

multi-Risk sciEnce for resilienT commUnities undeR a changiNgclimate

Codice progetto MUR: **PE00000005** – B53C22004020002



**Deliverable title:**

**Valuing CH exposure to MR, special focus on art cities, intangible social, aesthetic, and spiritual values**

**Deliverable ID: 7.3.1**

**Due date: XXXX**

**Submission date: XXXX**

#### **AUTHORS**

**Allegra Eusebio (CIMA Foundation); Valentina De Santi (CIMA Foundation); Filippo Fraschini (CIMA Foundation); Chiara Franciosi (CIMA Foundation); Antonio Gioia (CIMA Foundation); Marina Morando(CIMA Foundation)**

DV 7.3.1: Valuing CH exposure to MR, special focus on art cities, intangible social, aesthetic, and spiritual values

---

**Project Acronym:** RETURN

**Project Title:** multi-Risk sciEnce for resilienT commUnities undeR a changiNg climate

**Project Coordinator:** Domenico Calcaterra; Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II; domcalca@unina.it

**Project Duration:** December 2022 – November 2025 (36 months)

**Deliverable No.:** DV 7.3.1

**Dissemination level\*:** Public

**Work Package WP 7.3:** WP 7.3 - Multi Risk (MR) assessment for Cultural Heritage (CH) and role of CH on resilience

**Task:** T 7.3.1 Methods and guidelines for valuing intangible assets and CH exposure for MR assessment

**Lead beneficiary:** CIMA Foundation

**Contributing beneficiaries:**

## Table of Contents

<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	ERRORE. IL SEGNALIBRO NON È DEFINITO.
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURE</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
1.1.    THE EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT THROUGH THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS .....	8
1.2.    LANDSCAPE AS “COMPLEX CULTURAL HERITAGE” .....	14
<b>PART II – FROM CONCEPTION TO COMPLETION: THE EVOLUTION OF THE INVESTIGATION</b> .....	<b>20</b>
2      METHODS AND EVOLUTION OF THE INVESTIGATION .....	20
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>24</b>

## List of Figure

Figure 1. Cultural Heritage classification according to UNESCO Conventions.....	14
---	----

## Introduction

The work here presented constitutes the first deliverable of an ongoing investigation, part of the WP3- Task 7.3.1 Valuing CH exposure to MR, special focus on art cities, intangible social, aesthetic, and spiritual values, of the RETURN Project - multi-Risk sciEnce for resilientT commUnities undeR a changiNg climate. This investigation is framed in the general discourse addressing the role of cultural heritage in multi-risk assessment, focusing on the role of community engagement for the identification and definition.

Including heritage in multi-risk assessment is essential, given that it occupies a pivotal role in the shaping of urban and territorial systems, being one of their founding and structural elements.

Cultural heritage constitutes a fundamental aspect of a community's resilience, owing to its tangible attributes (such as the income derived from tourism linked to specific monuments) and intangible aspects (such as the social cohesion fostered by locations or monuments that hold historical significance for the community). Given this complex framework, it is crucial to carefully define and examine the cultural heritage dimension to develop policies and actions that effectively mitigate potential damage from disaster events, thereby enhancing the resilience of the affected community.

In the modern conception of the concept of heritage, this includes not only physical objects or buildings but rather the whole set of tangible and intangible elements that embody the value of tradition, history, memory or identity of a given place or community. This is “transmitted from generation to generation, [is] constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity “(UNESCO Convention of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003). Heritage can therefore be considered as the outcome of the superposition of historic, identitarian and social layers, inevitably included when dealing with comprehensive multi-risk assessments, to move from a technical to a holistic approach. It is no coincidence that the landscape is fully placed within the concept of cultural heritage. Precisely, it is a visible form of the operation of history, a manifest of the interrelations (social, legal, economic, etc.) that have occurred over time between the environment and the community, Landscape and cultural assets, movable, immovable and intangible, fall within a

unitary concept of cultural heritage, which is the expression of the history, culture and identity of a specific community, to be defended and handed down to future generations.

In this context, some critical elements emerge with respect to the characterization of cultural heritage: i) CH is a complex dimension, difficult to frame on a conceptual and terminological level, with a significant intangible component; ii) cultural heritage has a subjective component, therefore the community itself participates in the definition and attribution of meaning to its own cultural heritage.

