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This report, on the Living Heritage Programme in Romania, is the third national review to be undertaken on behalf of the King Baudouin Foundation, the initiator and sponsor of the programme across South East Europe. A report on Macedonia was completed in 2003, and on Bulgaria in 2004; a review of work in Bosnia Herzegovina will follow later in 2005.

The report is based on documentary material associated with the development and operation of the Living Heritage programme in Romania, meetings with those involved, over a period of three years, and field visits undertaken in March 2003 and September 2004 (see appendix). It describes the impact of the programme in Romania to date. Unfortunately, the review cannot include the experience of the third phase of projects, which is not yet complete. However, it was essential to review experience in sufficient time to consider options for the future of the programme and its ideas, following the completion of KBF work in 2005. The report comprises four main sections.

1. The institutional framework for development of Living Heritage in Romania.
2. Brief accounts of each project, the progress made and the main outcomes to date.
3. The human, social, economic and cultural impact of projects on the communities involved, alongside any identified problems and negative outcomes.
4. The key factors in producing the outcomes described, and lessons to be drawn.

Since I have been involved in the Living Heritage programme from its inception, and in its implementation as a trainer and advisor, my view of its development is necessarily subjective. Nonetheless, I have drawn on extensive research experience to approach the evaluation as objectively as possible. I consider the account given here to be a fair assessment of the programme and, if anything, to underestimate its impact.

In Romania, as in the other countries in the Living Heritage programme, it has been fascinating to visit project teams. I remain consistently impressed by what people have done, with relatively small resources and limited practical assistance, and by the results they have achieved. Above all, I am moved by the courage, vision and commitment of people who believe in their communities and are prepared to work tirelessly to strengthen them, and build a better future for those who live there. Such engagement is the foundation of stable and prosperous civil society. It cannot be taken for granted, and deserves to be matched by a similar commitment from local and national government and from independent foundations.

François Matarasso
March 2005
1 LIVING HERITAGE IN ROMANIA

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The origins of the Living Heritage programme

The Living Heritage programme is an initiative of the King Baudouin Foundation (KBF). It was developed between 1998 and 2000 through research into heritage and community development practice in several European countries, including Belgium, Sweden, Poland and the United Kingdom, and therefore draws on wide experience. Following its launch in Macedonia in March 2001, the programme was developed in Bulgaria later the same year, and then in Romania and Bosnia Herzegovina.

Living Heritage aims to support community development by building human and social capital. It does this by helping people develop projects using local heritage and cultural resources to address identified community needs or aspirations. Help is not just financial, but includes training, consultancy, advice and access to networking. It is based on a clear but flexible methodology encapsulated in 10 operational principles. The programme is concerned with heritage because people care about it, and because, in situations that are often thought of only in terms of their problems, local culture can be a very positive place to work. Above all, however, the Living Heritage programme is about investing in people – their capacities and confidence – so that communities are better able to manage their own futures.

1.1.2 The institutional framework of Living Heritage in Romania

Based in Brussels, the King Baudouin Foundation works with local partners wherever possible. In Romania, the Living Heritage programme is developed in association with the Carpathian Foundation (CF) and the Romanian Environmental Partnership Foundation (REPF). Although KBF is the principal financial contributor, both Romanian partners invest substantial resources to the programme, as well as taking responsibility for project management and grants administration in different parts of the country. Major decisions about programme development are made jointly between the partners.

A senior programme officer, Fabrice de Kerchove, manages Living Heritage within KBF; for the Carpathian Foundation, it is managed by the Romanian country director, Lorena Stoica, and for the Romanian Environmental Partnership Foundation and by the executive director, Laszlo Potozky. A small advisory group, including the partners and independent members with relevant experience, reviews project applications. The local foundation staffs assure programme delivery and project support, with additional input from Constient, a Cluj-based consultancy group. The KBF regional team, Vera Dakova, a Bulgarian expert in community development, and François Matarasso, a British specialist in community cultural development, provided further support.
1.2 The programme methodology

1.2.1 The project selection process

During the planning stages of the Living Heritage programme, the King Baudouin Foundation decided that an open call for proposals would inevitably favour established organisations with experience of developing projects and writing applications rather than grass-roots development and, if possible, people without previous project experience. In Macedonia, Bulgaria and Bosnia Herzegovina, therefore, projects have been identified through fieldwork, followed by support and training in project development. Although more demanding of management, this has proved effective because:

- It has identified good potential projects, often from communities outside the usual range of donor interest;
- It has reached well beyond the established NGO sector to involve people who would not spontaneously have responded to an open call for proposals;
- It has helped projects develop their thinking in advance of the formal application process, giving them the best chance of success in that, and in project delivery;
- It has made good use of people’s time, effort and resources, since, overall, about two thirds of projects contacted went on to gain a grant and complete a project.

However, the Romanian partners had some reservations about this approach, and preferred an open process that would be more demonstrably equitable. As established grant-makers they also had their own policy, practice and relationships which had to be taken into account. Notable among these was a commitment to support local government and NGOs as cornerstones of community development. For these reasons, Living Heritage in Romania was developed in a hybrid format, with, on the one hand, a well-publicised call for proposals and public information meetings, and, on the other, encouragement to interesting community groups to put forward proposals.

As a result, most Romanian grantees have been established organisations, either local government or community associations. Among these, preference was given to organisations based in local communities or with a history of established relations within the community where the projects were developed. In the third year of the programme, the existence of a strong local group (whether or not formally constituted), and its relationship with the applicant organisation, were important selection criteria.
1.2.2 Project development and support

Whether projects enter the programme through open application, or through research and fieldwork, Living Heritage is a demanding programme. Its central aim is capacity-building and it depends on investment in people, both through development workshops run by Constient and the continuing support of Foundation staff. Through the workshops, project teams were introduced to the concept, values and processes of Living Heritage, and to wider understanding of community development practice and project planning. This training, tailored flexibly to meet the needs of the individuals concerned, formed the basis of successful project implementation; it was also an opportunity for more experienced applicants to share insights with new ones.

Following approval of applications and detailed project plans, the project teams continued to have close support. This was important, since they were often beginning a development process of which they had little direct experience, and it was essential to provide technical assistance and guidance throughout. The human contact, with foundation staff and with other project teams, was also an essential part of the package, helping people build confidence and share experience. In all the countries where the Living Heritage programme operates, this support has been very demanding on local partners and freelance consultants and community facilitators. Romania is by far the largest of the countries involved, and it has been a real achievement to keep close contact with projects and communities that may be several hundred kilometres apart.

1.3 Living Heritage project development

1.3.1 The phases of project development

The Living Heritage programme was introduced to Romania in 2001, with an introductory workshop in Sibiu involving the Carpathian Foundation, the Romanian Environmental Partnership Foundation and the King Baudouin Foundation. Alina Porumb, Lorena Stoica and Laszlo Potozky drew up a detailed strategy, and this formed the basis for the first year programme in 2002. However, since the programme was already operational in Macedonia and Bulgaria, it was not thought necessary to begin with a formal pilot phase. The lessons already learnt suggested that smaller scale projects, and a broader conception of heritage, would be more likely to succeed.

A major information campaign was conducted, centred on public meetings in each of the six counties initially selected for the programme. It drew a good deal of media coverage, and many expressions of interest were submitted: 23 applications were made to the Carpathian Foundation and 27 to the Romanian Environmental Partnership Foundation. In the event, a relatively small proportion of these were found to be suitable, and 10 projects were supported in 2002. (This represents a relatively low success rate for applicants: 20% of those submitting detailed proposals, and 12% of those submitting outline letters of interest, eventually received a grant.) Two subsequent rounds of
project development have taken place, in 2003 and 2004, and a total of 40 projects have now been undertaken, with 36 different partners.

1.3.2 Living Heritage Projects in Romania 2002-2004 (Blue CF, Green REPF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects begun in 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cosau Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gura Humorului</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Moldovița</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Oradea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Solca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Brasov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cărtisoara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Joseni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sânmartin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Satu Mare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects begun in 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Gura Humorului</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Moldovița</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oradea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sighetu Marmatiei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Solca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Avrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Darjiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Satu Mare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Tusnad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects begun in 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Botosani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Botosani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Giocanesti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Creaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ipotesti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Marginea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Salaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Remetea Oasului</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Vama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bontida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Brasov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Cojocna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Dumbravioara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Izvorul Oltului</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Meresti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Odorheiu Secuiesc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Turda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Satu Mare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Satu Mare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sinca Noua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Tusnad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.3 Nature of the projects

The experience gained in Macedonia and Bulgaria was important in the development of the programme in Romania. Although the first phase of projects, in 2002, still tended towards conventional ideas of heritage, and especially museums, they were conceived at a more manageable scale and used resources that were within the ownership of the projects themselves. To a degree, but rather less than in other countries, the three years of the programme has seen a gradual shift from built heritage towards intangible resources like folklore, music and dance. Although the more traditional projects have been successful in their own terms, the commitment to living heritage has engaged larger numbers of people in events that have had a no less lasting, if more intangible, impact. It has also encouraged local participation, limiting the influence of experts like academics, architects and builders, and building a sense of empowerment for those involved.  

