificities of industrial heritage – for example, procedures should be put in place for responding quickly to the closure of important industrial complexes to prevent the removal or destruction of significant documentation and heritage features. Legislative provisions should be provided to allow reasonable *access to industrial sites for recording purposes* by relevant officials and investors should be obliged to provide records of significant features as a part of development consent procedure. The competent authorities should have statutory powers to intervene when necessary to protect important assets at risk.

***III. Issues for further consideration***

Amongst issues discussed during the symposium that require further consideration, the following challenges, values and priorities regarding industrial heritage have been identified with the view of following these issues up in future industrial heritage activities:

1. Industrial heritage conveys the full range of values from social, identity, creative and educational to economic and scientific ones. These values are integral part of common heritage of Europe being important for communities as a factor for identifying with place. It should be regarded as a category of heritage worthy of protection in its own right and of equal importance to other types of heritage categories. Protection should be more than its simple legal protection, by reflecting the importance of *management* of this heritage, particularly where it is in danger or threatened;
2. Heritage professionals and civil society interested in industrial heritage should take stock of lessons learned through different projects and pending issues in order to determine what could help resolving key issues. The possible solutions are the following:
	* develop a framework of a specific data base to be hosted as part of the Council of Europe’s HEREIN System, as well as tools to facilitate the collection of information. The aims of this framework could be to introduce industrial heritage and its subsets as specific categories in heritage recording and selection. At the same time recording and selection procedures should promote public participation;
	* prepare a publication taking into account major common references and identifying main issues at stake related to the industrial heritage in Europe;
	* organize educational programs, preparing the workshops for children, students, and stakeholders;
	* take the opportunity to contribute to the drawing up of the Pan-European Heritage Strategy 21 on the topic related to industrial heritage.

When drawing up ***Pan European Cultural Heritage Strategy 21*** the following issues should be considered:

* 1. Who formulates the key challenges, values and priorities regarding industrial heritage in Europe and for whom?
	2. Which priorities are relevant at European and national levels, for example those aimed at awareness raising and increasing connectivity and participation of individuals and heritage communities related to industrial heritage?
	3. Which tools are most needed and adapted to the industrial heritage needs? Some of the tools could be the following:
	+ Compilation of views related to the social and economic values of industrial heritage and alternative attitudes and interventions meeting the needs of industrial heritage at on hand and responding to the public and private investors’ expectations on the other thus enabling adaptive re-use of heritage resources;
	+ National authorities responsible for cultural heritage should provide *guidance* for safeguarding the buildings and sites to owners of industrial heritage assets, including concerning the safeguarding of sites from damage or *encouraging temporary uses or partial occupation*, which may help to maintain the condition of the site.
	+ National authorities responsible for cultural heritage should provide *guidance* and advice to owners and investors/developers about how to proceed with reuse schemes including:
		- the importance of recording important features (including the provision of suitable archiving facilities to safeguard the records for future reference);
		- identifying how spaces may be reused and their flexibility to accommodate change;
		- discussing with relevant officials about how to proceed with a rehabilitation scheme, including safeguarding as much as possible of the fabric, fixtures and fittings, in order to maintain the authenticity of the heritage, but also considering the option of reversibility.
	+ Relevant European institutions should provide manuals identifying good practice in industrial heritage rehabilitation projects, for meeting investors’ and community needs, for fostering intergenerational relationships … to enhance the re-use of heritage resources in respectful, creative and innovative ways and to contribute to the regeneration of urban and rural (brownfield) areas;
	+ Relevant European institutions should prepare compendium of economic and alternative financial models suitable for industrial heritage regeneration, tourism and other heritage related business and services taking into account territorial dispersion, industrial heritage character with the aim to benefit local communities, to encourage the re-use of heritage and to create jobs;
	+ Official policies should be adopted for *endangered heritage to enable the recording of sites that are at risk* through vacancy, disrepair, vandalism, climate, pollution and redevelopment proposals, including awareness-raising initiatives to identify that heritage assets provide an opportunity for investment and rehabilitation to owners, potential buyers and developers (including the possibility of advertising buildings and sites which are in need of new owners/uses/rehabilitation).
	+ *Enabling development* (new development on the industrial site can help to pay for the restoration and rehabilitation costs of the industrial site), but both activities should be suitably coordinated through official consent or agreement systems, especially to ensure that sufficient funds are derived from the profit from the new development, set aside, and specifically directed to restoration and rehabilitation works to the industrial asset.
	+ The *location* in which the industrial site is situated may an important factor in any rehabilitation scheme as the prevailing economic conditions may determine the viability of a project. There must be potential for sustainable development of the area. Run-down areas or those in decline may mean that market conditions are too weak to reuse the heritage at the present time (but the need for safeguarding or temporary uses should be reiterated in such circumstances). *Image* is also an important factor in that there may not be sufficient market appeal (in the site and the area where the site is located) for a commercial solution.
	+ *Funding assistance* may also be required, not just for assisting restoration and rehabilitation works in industrial sites, but also to create an "*enabling environment*" -through *urban renewal and regeneration of industrial areas and towns*. Many former industrial areas, including docks, ports and groups of buildings used for manufacturing and the transportation of goods have been successfully regenerated in some parts of Europe. To encourage such action legislation may be required to create possibilities for suitable project organisations and initiatives for regeneration. Moreover, a change in the wider area may be required before industrial sites become viable, including infrastructure renewal by public authorities.
	+ Council of Europe should widen the scope of the technical co-operation and consultancy missions enabling further on-site experimentations on industrial heritage-led local development;
	+ The scope of the European Routes networks dedicated to industrial heritage should also be broadened for better management of such properties in underrepresented European countries;
	+ EU institutions should enhance Twinning Programmes between partners facing similar challenges related to industrial heritage in EU and neighbouring countries;
	+ Industrial heritage issues should to be integrated into heritage study modules offered at European universities and enable students from countries where heritage studies are not part of university programme to attend such modules elsewhere;
	+ Programmes for exchange of experts and expertise, apprentices, researchers, students and volunteers (active in management of industrial sites and museums for example) should be expand and developed.