Immovable assets, collections and buildings become recognized as cultural heritage when they express the value of society, meaning that the tangible can only be understood and interpreted through the intangible since community and value are intrinsically linked (Munjeri, 2004). Different authors highlight this connection, For instance, Salvatore Settis, in a seminal publication, reconstructed the history of the concept of cultural heritage and landscape protection, bringing out a definition of landscape as a historical-environmental and territorial heritage to be deciphered (in the signs it shows) to discover the history and the identity or soul of a specific community and its space (Settis, 2010).

Consequently, as regards the relationship between heritage and risk governance and assessment, it becomes necessary to define a holistic approach that allows for a medium-long-term critical reflection on the practices implemented by communities in the management and care of their living space in order to understand not only the historical and environmental elements characterizing a community but what are the "protection" actions that are most compatible with the social context and achievable within it.

Economic studies focused on developing methodologies for assessing cultural heritage determine that the total value of a cultural or landscape asset is the sum of its use value, which is more closely related to market considerations, and its non-use value. These assets, whether private or public, differ from other consumer goods as they embody values that are difficult to quantify with a "price." (Vecvagars, 2006).

Among the many categories that the literature on the topic has defined for non-use values, social values, historical values and symbolic values are the ones that better serve the scope. Social value of Cultural Heritage is central as it conveys the sense of connection with others and contributes to the comprehension of the sense of identity and place. Likewise, historical value provides a sense of continuity with the past and symbolic value represents the repository of meaning given to Cultural Heritage. Understanding and considering non-use values in multi-risk assessment of Cultural Heritage is of primary importance.

Hence, many are the dimensions that need to be taken into consideration for an extensive evaluation of cultural heritage in multi-risk scenarios. Its multifaced characterization adds complexity as the quantification of social connections and historical and identitarian relations is hard to measure but its inclusion in the discourse is central, especially when dealing with community engagement.

Examining non-use values necessitates adopting a holistic view of the territory and a qualitative understanding of past territorial dynamics. The present work employs a geo-historical approach to achieve and promote an understanding of territorial heritage as a repository of knowledge and resources. This involves exploring the historical relationship between humans and the environment to analyse resource exploitation and management dynamics. A qualitative and large-scale study of the territory is essential for adopting preventive analysis methods, understanding vulnerability factors, and engaging the community (Carallo, Dossche, Epifani, Matarazzo, Pierucci, 2022; Masotti, 2017).

In taking a holistic approach, including participatory processes and community engagement, the goal is to understand not only the historical and environmental elements characterizing urban, territorial and social systems within a community but also the prevention and protection actions that might be more compatible and achievable in that specific organization. Moreover, including the population in the process of heritage identification and evaluation enables the integration of scientific and institutional top-down knowledge with local and informal one, proper of local communities. This integration favours the co-creation of knowledge and reinforces institutional and community trust (Gaillard and Mercer, 2012; De Marchi, 2015).

In building a more holistic and complete approach to managing both risk and territory, it is no longer possible to ignore the inclusion of the "heritage communities" that produced that heritage, inherited it, used it and transformed it to constitute targeted forms of participatory local governance.

Starting from these premises and recognizing the strong existing connection between cultural heritage, planning and community resilience, this investigation aims to analyze the contribution that participatory processes can provide for heritage identification.

This objective has a twofold outcome: on one side, it allows for strengthening multi-risk assessment, creating a more comprehensive risk scenario, that takes into consideration not only technical elements, and which could become the common ground for the development of territorial, urban and civil protection planning integration. On the other, it enables the identification of potential strategic assets which might be useful in the definition of emergency management procedure.

The final expected product of this study is the definition of a set of guidelines, useful for local administrators and municipalities for the construction of community engagement projects related to the topic of heritage identification and multi-risk assessment.

Our activity will be structured in subsequent steps. Firstly, the analysis will start from international, European and national normative frameworks relating to cultural heritage, to identify how the concept has been declined by institutional structures, highlighting definitions of cultural heritage, the related recurring material and immaterial dimensions and the place that the landscape occupies in it. Then, the investigation will move to the instruments derived from the above-mentioned normative framework, i.e. national planning tools such as urban and landscape plans and existing cultural heritage cataloguing systems. As for the latter, the aim will be to understand which identification and valorization methodologies and tools are in use today. Furthermore, particular attention will be devoted to the identification of participatory methodologies and community engagement strategies adopted by the different instruments analysed. The results derived from this wide analysis will be the foundation for the definition of guidelines and procedures for the participatory assessment of the exposure of the cultural heritage of a target community. Finally, the guidelines will be tested in one or more case -studies, which will be representative of the process developed.