1.3.4 Grants to Living Heritage projects

Living Heritage grants in Romania were kept at a lower level than in some other countries, as experience showed that money, while essential, was less crucial to success than effective training and support. It is notable that the third year of the programme, which began in summer 2004, has seen a doubling in the number of projects compared with the previous two years, but a reduction in the average size of grant, which is now about 58% of what it was at the outset.

![](chart.png)

Average size of Living Heritage Grant in Romania (in Euro), 2002-2004

1.3.5 Summary of investment

The Living Heritage programme has involved a major investment in local community development by the King Baudouin Foundation and its partners in Romania. The total budget over three years was €420,000, of which 72% was contributed by KBF, 14% by the Carpathian Foundation and 14% by the Romanian Environmental Partnership Foundation. Grants totalling €88,768 were made during the first year (2002), €93,543 in 2003 and €108,524 in 2004. Thus approximately €290,835 (69% of the budget) was
assigned directly to local communities in Romania in the form of Living Heritage grants. Programme support costs, including training seminars, consultancy work with communities and local management costs, were met from the remainder of the budget. In addition, the King Baudouin Foundation contributed substantial staff time to the programme, as well as resources for regional consultants.

The support offered to grantees, by foundation staff and external consultants, has been a critical factor in the programme's success. Without this intensive and individually tailored support, it would have been impossible to work with the often-inexperienced project teams, or to reach the communities who were involved, and the character of the programme would have been very different.
2 LIVING HERITAGE PROJECTS IN ROMANIA

2.1 Projects begun in 2002

2.1.1 Cosau Valley: IUGA Foundation

The Cosau Valley is close to the Ukrainian border, in mountains northeast of Baia Mare. The project was undertaken by the IUGA Foundation, a cultural and environmental NGO based in Baia Mare, and aimed to restore a number of traditional watermills and related structures in the neighbouring villages of Budeşti, Calineşti and Sarbi. These remote and self-sufficient farming communities, are now experiencing political, social and economic change. The increasing use of household electric flourmills has led to neglect not just of the watermills but also of the rivers, which have become polluted with rubbish. The project aimed to restore these facilities, working with local adults and children, and inspire communities with renewed pride in their cultural heritage and consciousness of the value of their natural environment.

The project identified and documented 36 installations on 16 sites, and involved work to raise local awareness of their value, repair and environmental cleaning and a marketing campaign to attract tourists to the area. In partnership with the mayor of Budeşti, a local woman was recruited to act as a consultant to the project, ensuring better connections within the communities. In all, 12 sites were restored and prepared for receiving visitors through a series of campaigns by local people. An art exhibition was also held, on the theme ‘Clean water = life, mills and whirlpools’, in which 130 children and 19 teachers took part. The project outcomes include:

• Restoration of watermills and cleaning of rivers and banks;
• Involvement of school and community groups and establishment of an environmental protection group in Calineşti;
• Distribution of information brochures, a video and a project website.8

2.1.2 Gura Humorului: DOMUS Humanitarian Foundation

Gura Humorului is a town of 16,000 in Bucovina, west of Suceava; it attracts tourists as a centre for the famous painted monasteries. The project is a partnership between the museum and the Domus Foundation, with the support of the town council. It aimed to improve the town’s recently relocated museum as an attraction for visitors, and develop a programme of cultural animation to engage local people more closely in their own traditions. The museum’s ethos is very active, and very committed to engag-
ing a cross-section of local people; it has been particularly concerned in art education. The first phase of the project focused on the museum itself; it was followed by a 12 month programme traditional cultural activities in and around the town.

The upper gallery of the museum was refurbished, following replacement of the roof with funds from the local council. Local artisans have constructed a traditional house porch as a viewing platform for a display of costumes linked with New Year festivities. Other artefacts from the collection are to be installed in the other first floor rooms. During the first year, a small number of events were held to raise interest in the project, including a choral evening, Voce Bucovina, and celebrations of the New Year mumming traditions. In the second year, 12 different events were held at the museum, in other parts of the town and at the Humor Monastery, to mark traditional festivities. They included Vinerea Mare (the Shepherds' Day), Festivalul Ursului de Paie (the Straw Bear Festival) and Sanziene (the Solstice Feast). Activities included cultural celebrations, exhibitions, debates, fairs, in each case involving many adults and children in preparations and performance. Links with local partners, including the Best Western Hotel, and the media have also helped integrate these activities in the town. The project outcomes include:

- Development of a new gallery in the town museum presenting the area's culture;
- Revival of a series of a traditional festivals and cultural events;
- Publication of information, and increased recognition of local cultural traditions.

2.1.3 Moldovița: Baltagul Foundation  
(CF Completed 2004)

Moldovița is known for its painted monastery, one of a dozen World Heritage sites in Bucovina and a major tourism destination, but the community is some kilometres away and so benefits little from this resource. The Baltagul Foundation, a local cultural NGO aims to promote economic development through tourism, and worked with the town council and local people to create a museum for a collection of domestic and agricultural artefacts in a restored former school building. The aim was to create a space that would be of wider value as a centre for traditional cultural activities, and also of interest to visitors to the monastery, giving them a reason to venture into the town itself.

The work was undertaken in two stages, as the Foundation received a follow-up grant in 2003. The first phase involved the restoration of the ground floor of the building,
which stands on the main street of the town. Four rooms were renovated and fitted out to display artefacts and traditional objects donated by local people, and bought for the museum. Administrative and other problems delayed repairs to the roof, and leaking water damaged some of the work, but this has since been made good by the town council. In the second phase, the rest of the ground floor has been renovated, and will serve as workshop rooms where the project team hope to encourage regular activity, including demonstrations of traditional crafts; a display of art donated by a linked Belgian town, Kruibeke, is to be installed. The support of the Batalgul Foundation will continue after the completion of the project. The outcomes include:

- Restoration of a former school building to become a museum and cultural centre;
- Strengthening the friendship between Moldovița and Kruibeke;
- Development of a local association to support eco-tourism and pensions.

2.1.4 Oradea: Public Real Estate Administration Oradea

Oradea is a major city in the west of Romania, close to the Hungarian border. Its situation has made it an important stronghold throughout history and it has a well preserved example of an 18th century fortress, built on an earlier site. The buildings are used for a variety of purposes, including by the city’s art school. The decaying site has been taken in hand by the City Council, with the aim of developing it as a cultural centre for the city and a tourist attraction. The project was developed within the Council, with partners in the tourism, education and arts sectors. Given the scale of the site and its range of uses, the Living Heritage project is only one part of a wider strategy.

The project has developed in two phases, between 2002 and 2004. In the first, the focus was on improving awareness of and access to the site. New direction and information signs were prepared, along with leaflets, brochures and a CD for distribution to local schools and tourism outlets in Oradea and nationally. A visitor information point was installed and a cultural programme, including theatre and medieval music concerts, was organised by a local art group; the eight events drew good audiences from the city. In the second phase, an exhibition space was created in one of the bastions, and a display of local handicrafts organised with a local association. In support of this, information brochures and CDs about the artisanal traditions of Bihor were produced. The project outcomes include:

- Information and marketing campaign, including new signage, CDs, brochures etc.;
- Development of a programme of cultural events and festivals in the fortress;
- Renovation of a room as a visitor centre with exhibition of local handicrafts.
2.1.5 Solca: Solca Town Hall

Solca is a town of 4,500 people near the Ukrainian border. The local council, in partnership with local organisations, including the high school, developed the Living Heritage project in 2002, with a second phase completed in 2004. It aimed to restore and animate a woodland park, formerly part of a spa development in Solca, but now overgrown, litter strewn and fallen into disuse.

In the first phase of the project, a volunteer campaign was undertaken to clean the park and install new benches, litterbins and lighting; the Heroes' Monument was also restored. The work raised awareness of the park as an amenity and led to increased use. In the second phase, the mayor aimed to build on this by bringing in people to a series of special activities, including a traditional craft fair in April 2004, a music day in May and further events June and October. The events have been successful, attracting several hundred people each time, and beginning to establish the park as a location for community activities. The involvement of the mayor, and the creation of a community council with young and elderly members as a forum for consultation and debate, should help to sustain the work in years to come. The project outcomes include:

- Cleaning and gardening in Solca City Park;
- Installation of new lighting, street furniture and a bowling alley;
- A programme of park animation, including four music and culture festivals.

2.1.6 Brasov: Eco-Plus Association

Brasov is a historic gateway to Transylvania; although it is now a large city, it preserves a Saxon centre with fine buildings and fortifications. The project was developed by the Eco-Plus Association, a new NGO formed to stimulate community action in Brasov. The members aimed to draw attention to and encourage the restoration of the Rope Street, which has linked two larger thoroughfares since at least the 14th century, and is one of the narrowest named streets anywhere. The Living Heritage project included an awareness-raising campaign, and new paving, lighting and other works. Given the multiple property ownership, historic buildings legislation and the costs involved, the project was a very ambitious first initiative.

In the event, the project was completed very successfully. A competition was launched for local schoolchildren to make images and texts on the theme of the Rope Street; about 30 schools took part, with most visiting the site. Several hundred pieces of work
were submitted and these were exhibited on 17 November 2002, during an annual cultural festival organised by the Detaeye Foundation. An estimated 3,000 people saw the exhibition and the subsequent performances and prize distribution in the nearby Weaver’s Bastion of the town wall. The response encouraged Eco-Plus and Detaeye to make the event an annual celebration, and similar events have happened since. Repair work began in July 2003 following successful negotiation of a labyrinth of regulations and permissions, and the street is greatly improved and much better used. Eco-Plus has undertaken other work in Brasov, buoyed by the success of the Rope Street project. They have also been particularly successful in building links with the Council, schools, cultural organisations, the university and the private sector. The outcomes include:

- Raising awareness of the Rope Street through school art competitions;
- Creating an annual celebratory event for the street and surrounding area;
- Physical restoration of the fabric and installation of new lighting and signage.

2.1.7 Cartișoara: Cartișoara Local Council (REPF Completed 2003)

Cartișoara is a dispersed rural community of some 6,000 people, close to the Făgăraș Mountains in southern Transylvania. The municipality undertook the Living Heritage project, under the leadership of the vice-mayor, to restore a local museum first established in the 1960s on a site with a farmhouse, barn and a peasant cottage. The museum is dedicated to the memory of Badea Cartan, a 19th century autodidact, known for his long-distance walks and promotion of education among peasants and working people; it also displays the distinctive glass-painted icons of a former villager. Working with the specialist advice of the Brukenthal Museum in Sibiu, the project aimed to revive traditional building techniques, and bring new visitors to the village.

A specialist builder and carpenter was employed as foreman, working with a team of about 20 volunteers, including four principal craftsmen; the decayed barn was re-built using traditional methods to the original plans, and much restoration work undertaken on the house, including a new roof. Many local people were active in the project, with some offering help in kind including timber, building materials and transportation. In a second phase, a small market area was established in a corner of the site, together with a car park; this will be used to offer traditional products and handicrafts for sale to museum visitors. The municipality plans to continue with the development of the site, including bringing some rooms in the museum into use for weaving workshops and demonstrations. The project outcomes include:

- Restoration of the museum, and reconstruction of the damaged adjacent barn;
- Improvement of facilities for visitors, and promotion of the museum.
2.1.8 Satu Mare: Kolik Cultural Association

Satu Mare is a Hungarian village of about 1,900 people on the road from Sighişoara to Miercurea Ciuc. The community has an old tradition of constructing massive wooden gateways between their properties and the street; there are some 35 examples extant in the village, mostly dating from 1870-1914. Eleven are listed monuments, and 20 are protected under different statute, but without money for their preservation, many are deteriorating. Their interest lies partly in the intricate carving, with a mix of family, historical and symbolic references. The ‘Gates of the Future’ project was developed by the Kolik Cultural Association with the local council and Nyiro Jozsef Secondary School to repair and restore some of the gates, and provide training for local young people in the carving techniques used.

The project began with a competition, involving around 160 children from Satu-Mare and neighbouring villages; they worked in small groups to record and draw the gates, and were introduced to woodcarving techniques. A training course was organised for 31 young people, dealing with the history of the gates, woodcarving techniques, restoration, ethnology, and tourism development. A seminar was also held for 30 owners and residents, to develop their interest in the gates. Local artisans and young volunteers have restored three gates so far, and built a new one at the local school; a workshop has been created in the barn of the village museum. The project outcomes include:

• Raising awareness within the community of the value of traditional gates;
• Restoration of at least three old gates and the construction of a new one;
• Training in for young people and the establishment of a permanent workshop.

2.1.9 Joseni: Nyires Grup Cultural Association

The project was led by a local cultural association, and aimed to strengthen traditional culture in Joseni through the creation of a village museum of old houses linked to a programme of workshops and other activities for young people. The project team were able to buy three traditional houses, which were brought to Joseni and rebuilt in the project area, establishing a new village museum. The project encountered some difficulties with the local administration.

2.1.10 Sanmartin: Alcsik Microregional Development Association

The Sanmartin project aimed to develop eco-tourism in the Fisag Valley through a partnership between the local councils, the Alcsik Association and the owners of six traditional houses, which were developed to receive tourists. Research was undertaken to evaluate the tourism potential of the region and a group of stakeholders interested in heritage and tourism was formed. There was a strong commitment from young people in the project and that has continued since its completion.
2.2 Projects begun in 2003

2.2.1 Introduction

The second round of projects was launched with a publicity campaign in March 2003. Information was distributed widely, through print and other media, and public meetings were held about the programme. As a result, 47 expressions of interest were received, compared to 74 in the first round; five new projects were taken on, and four were granted further funds to consolidate and extend their work. They were Gura Humorului, Moldoviţa, Solca and Oradea, in the Carpathian Foundation region.

2.2.2 Sighetul Marmatiei: Valea Verde Association (CF Completed 2005)

The Sugau Valley lies outside Sighetu Marmatiei in Maramures, in an area where traditional styles of architecture are being replaced, like the ways of life that supported them. The Valea Verde (Green Valley) Association has been formed by a small group of local people to undertake a Living Heritage project to strengthen the attractions of the area for eco-tourism. The project had three components, of which the most ambitious was the purchase and

![Image: Purchase of a traditional house as a living museum in Sighetul Marmatiei: Valea Verde Association]

restoration of a traditional house as a living museum in which tourists can stay. In addition, it was intended to repair some older houses in the valley and run woodcarving workshops for children and young people.

The purchase of a suitable wooden house proved to be more difficult than anticipated, but this has now happened, and it is planned to transport it to a site earmarked beside the pension run by one of the members of the Association. It is hoped to offer this accommodation to visitors later in the year. A successful summer woodcarving camp was held, in partnership with a French NGO that has begun assisting the Association. Repairs have been carried out on three houses, one of which has been prepared by the owner as a pension for visitors. The project outcomes include:

- Restoration work on three traditional wooden Maramures houses;
- Development of traditional houses as accommodation for tourists;
- Woodcarving tuition for local young people.

2.2.3 Avrig: Friends of Avrig Association (REPF Completed 2004)

Avrig is a small town southeast of Sibiu in Transylvania. The Friends of Avrig are an association of people involved in traditional weaving, who planned to use the Living Heritage project to restore the local museum, and develop a workshop for weaving and a sales point for visitors. As part of this, they planned a training programme for children and young people, in association with the local school. Despite problems with the weather, and unforeseen challenges in the building restoration, the project has pro-
gressed well. The museum has been re-roofed and internally refurbished; its collection, including fabrics by Maria Spiridon, has been conserved and a new exhibition has been created. Regular weaving classes, for three separate groups, have been established, first in the school, and now in the museum itself; the children’s work was displayed during the local festival. Links have been developed with artisans involved in glass painting, and the group plans to develop workshops in this traditional skill and produce material for sale. The project outcomes include:

- Restoration of the museum and collection, and installation of local craft outlet;
- Establishment of a regular training programme in weaving for local young people;
- Securing long-term financial support for the project from the local council.

2.2.4 Darjiu: Civitas Foundation (REPF Completed 2004)

Darjiu is a relatively isolated village in central Transylvania, with a UNESCO-listed fortified church, in whose precincts the tradition of storing hams is maintained. Although it is not very far from the town of Odorheiu Secuiesc, the road is bad, and few visitors make it as far as Darjiu. The director of the Civitas Foundation, an NGO based in Odorheiu, is from the village and felt that a Living Heritage project might help revive the community’s confidence and capacity to address its own problems, particularly through improving the tourism offer. The project revived several traditional events, including a theatre and music performance in the grounds of the church.