This deliverable examines the first steps of this investigation, providing a preliminary reflection relating to the very concept of cultural heritage.

First, we examined the concept of heritage through its first appearance in the 1964 Charter of Venice up to the UNESCO Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage of 2003. This path will highlight the progressive extension of the range of assets included and protected by these regulations.

Secondly, we focused on the European Landscape Convention of 2000 as the keystone of the legitimation of the landscape as a cultural heritage. The dual value of the landscape will be highlighted both as a theoretical concept and an operational tool, From the theoretical side, in fact, the concept of landscape contributes to the understanding of the relationship between "nature" and culture and, therefore to the conservation of the territorial heritage in its material and immaterial elements, while, from the operational side, landscape can be considered a useful tool in defining risk mitigation strategies.

The last paragraph of the deliverable provides an exhaustive overview of the following stages of the investigation; it clarifies the points that will be addressed as the project progresses and the objectives pursued.

## PART I – INITIAL STEPS IN DEFINING CULTURAL HERITAGE

### 1.1. The evolution of the concept through the International Conventions

Tracing back international resolutions and conventions it is possible to understand how the definition of the concept of cultural heritage has evolved and which are the elements that have shaped its significance. From the sole consideration of cultural heritage intended as a physical object, the concept has englobed oral traditions and digital artefacts. The term “cultural heritage” emerged in conventions and norms to address the inadequacies of previous terminologies. Unlike “cultural property,” which emphasizes ownership, “cultural heritage” encompasses a wider array of cultural expressions and artefacts, both tangible and intangible, and stresses the value of these items to communities and humanity as a whole. This shift reflects a deeper understanding of culture as a living, dynamic process rather than a static collection of objects (Ferrazzi, 2020).

Excluding the Athens Charter (1931)<sup>1</sup>, which treats the conservation of artistic and archaeological heritage, without an explicit definition, the reference to the concept appears in 1964 in the introduction of the Venice Charter, the international charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites<sup>2</sup>, produced during the Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments. This document was intended as a set of guidelines providing an international framework for the conservation and restoration of historic buildings. According to the Venice Charter:

*«The concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event. This applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past which have acquired cultural significance with the passing of time» (Venice Charter, Art.1).*

---

<sup>1</sup> International Museums Office. (1931). The Athens Charter for the restoration of historic monuments. Online source: <https://www.icomos.org/en/167-the-athens-charter-for-the-restoration-of-historic-monuments> (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

<sup>2</sup> International Council on Monuments and Sites. (1964). The Venice Charter: International charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites. Online source: <https://www.icomos.org/en/participer/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/157-thevenice-charter> (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

The issues introduced in this document were to be the object of discussion for the following years (Vecco, 2010) as the concept of “ancient monuments as common heritage” was introduced. The debate was articulated around different topics, mainly focused on conservation and restoration issues. Omitting more technical issues regarding restoration techniques and theory, which are not relevant to the interest of the present research, the discussion engaged on the authenticity and contextual significance of heritage sites. The relationship of monuments and sites to their surrounding environment and context occupied the center of the discourse, including as well the impact of urban development and tourism on heritage sites and the need to preserve not just the structures themselves but also their historical and cultural contexts (ICOMOS, 1976). The group of professionals taking part in the International Congress of 1964, and in the following debate, would later become the founding nucleus of ICOMOS, the International Council on Monuments and Sites, a non-governmental professional organisation, primarily concerned with the philosophy, terminology, methodology and techniques of cultural heritage conservation, especially architectural and archaeological ones, closely linked to UNESCO, to which is the principal adviser on cultural matters related to World Heritage.

Following the Venice Charter, in 1972, the debate on the formal definition of heritage led to the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of World, Cultural and Natural Heritage<sup>3</sup>, a legally binding instrument providing an intergovernmental framework for international cooperation for the identification and conservation of the world's most outstanding natural and cultural properties.

The UNESCO Convention defined heritage as cultural and natural.

According to the art.1, cultural heritage is composed by:

*«Monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science.*

***Groups of buildings:** groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science.*

---

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1972). Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage. Online source: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/> (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

**Sites:** *works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view. »*

while art.2 defines natural heritage as

*«Natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view.*

**Geological and physiographical formations** *and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.*

**Natural sites** *or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty».*

Therefore, a first step in the evolution of the concept is made: heritage, not only as a built manufacture but also as a natural element.