The people of Darjiu formed a group to develop the project, which became a focus of local activity during the summer of 2004. The elements included the Hail Festival, commemorating disastrous harvests in the 1820s, a summer camp, with traditional craft activities for 30 local children, and a final show, telling the story of St Ladislas and performed by 20 young people with professional support from the Odorheiu theatre. Many visitors from other parts of Romania and abroad were attracted to the village during the festival period, and put up locally. The project enabled the council, the church and the school to develop a more constructive working relationship. The group are now planning to convert the former school building into a community centre with doctor’s consulting rooms and accommodation for tourists. Plans are also underway to begin restoration of the church with support from the Unitarian Church in Hungary. The project outcomes include:

- A very successful festival, including a children’s camp and a theatre show;
• Attracting new visitors to the village and development of new partnerships.

2.2.5 Satu Mare: Artera Foundation

The Artera Foundation is a cultural and tourism NGO based in Odorheiu Secuiesc, some kilometres from Satu Mare itself, but its director has personal ties to the village. The Living Heritage project aimed to revive a local play, the Miraculum, which recounts how villagers saved themselves during a Tatar invasion by hiding in caves above the village. It had not been staged for many years, partly because of the difficulty of accessing the site, high above Satu Mare. The project involved about 180 people, including 60 performers. The script and the music were developed through drawing on the memories of the older residents of the village, and through a summer camp in which young people learnt traditional craft skills. The event itself was staged with professional technical support. Everything necessary – lights, costumes, props, seating and so on – had to be hauled up a track on foot or horseback; similarly, the cast, many of whom were in their sixties, had to climb the hill each evening after work for rehearsals. Several hundred people saw the performances, coming from as far as Hungary for it, and local people made their houses available to put the guests. All those involved in the Miraculum are enthusiastically planning how to develop their performance and make the play a permanent part of local life. The project outcomes include:

• A children’s summer camp, based on traditional craft activities;
• Revival of a traditional play, devised and performed by 60 local people;
• Bringing in a large audience and developing the tourism potential of Satu Mare.

2.2.6 Tusnad: Csik County Nature and Conservation Society

Tusnad is in an area known for its natural springs, and its mineral water has long been recognised for its quality. The Living Heritage project was developed by the Conservation Society, based in Miercurea Ciuc, about 30 minutes drive away. The group has been working for several years on a programme to improve public access to the various springs, through the construction of paths, bathing places and toilet facilities, working each summer with volunteers from other parts of Europe. They also aim to raise awareness of the springs and their tourism potential. The project envisaged the construction of a Mineral Water Museum in Tusnad, linked to a craft centre where local artisans would be able to sell their work. The financial support of the local council was key to the development, and further
support has been gained from the Hungarian Ministry of Culture and the mineral water production company.

The project progressed rapidly, with the design and construction of a new museum on a site in the centre of Tusnad. The building is round to reflect the shape of mineral water bottles, and is being fitted out with an exhibition drawn partly from objects donated by the local community. Work on the craft centre continues, paid for separately by the council, and local artisans have already bought nine of the planned shops. The project received further funding through the Living Heritage programme in 2004 for the installation of the museum displays and marketing activity. Its outcomes include:

• Construction and fitting out of the mineral water museum in Tusnad;
• Promotion of Tusnad as a centre for visitors and the mineral springs tour.

2.3 Projects begun in 2004

A third round of projects was developed in spring 2004, following some changes to the promotion and selection process. The following list gives brief information on the selected projects, which are still in train; they were not visited during the fieldwork.

2.3.1 Botosani: Stefan Cel Mare Association (CF in progress)
The project aims to involve young people and other members of the community in promoting Botosani’s cultural, historic and religious sites. To date, they have organized trips to the monasteries close to Botosani, information sessions about the history and culture of Botosani, and plays performed by local schoolchildren were produced for the local fair. The group has been successful in local fundraising for the trips.

2.3.2 Botosani: Stefan Luchian Foundation (CF in progress)
The project aims to involve teenagers in spreading the cultural heritage and Romanian popular art from the Botosani area. So far, 1300 brochures and 700 calendars have been produced to market the Museum House and its collection of work associated with the artist, Stefan Luchian. The work has been presented in seven high schools, and 50 pupils were selected to participate in painting, weaving and needlework workshops.

2.3.3 Ciocanesti: Association for Cultural, Ecological & Rural Tourism (CF in progress)
The Ciocanesti region is known for egg painting and folk costumes. The goal of this project is to record these traditions and skills in a Living Museum of Popular Art. In the first six months 60 pension owners were trained in agro-tourism, and 25 craftsmen participated to the National Egg Painting Festival. A room was established in the Town Hall as a Tourism Information and Promotion Centre. Promotional materials have been prepared for the RomExpo Tourism Fair in Bucharest, with details of the region’s tourism offer, maps, itineraries and information about places to stay.
2.3.4 Creaca: Brebi Association for Community Development  (CF in progress)
The project aims to develop a tourist circuit around the beautiful wooden churches of Creaca, to create a sense of community solidarity and generate tourist interest. Work has begun on documenting churches in six villages and preparing information and publicity materials. The activities developed by Spring 2005 include training six volunteer tourist guides, new signage and a tourism circuit linking six churches, and the creation of an exhibition room with traditional artefacts. Publicity material has also been prepared and agreements made with tourism agencies in Salaj County.

2.3.5 Ipotesti: Mihai Eminescu Foundation  (CF in progress)
The project will involve villagers, pupils and others in renovating the Blue Flower Park in Ipotesti, as ‘a place to dream, to consider the community’s culture and traditions and to pass them on to the next generations’. Work has begun with architects to develop a design, and materials have been bought, but restoration work is yet to begin.

2.3.6 Marginea: ‘Club Speo Bucovina’ Foundation  (CF in progress)
The project aims to link older and younger inhabitants of Marginea in exploring and developing interest in the community’s traditional arts and crafts. To date, the project team has organized exhibitions of traditional crafts in different rooms at the school, and pupils have participated in traditional workshops in pottery, making traditional shirts, painting on glass, egg painting and ceramics. A magazine and brochure about local culture have been produced and several traditional events celebrated, including ones associated with Christmas and New Year festivities.

2.3.7 Salaj: Friendship Club Association  (CF in progress)
The objective of this project is to involve children in actively promoting the value of the traditional activities of the village. A group of 56 school pupils were chosen to take part in visits to heritage sites in the county and in workshops in painting, knitting, folk dance and singing, as well as basic introduction to restoration. They were also involved in the creation of a map of ‘Cultural itineraries in Salaj County’.

2.3.8 Remetea Oasului: Carpathia Ardeleana Society  (CF in progress)
Changes in the local lifestyle, and the departure of many young people from the village, have put the traditional skills of viniculture at risk, so the project aims to set up a new organisation to cultivate the vines in Remetea Oasului. The project has developed a local information campaign with public meetings, production of a local newspaper and organising wine tasting events; at the same time, they have been undertaking research into customs associated with wine production and viticulture.

2.3.9 Vama: Cucezanta Vama Association  (CF in progress)
Vama was once well known for its pottery, but with only a single potter now working in the town, the project aims to involve the younger generations in preserving the skills
and traditions of pottery making. The project was launched at a public meeting, and a short TV documentary about the potter has been produced. As a result, about 50 local people have become involved, collecting information about the pottery tradition and developing two exhibitions showing old work alongside new pottery by pupils from the local school; promotional materials have also been prepared.

2.3.10 Bonjida: Transylvania Trust Foundation (REPF in progress)
The project aims to enhance and protect the natural environment of Banffy Castle and its surroundings, to strengthen community spirit and attract tourism. Following approval of a landscape architecture plan by the local community, initial cleaning work and tree planting by young people, supported by 5 unemployed adults, has begun; the group assures the long-term protection of the new trees. The work has begun to attract positive media attention.

2.3.11 Brasov: CORONA Local Initiative Group (REPF in progress)
The project aims to involve school students in cultural and educational activities to celebrate the cultural identity of Brasov. So far, extensive research and documentation work has been undertaken, and 160 participants from 15 schools have taken part in the November Festival with guided walks and performances over three days. The high profile of the work has helped engage a wide range of institutional and voluntary sector partners, including the museums service, which is now assisting with multi-disciplinary lessons exploring ethnography, literature, religion and technology.

2.3.12 Cojocna: Foundation for Community Initiative (REPF in progress)
The project aims to preserve the strong musical traditions of the town by re-establishing the local folk music band and the Cojocneana folkdance ensemble. Following discussions between elders and young people, instruments have been bought and a group of eight teenagers selected to begin learning to play them. A further 60 young people are involved in learning the local dances from the older generation; they include people from three different ethnic backgrounds working together.

2.3.13 Dumbravioara: Milvus Association (REPF in progress)
The Milvus ethnological association plan to build a visitor centre to promote awareness of the white storks for which the village of Dumbravioara is famous. The local council has donated land, and plans are being developed for construction and information displays about the storks and the village itself.

2.3.14 Meresti: Kucko Association (REPF in progress)
The Kucko Association is heading a project to revive the traditional craft of furniture decoration in Meresti, through classes, organising a trade fair and producing a book. Work has begun in identifying over 80 pieces of painted furniture and documenting
the motifs for use by young people in workshops. The designs have been produced in a children’s painting book; further research and training work is in progress.

2.3.15 Odorheiu Secuiesc: Traditional Szekler Hussars Association (REPF in progress)
The project aims to revive the Husars (traditional processions) of Odorheiu Secuiesc, to strengthen community development and help attract tourism to the region. Work has begun with local artisans and two local schools in the town.

2.3.16 Potaissa: Potaissa Foundation for Ecology & Tourism (REPF in progress)
The project aims to promote the local heritage of Turda in an effort to develop sustainable tourism in the region; work has begun on research and documentation, and raising interest among local people through schools.

2.3.17 Sandominic: Sandominic Museum Association (REPF in progress)
Three houses in Izvorul Oltului, each over 100 years old, were refurbished as workshops for training young people in traditional wool spinning, weaving and sewing.

2.3.18 Satu Mare: Artera Foundation (REPF in progress)
The project aims to promote recognition of the community’s culture through its music and costumes, as a means of attracting tourism to Satu Mare.

2.3.19 Satu Mare: Association of Hungarian Popular Artists from Romania (REPF in progress)
The project, called ‘The Chest of Hope’ aims to encourage the community to preserve its heritage and craft of traditional painted furniture.

2.3.20 Sinca Noua: Pro Sinca Noua Association (REPF in progress)
The Pro Sinca Noua Association aims to preserve and develop the cultural identity of the village, by developing dialogue between young people and elders, documenting traditional resources and establishing a group of singers and dancers. The groups have been successfully created, and have already performed at Winter Traditions Festival in Făgăraș and a national TV broadcast Christmas concert in Cluj.

2.3.21 Tusnad: Csik County Nature and Conservation Society (REPF in progress)
This is a development of the earlier project, which set up the first Mineral Water Museum in Romania, through the creation of an exhibition and visitor information.
3 THE IMPACT OF THE PROJECTS

3.1 Introduction

The stated aim of the Living Heritage programme is ‘community development through cultural resources’. It is against this goal, therefore, that any evaluation must assess the outcomes of the projects supported through the programme. This section of the report begins with the individual, where the impact is likely to be greatest and most evident, before moving on to community development, which is closely linked to the experiences of the people involved. It then considers broader impacts on the local economy, on cultural development, on environmental issues, and on partners and other institutions. Finally, recognising that projects can fail and that change can bring its own problems, the report reports any major problems and negative impacts.

This account cannot be comprehensive, since the fieldwork and interviews had to be undertaken before the third round of projects, numbering about half the total, were complete. Even so, limitations of space mean that it is impossible to do justice to the rich experiences and outcomes evident in most of the projects visited: the following account is therefore the tip of an iceberg.

3.2 Human development

3.2.1 Learning and skills

People are at the heart of the Living Heritage programme, and they are the main focus of investment. This starts with the project teams, who receive training through the project development workshops, and support through the national partners. Project teams in Romania tended generally to be more experienced than in other countries, since they were drawn mostly from the local government and NGO sectors, but the work was still an important learning experience. Indeed, this sometimes meant re-thinking existing ideas: for example, the programme’s emphasis on process challenged assumptions about what is a worthwhile community outcome.
The value of the training workshops is enormous, though people’s capacity to accept and apply some of the ideas to which they were introduced varied. Some of the most experienced and well-qualified individuals, including members of the Brasov and Gura Humorului teams, were the most positive about what they had learned, both from the trainers and from other projects. Other participants, with less formal education, also felt that they had gained skills, insight and ideas of practical value to them in their work. In at least one team, however, there was little evidence of new skills, or of any willingness to extend their thinking, partly because of an existing rigidity of approach and an unwavering commitment to their original idea.

People learned most, of course, from working on their projects. The demands of management, planning and budgeting, building local partnerships, involving stakeholders and similar activities required teams to learn quickly from experience. This was not confined to those developing projects for the first time. In Brasov, the Eco-Plus Association’s members are mostly professional people; none the less, the Rope Street project involved them in many new activities, from education work to marketing. One member with wide business experience felt that community development had provided fascinating new challenges of a kind he had never encountered before.

Beyond the teams themselves, the projects provided valuable learning experiences for many people who took part in a variety of ways. Sometimes these were practical: in Cartișoara, some 20 people have helped with construction work, and four have been trained in traditional timber building. Many projects have worked on craft skills: woodcarving in Satu-Mare and the Cosau Valley, weaving in Avrig, and painting in Meresti. Elsewhere, people have taken in paying guests for the first time, and begun to learn about the expectations of tourists. People also spoke about learning to work together, and to plan and delegate tasks effectively.

The involvement of schools, in Brasov, Avrig, the Cosau Valley and elsewhere, has been important in providing young people with out of school education, raising awareness of the value of local culture and providing opportunities for old and young to meet and work together on common tasks. In Brasov, the Rope Street project and its subsequent activities involved 30 schools, and developed links with the museums that have produced new educational resources.
3.2.2 Confidence and empowerment

The acquisition of new skills tends to build confidence, particularly when they have been gained through activities recognised locally as being valuable. Project teams spoke of their ideas for further, more ambitious developments, based on their positive experiences. In Darjiu, for example, the success of the festival and summer camp showed the value of working together, and the partners are planning further projects. Several other early projects, including Brasov, Gura Humorului and Oradea, have developed further work independently of the Living Heritage programme.

'It was an opportunity to forget our troubles and to feel good together.'

The process of leading a Living Heritage project has brought a transformation in several groups. Their achievement has given them confidence and built their credibility in the local community. One of the project teams explained how they were now seen as a source of advice and help by other, smaller community associations, and that they even struggled to find time to meet all the demands. It was striking to see how relationships with expert advisors, for instance in traditional arts and crafts, have begun to change, with group members increasingly willing to question what they were told. The Friends of Avrig had the confidence to consider the advice of the museum specialist involved in the project, and then make different choices that reflected their own needs.

3.3 Community development

3.3.1 Community cooperation

Working together has helped several of the project teams, and people in the wider community, to appreciate the value of teamwork and cooperation. At one of the sites in the Cosau Valley, efforts to repair the mill revived a traditional form of mutual self-help called a ‘claca’ in which people cooperate in building work; after initial reluctance, the revival of the tradition proved to be very successful. In Avrig, Darjiu, Gura Humorului, Satu Mare and elsewhere, the foundations of sustainable community development work have been laid as a result of the project. In Calineşti, the voluntary environmental protection group have continued to protect the village’s natural assets;
here and in the other villages in involved in this project, it was reported that people had more confidence in organising and arguing for the needs of the area.

3.3.2 Strengthening community organisations

In Romania, the Living Heritage programme focused deliberately on local government and established NGOs, with the aim of strengthening them professionally and in relation to their civil society role. In most cases, this aim has been well advanced, as groups have achieved substantial developments in their communities. They have gained experience and confidence, and have all gone on to do further work on the project or in related areas. Their skills and managerial capacities have been built up by the training they received, and by overcoming the obstacles they met. In Brasov, the Eco-Plus Association now has an office in a university building, though it is still looking for financial support. The Friends of Avrig are now well established with over 100 members who contribute through fees to the group’s work.

‘The project was a milestone for our association – some learned, some remembered that “together” is not just an adverb but a magic word with which great things can be built.’

The incremental approach of the programme has been effective in Romania, enabling teams to develop projects in manageable stages, and so build on their achievements. The fact that several have been encouraged to take on a second stage through the Living Heritage programme has helped in this. Others, like Darjiu, did not apply for more funds because they felt that they would be able to do their next project with the local support they have established. In several places, the experience of working together has encouraged people to maintain relationships; the IUGA Foundation has kept in touch with people in the Cosau Valley, while similar contacts exist with Artera in Satu Mare and Civitas in Darjiu.