Starting from the 70s, this comprehensive approach to cultural heritage can be traced in many international documents and some interesting concepts started to be associated with the definition of CH. Many documents began to define the importance of historic buildings or monuments not just for their historical value, but also as they embodied the values of tradition. An example of this is the ICOMOS Washington Charter of 1987<sup>4</sup>, the Charter for the conservation of historic towns and urban areas, a document that follows and completes the Venice Charter, introducing the concept of cultural identity and memory of a place. The introduction of the document states that

*«This charter concerns historic urban areas, large and small, including cities, towns and historic centres or quarters, together with their natural and man-made environments. Beyond*

---

<sup>4</sup> ICOMOS, 1987, Washington Charter - charter for the conservation of historic towns and urban areas, Online source: [https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/towns\\_e.pdf](https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/towns_e.pdf) (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

*their role as historical documents, these areas embody the values of traditional urban cultures».*

Hence, heritage is not relevant just for its historical value, but also for its inner characteristic of being representative of the memory of humanity. Together with this concept, another significant article is number 3, where the issue of community engagement is introduced:

*«The participation and the involvement of the residents are essential for the success of the conservation programme and should be encouraged. The conservation of historic towns and urban areas concerns their residents first of all».*

It is evident how the identification and selection of cultural heritage can no longer be founded on the intrinsic quality of the object, but rather on our ability to recognize their aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value. Progressively, the discourse is moving from the conceptualization of cultural heritage not only as tangible but also intangible, and therefore, is not anymore closely connected to the physical consistency of the element (Vecco, 2010). Heritage should reflect the values of society, meaning tangible heritage can only be fully appreciated through the lens of intangible one, which encompasses the values and practices of a culture (Munjeri, 2004).

A milestone in recognizing the importance of intangible heritage was the 2003 UNESCO Convention of the Intangible Cultural Heritage<sup>5</sup>. In the Convention, intangible cultural heritage is defined as

*«Means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus*

---

<sup>5</sup> United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2003), Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Online source: <https://ich.unesco.org/convention> (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

*promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development».*

Moreover, the convention gives a list of domains in which the Intangible Cultural Heritage is manifested (art. 2.2):

- oral traditions and expression, including languages as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage.
- performing arts.
- social practices, rituals and festivals.
- knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe.
- traditional craftsmanship

Not only intangible heritage was defined in 2003, but also digital. Indeed, it was in the same year that the Charter on the Preservation of the Digital Heritage<sup>6</sup> was adopted. The documents stated that

*«Digital heritage consists of unique resources of human knowledge and expression. It embraces cultural, educational, scientific and administrative resources, as well as technical, legal, medical and other kinds of information created digitally, or converted into digital form from existing analogue resources. Where resources as “born digital” there is no other form but the digital object».*

A list of what is considered digital heritage is presented: texts, databases, still and moving images, audio, graphics, software and web pages, in a various range of formats.

In conclusion, observing the international documentation that followed over the year, it is possible to define the process of extension of the concept of heritage, that leads to the mainstream

---

<sup>6</sup> United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2003), Charter on the preservation of Digital Heritage. Online source: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000179529> (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

definition adopted today. First of all, there was a typological and thematic extension of elements belonging to heritage: the monument is not considered alone anymore, but rather it is placed in a meaningful context, which is part of an integral approach through heritage. At the same type, the selecting criteria of cultural heritage has changed. If initially only historical and artistic values were taken into consideration, now cultural, identity and memorial value are included as well. This inevitably led to the separation of the physical element to the concept of heritage, opening the way to the recognition of intangible and digital heritage.

## HERITAGE

---

### TANGIBLE

1972 - *Unesco Convention on the Protection of world, Cultural and Natural Heritage*

#### CULTURAL HERITAGE

Monuments, groups of buildings and sites with outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science

#### NATURAL HERITAGE

- physical, biological formations or natural areas of aesthetic or scientific value
- habitat of threatened species of animals and plants

### INTANGIBLE

2003 - *UNESCO Convention of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*

- oral traditions and expression;
- performing arts;
- social practices, rituals and festivals;
- knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe;
- traditional craftsmanship.