The successful outcome of their projects has helped NGOs and community associations develop partnerships with local government, other groups and members of the community. As a result, most are regarded as credible partners and allies by town and county councils: there is a good basis for future cooperation.
3.3.3 Strengthening social networks and social capital

The concept of social capital

According to the World Bank, ‘Social capital is not simply the sum of the institutions which underpin society, it is also the glue that holds them together. It includes the shared values and rules for social conduct expressed in personal relationships, trust, and a common sense of “civic” responsibility, that makes society more than a collection of individuals.’ Social capital is increasingly used in understanding how societies and groups within them interact and support each other, and the values of trust and cooperation that underpin sustainable development. It is seen as a kind of virtuous circle, where action builds recognition of shared interests, paving the way for further action. One of its central ideas is the development of networks through which individuals can access information, assistance and resources, and thus be more empowered. Three kinds of networks are usually recognised:

- **Bonding networks**, which bring together people with a shared identity or status;
- **Bridging networks**, which connect people with different backgrounds or interests;
- **Linking networks**, which connect people across social and other hierarchies.

The following sections consider the impact of the Living Heritage programme in respect of each of these networks.

**Bonding networks**

Because of past political experience, traditions of community cooperation are not always as strong as they might be; the Living Heritage programme is one way of changing some of these patterns. Even in relatively small, and superficially stable communities, long-standing social customs have been weakened in recent years. In Satu Mare, for example, the process of working on the *Miraculum* led to the revival of the habit of women meeting in one another’s houses to sew; indeed, they are now joined by some men in these gatherings. Christmas and other seasonal traditions, which many in the older generation believed had been completely forgotten, were revived as a result of getting together and talking about the village’s past. Although they form the pillars of local society, the council, school and church in Darjiu had no tradition of working together. The Living Heritage project was the first joint project they had undertaken, and required much rethinking; its success has built trust and a belief in cooperation.
Bridging networks

Most of the projects have depended on bringing people together, including some who may have had little opportunity to interact otherwise, especially across the age range. Many projects have deliberately aimed at involving young and older people, and passing on traditional skills, knowledge and stories is a successful form for intergenerational contact. The experience of projects such as Gura Humorului has shown the potential of heritage to bring people together across social and other dividing lines. In putting on their 12 different events, they involved a cross-section of the local community, from the elderly to the very young, and including two local monasteries, a school for children at risk, and a range of community associations.

'It's very good to see the young learn about the tradition.'

In contrast with the Living Heritage programme in some other countries, there has been somewhat less interethnic contact in Romanian projects. In Cartișoara, the project included volunteers from the local Roma community, although the museum was perhaps of less direct interest to them. But this is relatively unusual, and projects have generally involved ethnically homogenous groups. This may be substantially explained by the social and demographic situation of the country, with individual villages being less diverse in this respect than some other parts of South East Europe. But it may also be that the programme’s applicants did not see interethnic relations as such an important issue. None the less, some projects have brought together people from different national or ethnic communities, including Romanians and Hungarians in Oradea and Satu Mare, as well as the Roma people in Cartișoara already mentioned.

Links between Romania and Western European countries are not uncommon, for ancient and more recent historical reasons. Several Living Heritage projects have become the focus for renewed international cooperation. Moldovița’s twin town in Belgium, Kruibeke, has become involved with the museum development, assisting not only financially, but with a donation of art works installed in a new ‘friendship room’. In Valea Verde, a French NGO has offered support to the development of the living museum house. The long connection between Transylvania and Hungary has been crucial in Satu Mare, Darjiu and Tusnad, where links have helped with fundraising, technical assistance and tourism development. The anticipated entry of Romania to the European Union should strengthen these ties.
Linking networks

The involvement of local councils in many of the Living Heritage projects has enabled new connections to develop between community groups and the closest tier of government. This is a particular strength of the Living Heritage experience in Romania, and should be a key factor in the longer-term sustainability of the work begun here. Community groups have also developed links with local business, such as the Mineral Water Company in Tusnad, with the media, including press, radio and TV, and with foundations in Romania and abroad, especially in Hungary. Each of these strengthens community networks and access to people and institutions with the resources and the capacity to help future development.

3.4 Cultural development

3.4.1 Raising awareness of culture and heritage

All the projects have, to a greater or lesser extent, drawn attention to neglected or little-known aspects of local culture. The process of work on a restoration or development project inevitably marks out its object, and the culture associated with it, as being of value. In Avrig, Brasov, Darjiu, Gura Humorului, Oradea and elsewhere, the projects have successfully revived people’s interest in parts of their heritage that they may have taken for granted, or even forgotten. Many of the project teams have been astonished at how people have responded to the work, and made efforts to keep in touch as it has developed. In all the most successful projects, there is a powerful sense of validation of local identity and tradition, and a renewed confidence.

‘We have learned that tradition is not a word, but a way of life that defines us as a community, and modern means not to bury your past but to use it as a foundation for your building.’

Several projects, including Satu Mare, Tusnad and Moldoviţa have drawn the attention of tourists, whether from Romania or from abroad, of the media, and of academics and professionals in the heritage field. In many cases, people were also surprised to find that their heritage was sufficiently valued by others that they would provide financial assistance towards its conservation or development: in Darjiu, the involvement of the
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Unitarian Church and the Hungarian Ministry of Culture is greatly appreciated. This external interest has strengthened local people’s pride in their heritage and their support for its conservation and development.

In Moldovița, Cartișoara and elsewhere, the Living Heritage project has changed the local council’s views of the value of heritage to the community, building the conditions for long term support. In Satu Mare, the mayor took a role in the Miraculum play, and has become a strong supporter of culture both as a part of community life, and as a focus for tourism. In Gura Humorului, the links with the council have been strong enough to withstand a change of political control; although the museum director campaigned for the losing party, the working relationship between the museum and the council is rightly seen as separate from such political differences.

‘Heritage means anything that we had to hide, it means that these are the reasons to be here: it’s our meaning.’

Heritage has been so effective partly because of its deep roots in many of the remote rural communities where the programme has worked. Project participants often reflected on the way their heritage had been undervalued, or sometimes repressed, under the Communist regime. Despite the ‘patriotic’ use of folklore by the state, people’s real values and identities, as expressed through crafts, traditions and way of life, lay buried. The programme’s use of the word ‘heritage’, rather than ‘culture’, helped avoid some of the negative associations that the latter word had acquired under the former regime. Heritage offered access to something that many participants perceived as belonging to them in a way that culture often did not. The importance of regaining free access to these forms of expression was mentioned several times by individuals to explain the success of their projects. Many people shared an ambition to restore ‘authentic’ Romanian cultural traditions in the eyes of local people and visitors.

3.4.2 Strengthening cultural resources

The projects have not only raised local awareness of heritage resources, but also left them in a much stronger position, from which further development can be expected. Many sites, structures and buildings have been conserved, including parks in Solca and Ipotesti, water mills in the Cosau Valley, and museums in Avrig, Cartișoara and Gura Humorului. Most are better able to attract visitors, and have better support from the
local council and the community. Staff, where they exist, have gained new skills and confidence: as one curator explained, it is now much more satisfying to show the museum to visitors. Elsewhere, dance and music groups have been strengthened, and there is every reason to expect that they will play a lively part in local development in future.

'It was a revelation for me to rediscover the Fortress, which was so close but at the same time far from the citizens.'

The risks of focusing on culture and identity are evident in the recent history of Southeast Europe, but the Living Heritage experience suggests that engaging positively with the issues may help avoid their exploitation. For demographic reasons, there has been limited integration between people with different cultural, religious and ethnic backgrounds in Romanian projects. But where such diversity exists, as with Roma people in Cartișoara, the projects have proved to be as successful in fostering community cooperation as in the other countries participating in the programme.

3.5 Local economic development

3.5.1 Introduction

The aim of the Living Heritage programme is community rather than economic development, but it is important to consider the projects’ impact on the local economy. Although the grants are relatively small in West European terms, they can be significant to the communities concerned. For example, the municipality of Cartișoara has an annual budget of less than €30,000, with which it employs eight people; the Living Heritage of €9,200 was therefore a huge capital injection, making possible work which would otherwise be beyond the council’s reach.

3.5.2 Employment and micro-business

In many projects, including Cartișoara, Moldovița, the Cosau Valley, Oradea, Tusnad, the Sugau Valley among others, temporary jobs have been created for local people and artisans. Though rates of pay are not high, they are in line with local norms and make a real contribution to these mostly rural economies. Several projects have aimed to produce resources with the potential to support longer-term economic development. The museums in Avrig and Tusnad are both associated with sales areas in which local arti-
sans can sell their work to visitors; the latter project, which aims to create permanent sales space for nine small businesses, is especially ambitious in this respect. In Oradea, the project has contributed to the gradual transformation of the old fortress; although its impact on the fabric is limited, it has drawn attention to the potential of the site, encouraging major renovations by the City Council and renewing the idea of the place as a location for business alongside its tourism and educational use.

3.5.3 Tourism development

Tourism, both internal and external, is better developed in Romania than in some of the other countries in the Living Heritage programme. Consequently, infrastructure, resources and experience on which to build exist, and in several cases, the Living Heritage project has helped develop the tourism offer. Notable examples include the fortress of Oradea and the museums in Tusnad and Gura Humorului, where good connections have been established with the town’s major tourist hotel. In the Cosau Valley, the restoration of watermills and improvements to the river environments was linked with a tourism promotion campaign by the IUGA Foundation; a small study in June 2003 identified that some 200 visitors had been attracted to the area following its promotion by local tourism agencies.

In some cases, such as Valea Verde, the project has encouraged local people to become involved in eco-tourism initiatives. In Moldoviţa, six existing pension owners have formed an association and registered their businesses legally; other people are expected to join the group, which will use the new museum to attract visitors. Elsewhere, for instance in Satu Mare and Darjiu, the numbers of visitors far exceeded the capacity of formal accommodation, and residents became impromptu pension keepers. Not only did this ensure some earnings, but it highlighted the possibilities of receiving tourists on a more regular basis. Several projects attracted substantial numbers of international visitors (and, in the case of Tusnad, volunteers), especially from Hungary; links have been strengthened, and some visitors have since become informal ambassadors promoting interest in the area, and returning with other tourists.

Living Heritage projects cannot be expected to create a tourism industry on their own, but they have been able to improve an existing offer. However, the vice-mayor who said frankly that, despite its ostensible tourism focus, the value of his project lay pri-
marily in creating a cultural resource and a focus of community pride was wise: tourism income, he recognised, would be a bonus but not the main benefit of the project.

3.5.4 Additional investment

Financial assistance and donations

Several of the Romanian Living Heritage projects have been successful in bringing in additional resources. Local government has been an important partner in places like Tunsad, Oradea and Cartișoara, and the future of several projects is effectively assured by the participation of the council. The Living Heritage grant was able to leverage additional public funds in Gura Humorului, where the council renewed the museum roof as a result of the project, and in Brasov, where the grant has been matched by the City Council and led to the restoration of the Rope Street.

The historic ties between parts of Transylvania and Hungary have opened further sources of funding, including the Hungarian Ministry of Culture (in Tunsad and Satu Mare) and the Unitarian Church (in Darju). More unusual was the success of the Csik County Conservation Society in Tunsad, and the Eco-Plus Association in Brasov, in gaining business sponsorship for their projects. Such links are not only valuable in themselves, but in creating relationships with funding partners, and building project teams’ confidence in their ability to secure funds for their work.

Help in kind

The close involvement of local government in many projects helped secure resources without which they would not have been possible. For instance, in Tunsad and Dumbravioara, the council provided land for the construction of visitor facilities. Elsewhere, other agencies have helped: in the Cosau Valley, the local forestry department offered wood for the repair of the waterworks, though in the event none of the owners needed this assistance. Local people have also been generous in their support. In Avrig, Cartișoara and elsewhere, they donated building materials and provided help with transport; businesses were also sometimes willing to help in this way.

Voluntary work

Volunteering is at the heart of the Living Heritage programme, though some of the first projects found it difficult to develop. With more experience on all sides, and a widening of the range and concerns of the projects themselves, voluntary involvement
has become the cornerstone of the work. In Cartișoara, for example, the repair of the museum, and reconstruction of the barn, depended on the unpaid work contributed by about 20 local men, under the direction of a paid carpenter and supervisor. In Solca, Tusnad and other projects focusing on natural heritage, large numbers of people have given their time for cleaning and simple restoration activities. More strictly cultural activities, including the Satu Mare Miraculum and the festival week in Darjiu, also depended on people’s readiness to give their time and energy over several months. The development of new dance or music groups, as at Cojocna, is another example of how Living Heritage projects have been able to support voluntary commitment.

### 3.6 Environmental outcomes

A number of the Romanian projects have been concerned with natural heritage and environmental protection. In Tusnad, for example, respect for the environment is inseparable from the development of the springs, baths and camping areas, which encourage people to spend time at the sites; the Mineral Water Museum itself aims to increase visitors’ appreciation of this most basic resource. In the Cosau Valley, the project has highlighted relationship between the watermills, the life they enable, and the rivers on which both depend, and led to the formation of an environmental protection group. Other projects, for instance in Solca, Ipotesti and Bonțida, have centred on restoration of the natural heritage of public parks and similar areas, normally celebrated through the creation of cultural festivals and events.

In Brasov, the Eco-Plus group built on their achievement in the Rope Street with another, independently funded, initiative, to clean a mountain path overlooking the city. Working with a youth organisation, they collected and brought down 80 bags of rubbish. Other projects, concerned with human rather than natural heritage, have been drawn into environmental concerns. In Gura Humorului the activity programme included an event to celebrate the coming of spring, and the planting of an ‘Armindeni’ tree in the town park in from of the museum. The environmental value of these projects is evident in the physical improvements that they have produced; much less obvious, but perhaps of greater long-term significance, is the extent to which they have raised awareness of the value of natural resources and strengthened people’s commitment to protecting their natural heritage.
3.7 Impact on institutional practice and policy

3.7.1 Impact on local government, NGOs and other partners

The Living Heritage projects in Romania are different from most of those in other countries in being led by established NGOs or local government rather than less formal community groups. Some of the teams, for instance in Tusnad, Darjiu, Gura Humorului and Oradea, already had a professional, experienced and thoughtful approach to their work; for them, the project strengthened, rather than transformed, their capacity. But because these actors work within local government and civil society the lessons gained may have a deeper impact on institutional policy and practice, permanently changing how the councils and NGOs involved work. All the interviewees spoke of what they had learnt from the training and actually carrying out the projects, and it was evident, in some cases at least, that this had had a lasting effect on them.

Living Heritage projects have attracted some interest from Romanian government institutions responsible for culture and tourism, with officials visiting the projects in Cartișoara and Moldovița. The Minister of Culture, Mrs. Mona Musca, has expressed interest in the programme and its approach. Although these are positive signs, suggesting that the programme’s ideas may have some influence on wider policy, it will take considerable advocacy work to turn this interest into something more substantial. The future of this will depend on the work of the national partners.

3.7.2 Impact on the national partners

The implementation of Living Heritage has been straightforward for both the Carpathian Foundation and the Romanian Environmental Partnership Foundation. Their approach has been characterised by an attention to results and outcomes, initially with less focus on the process. At the start, they tended to support projects run by trusted partners rather than by potentially more risky community groups, but as the programme has embedded itself in their work, it has been successfully widened; the third year of projects is the most ambitious to date. The partnership was also significant for the two foundations in being the first partnership of its kind in Romania, and establishing a precedent for future cooperation.

3.8 Problems and negative outcomes

3.8.1 Problems

Living Heritage projects in Romania are notable for the quality of their leadership. Many are led by individuals with passionate, seemingly indefatigable, commitment to the idea and the community with which they are working. The downside of this is that they sometimes struggle to build a strong team with real shared ownership and control. When someone is doing a very good job, it is natural for others, less confident or experienced, to take a subsidiary role. This is especially likely when the project is led by
someone with the institutional support of a formal body such as a council or an NGO. One result, in the longer term, may be to limit community development because, although things are done, the skills and capacities necessary to that delivery are not shared within an extending and renewing group of people. This is evident in several of the projects, and is an important issue for future work.

A number of the Romanian Living Heritage projects have involved restoration of historic buildings or structures, or, in a few cases such as Tusnad, new constructions. It has sometimes been difficult and time consuming to get the necessary permissions, despite local council support. The problem has always been overcome, but at the cost of delays and frustration. Where the sites or buildings to be improved were in private ownership, as in the Cosau Valley or Sighetu Marmatiei, for example, there was sometimes difficulty in harnessing community involvement. This is understandable, and underlines the importance of focusing on what is seen to be a shared resource.

Training was an important part of many projects, and was generally appreciated by participants. However, there were substantial obstacles, especially in terms of illiteracy, which reduced the value of this input for some people. A few projects found it harder than others to develop an effective approach to volunteering, and were able to engage only limited numbers of people in this way: Valea Verde and Moldovita are instances. The reasons are complex, but include limited experience of the project teams of voluntary work and its values, lack of connection with the local community, and problems communicating the public benefit and communal nature of the enterprise.