### DIGITAL

2003 - *UNESCO Charter on the Preservation of the Digital Heritage*

- texts;
  - databases;
  - still and moving images;
  - audio;
  - graphics;
  - software and web pages.
- 

*Figure 1: Cultural Heritage classification according to the UNESCO Conventions*

## 1.2.Landscape as “complex cultural heritage”

### From Traditional studies...

In recent decades, cultural heritage has emerged as a driving force in territorial planning and valorisation processes, linked as well to protection and sustainable development. This concept encompasses a wide range of assets and meanings that have given rise to an intense scientific debate and a vast reference literature within which a prominent place is reserved for the landscape (Graham, Ashworth, Tunbridge, 2016). Within this framework, we cannot fail to consider the landscape and its role within the processes of patrimonialisation of cultural and historical heritage. To reflect on these issues, we have set ourselves the goal of following the debate animating the field of geographical-historical studies (also by including it in the international conventions mentioned in the previous paragraph) in order to understand:

1. the evolution of the landscape concept.
2. its affirmation in the field of territorial sciences as a determining factor in the identity of a given community and a driver of sustainable planning and risk mitigation.
3. its potential cognitive value in the service of strategies to increase community resilience.

Landscape is a word with a complex meaning. Most commonly, the term ‘landscape’ is associated with the idea of a ‘perceived image of a section of the earth's surface’, i.e. a visual representation of concrete geographical reality, interpreted in such a way as to provoke an emotional reaction. This definition reduces landscape to being almost synonymous with ‘panorama’, referring back to the pictorial tradition (Baldeschi, 2011, pp. 9-36).

The concept has a long duration on which it is not possible to dwell. Alongside all the variants of landscape as aestheticised nature or as the projection of art onto nature, another concept emerged in the 19th century: the concept of the geographical landscape, which is considered no longer a representation of nature but a scientific interpretation of material reality. Thus, a separation begins to emerge between landscape as an aesthetic fact and geographical landscape. The latter is anchored, especially during the second half of the 19th century, on two cognitive paradigms, geographical determinism and possibilism; paradigms through which a different relationship between nature-environment-society is expressed and constructed according to the different degree of ‘freedom’ or operativity of human action for natural reality. These theories - of which we only recall some of the best known exponents: Alexander Von Humboldt, Friedrich Ratzel, Vidal de la Blache, Renato Biasutti, Aldo Sestini - have guided modern Western science well beyond the threshold of the 20th century, fuelling a dualistic view of the power relations between human action and the action of nature

and an ambivalent concept of landscape divided between ‘sensitive landscape’, perceived by the observer and aesthetically connoted, and ‘scientific landscape’, studied, described and classified on the basis of its visible forms. It was only during the course of the second half of the 20th century that the idea of the landscape as an ‘artefact’ and ‘palimpsest’ gradually asserted itself, i.e. an approach that studies the landscape from a socio-historical point of view, as the outcome of economic and productive relations<sup>7</sup>.

We pause briefly on this moment because it is a fundamental epistemological turning point for the path that has led today to the recognition of landscape as heritage. The protagonist of this innovative interpretation is Lucio Gambi, to whom we also owe the first reflections on the protection of the cultural and landscape heritage in Emilia Romagna, participating in the founding of the Institute of Artistic, Cultural and Natural Heritage of the Region and in the reflections on the landscape plans established by the Galasso Law of 1986 (Gambi, 1986).

For Gambi, the landscape originates within and from the territory, its rules, its variable organisation over time, and the relationships between the natural and human spheres:

*«lo spazio non come entità (dirò così) astratta e pura, e neanche come area di terra o di mare, o pezzo della crosta della Terra che accoglie su di sé l'uomo, non la regione che nella definizione di Ratzel è «pezzo di terra e di umanità»; ma spazio che assume una dignità di potenza storica, continuamente diversa, perché l'uomo ci vive e ci opera, e quindi lo fa suo e gli dà valori continuamente nuovi»* (Gambi, 1964)<sup>8</sup>.

Gambi's humanist conception, taken up by the historian Emilio Sereno, places the concept of value at the centre. Gambi sees space itself not as an abstract entity but as a historical one, constantly changing because man lives and works in space itself, thus making it his own and continually attributing new values to it. Landscape is ‘a palimpsest’, an operational tool for ‘visualising history’ (Lanzani, 2008; Quaini, 2008).

---

<sup>7</sup> A vast literature exists on the history of the concept of landscape. We refer mainly to: Besse, 2000; Farinelli, 1982; Zerbi, 1993.

<sup>8</sup> “space not as an (I will say) abstract and pure entity, and not even as an area of land or sea, or piece of the Earth's crust that accommodates mankind, not the region that in Ratzel's definition is ‘piece of land and humanity’; but space that takes on a dignity of historical power, continually different, because man lives and works in it, and therefore makes it his own and gives it continually new values”.