Conflicts of interest
One of the more intractable problems of the earlier phase of Living Heritage development in Romania was the genuine confusion about private and public initiatives, including the distinction between the charitable ethos of a foundation or NGO and the commercial interests of a business. Both models are relatively new in Romanian society, and particularly in some of the more remote areas where the Living Heritage programme operated. Though each is intrinsically legitimate, they have different values and processes, and these were not always well appreciated by grantees who were operating simultaneously in commercial and non-commercial structures. Such confusion is understandable, but should have been identified and addressed by the grantors to avoid possible or actual conflicts of interest.

Similar ambiguities arose from the close involvement of local government in many of the Living Heritage projects in Romania. This was a policy decision, reflecting the existing policy of strengthening local government held by the Carpathian Foundation and, to a lesser extent, by the Romanian Environmental Partnership Foundation. The importance and value of support to local administrations is not in doubt, but it needs safeguards for the appropriate delivery of the Living Heritage programme. It would clearly be wrong for programme funds to be used for electoral advantage, but a successful community project delivered through the efforts of a local politician may lead to
increased support for him. In Solca, the mayor made the Living Heritage project part of his published campaign programme, and faced suggestions from local people that he was organising festivals in the park only to support his candidature in the summer’s elections; he was duly re-elected. In other cases, difficult relations with an existing mayor, or changes in political control following elections, caused problems for the projects involved. The support of local government is crucial, but the ways in which this may be offered need to be considered.

This is a complex area, where clear boundaries between appropriate and inappropriate conduct are very hard to draw. Some of the politicians involved in Living Heritage projects were sensitive to this. In Cartișoara, the vice-mayor suspended work on a building project of his own while the museum was being renovated, explicitly to avoid any suspicion within the local community that materials or labour might be diverted; in the event, at the next election, he stood against and defeated the mayor. In Gura Humorului, the potential difficulties arising from members of the project team belonging to a different party from those who controlled the local council were very well handled on all sides. The influence that Living Heritage projects may have had in the outcome of democratic processes is impossible to gauge; nor would it necessarily be wrong, since achievement in community development, including bringing in new resources, is a legitimate political platform. There is not easy answer to these questions, which are ultimately a matter of judgement for the Foundations concerned, but it is important to remain alert to the dangers.

3.8.2 Disappointments

In several cases, (e.g. Darjiu, Tusnad, Moldovița), the projects have been led by NGOs based outside the community where the work has happened, though the people concerned have had strong family ties to the village. This itself is a result of the different approach to project selection undertaken in Romania. There have been advantages, notably the professionalism and external perspective of such partners; but there have been drawbacks too, as such an organisation cannot have the same kind of relationship with a community as one that has grown up within it. This may explain, for example, the relatively low level of donations made to the museum in Moldovița.

Leadership has been strong in many of the projects, often because of the involvement of an experienced person – mayor, director of an NGO, teacher – who is passionate about the work. The drawback is that it has sometimes been harder for a strong team to emerge. People have been content, or perhaps obliged, to take a back seat, with the result that the longer-term community development effects are not as profound as they might have been. In some of these projects, strong leadership has also limited people’s ability or willingness to learn from the experience, and the successful outcome has become, perversely, a vindication of a way of working which may not be sustainable or effective in the longer term.
Some projects have found it more difficult than others to engage local people's voluntary commitment to the project, both in terms of participation and contributing help in kind. Thus in at least three cases, the work has been undertaken by paid builders and craftsmen, without local involvement, with consequences not only on costs, but more importantly on people's sense of ownership of the result. Sometimes, project teams have chosen to buy objects for museums from local people, rather than developing a relationship in which they are happy to donate or lend material because they recognise the museum as their own.
4 CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Assessing the Living Heritage Programme

4.1.1 Introduction
This section of the report considers the experience of developing the Living Heritage programme in Romania, as its original three-year period draws to a close. It looks at how the original concept, and the principles through which it is expressed, have stood up to experience, and it considers some of the practical issues relating to implementation. But before turning to details of the programme itself, it is worth observing that, as the total number of Living Heritage projects approaches 150 in 4 countries, the outright failures may be counted in single figures, though other projects have had less impact on community development than they might. But the general experience, here as in the other countries in the programme, has been of consistently exceeding the expectations of those who proposed and undertook them. It is, in short, a remarkable record of achievement, in which Romania has played a distinguished part.

4.1.2 The original concept
The Living Heritage programme was based on the idea that heritage and culture could be understood not as a liability but as a resource, which people could harness for community development. Not all those involved immediately understood that idea, but it has now become well established. Crucially, most of the project teams and the much larger circle of participants have had little difficulty seeing how a heritage project might contribute to the aims of their communities. One reason for this is the way in which culture itself fired people’s imaginations and their enthusiasm to take part.

The cultural aspect of the programme attracted applicants who would not have taken on another kind of initiative, and people who had not previously done a project at all. Although some schemes, such as the museums, were relatively conventional concepts, the way in which work developed, in places like Gura Humorului or Brasov, took people far beyond their original idea, as they became involved in a real community project.

Heritage was an effective focus because it engages people’s interest. It is something they care about, that connects at a human level, and touches people’s feelings: it is not abstract. Just as importantly, it is within reach: small heritage projects are within the resources and capacity of local people. The extent of participation in the Cosau Valley, Satu Mare, Brasov, Gura Humorului and elsewhere shows that everyone can find their place in a cultural project, whatever their perceived abilities or social status. Finally, in a context with so many problems, whether identified internally or externally, culture focuses on a community’s strengths. In doing so, it avoids problematising a situation or a group of people, looking instead for common ground and shared values.
4.1.3 Programme implementation

Project identification and development
The experience of inviting proposals for an open programme, as adopted in Romania in the first two years, has been mixed. It did identify some new partners, and led to some strong projects, but it demanded a substantial investment of time in public meetings and the media campaign. It also produced a large number of project ideas which did not go forward. In the second, and especially the third year, the approach to project identification was brought more closely into line with that in the other three countries where the programme operates, with positive results both in the number and quality of projects developed. The experiment was certainly worthwhile, but has underlined that a community development approach is the most appropriate way to develop the Living Heritage programme, at least in the specific situation of South East Europe.

Project support
Project support, through training workshops, the two Foundations’ management processes and informal routes, has been exemplary. It has helped the project teams develop the skills and confidence to undertake their work, and the lessons they have gained have been embedded in their thinking.

The donors and programme managers
The programme has challenged all the main partners involved in different ways, requiring them to test assumptions and sometimes rethink approaches. Its emphasis on process, rather than merely measurable outcomes, was unusual, and took some adjustment. If it has led to greater understanding of the complexity of the development process, and its wide range of outcomes (many of them difficult to see and impossible to quantify), it will have made a useful contribution. Of course, as this report has shown, Living Heritage projects produce often impressive demonstrable results: but it is central to the programme’s philosophy that good outcomes depend on a good process, and that not all that is important can be measured. The capacity and willingness of all those involved to learn from the experience, and to adjust their work accordingly, has been very impressive.

4.2 The future of Living Heritage in Romania

4.2.1 Helping existing projects to build on their achievements
Romania’s Living Heritage projects have been successful, and most have continued developing, albeit at a different pace, since the project itself came to a formal end. However, it is always difficult to move from a period in which financial and technical support is available to one of independence. It would therefore be wise to plan some post-completion support for every Living Heritage project, and particularly the large number in the third phase. The most effective way to do this would be to make available a day of community facilitator’s time for a debriefing and to help with planning
the next steps. Such a commitment would be a cost-effective way of ensuring that projects successfully negotiate the sensitive process of becoming fully independent of the programme.

4.2.2 Developing new projects using the Living Heritage model

As the period of financial support from the King Baudouin Foundation comes to an end in 2005, both the Carpathian Foundation and the Romanian Environmental Partnership Foundation have chosen to continue the Living Heritage idea within their mainstream grant programmes. Indeed, the Romanian office of the Carpathian Foundation will be leading on this work for the organisation as a whole, so that its ideas will gradually be extended to the other countries served by the organisation.

One question that might be considered is whether to maintain 'Living Heritage' as a title within the programme: it is a strong brand and maintaining it might help develop good new projects that would not otherwise come forward. It is also possible that new resources could be secured through other foundations for this approach to community development on the basis of success to date.

It is a substantial achievement on the part of the partners to have taken on the long-term future of Living Heritage in Romania, and is a reason for optimism. The development of the Living Heritage Network, linking partners in all four countries where the programme has operated, offers further opportunities to build on the ideas.
5  APPENDIX

The evaluation process
The evaluation was prepared through analysis of documentary records and background information, with fieldwork undertaken in two visits, the first in March 2003 and the second in August and September 2004. Twelve projects were visited during these trips, from the first two years. Although it was not possible to visit all the Living Heritage projects in Romania during the period, those chosen were a representative cross-section of the programme’s work.
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