Gambi's concept would be taken up, reworked and renewed over the following decades. Here are three short quotations that show the evolution of the concept and its affirmation as a cultural asset:

*«Il paesaggio nasce dal territorio: da quello prende forma ed è una realtà indiscutibile, sia quando lo si considera oggettivamente in sé, sia quando lo si filtra culturalmente o sentimentalmente in una interpretazione artistica figurativa o in moduli letterari. Su questa base, può e deve essere studiato, come una sorta di memoria in cui si registra e si sintetizza la storia dei disegni territoriali degli uomini» (Quaini, 1998, p. 191)<sup>9</sup>.*

*«Il paesaggio è bene culturale complesso e il principale fattore di complessificazione è dato proprio dal tempo: il paesaggio, infatti, è tante storie contemporaneamente, è un sistema che si compone ad ogni momento della storia di elementi che appartengono geneticamente a più processi di territorializzazione, quindi a più sistemi territoriali che la storia ha prodotto, trasformato, alterato, destrutturato in quanto sistemi, trasmettendone però alcune componenti: che, pur avendo mutato talvolta significato e funzione, si ricompongono in un nuovo sistema, ristabilendo altri legami con altri oggetti all'interno di nuovi processi di territorializzazione. Il paesaggio è il contesto storico-geografico entro cui il singolo oggetto assume significato, un significato dunque che è storico e pertanto non universale» (Sereni, 2001, pp. 130 e 134-135)<sup>10</sup>*

---

<sup>9</sup> “The landscape is born from the territory: it takes shape from that and is an indisputable reality, both when considered objectively in itself and when filtered culturally or sentimentally in a figurative artistic interpretation or in literary modules. On this basis, it can and must be studied, as a kind of memory in which the history of the territorial designs of men is recorded and synthesised”.

<sup>10</sup> “The landscape is a complex cultural asset, and the main factor of complexification is precisely time: the landscape, in fact, is many stories at once, it is a system that is composed at every moment in history of elements that genetically belong to several processes of territorialisation, hence to several territorial systems that history has produced, transformed, altered, destructured as systems, while transmitting some of their components: which, although they have sometimes changed in meaning and function, are recomposed in a new system, re-establishing other links with other objects within new processes of territorialisation. Landscape is the historical-geographical context within which the individual object takes on meaning, a meaning therefore that is historical and therefore not universal”.

Today, the landscape is fully recognised as a ‘complex cultural asset’, the complexity of which is given precisely by time, by the historicity encapsulated in its signs and to which we attribute a value of identity, memory and ecosystem service providers.

*... to the European Landscape Convention*

The landscape is a ‘historical product’, a complex of stratifications to be deciphered and through which to learn about and understand the dynamics and transformations of territorial structures that have settled and overlapped. It is possible to think of today's landscape as the product of the combination of different evolutionary processes, of the territorialising acts performed, over time, by the action of human communities as different ways of creating and ‘using’ the territory (Turco, 2014).

Through a methodology that can be derived from the geo-historical and territorialist approach, it is possible to obtain a cognitive base and a holistic framework of information. This methodology is created following a dynamic reading of the landscape at integrated scales and sources and is capable of proposing a medium-long-term critical reflection on the practices implemented by communities in the management and care of their living space. Moreover, it allows the reconstruction of the historical memory of a place, thus participating in today's debate on the definition of historical-environmental heritage and participatory planning processes (Masotti, 2017).

This path is completed with the conception of the European Landscape Convention<sup>11</sup> that Europe approved in Florence in 2000 and that legally legitimises not only on a theoretical but also on an international normative level the role of landscape. The Convention deserves a full reading. Here we offer some of the most significant excerpts concerning the recognition of the landscape as heritage, i.e. as a ‘reserve’ of cultural and environmental values.

The importance of the European Convention lies in several aspects that can be deduced from the preamble and the articles of which it is composed:

*«The landscape contributes to the formation of local cultures and that it is a basic component of the European natural and cultural heritage, contributing to human well-being and consolidation of the European identity» (preamble)*

---

<sup>11</sup> Online Source: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list?module=treaty-detail&treatynum=176> (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

*«Landscape" means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors» (art. 1)*

These first excerpts bear witness to the holistic definition that this regulatory source assigns to landscape conceived not only from an ecological point of view but involving anthropic aspects (historical, cultural, economic, social, etc.), as well as intangible characteristics derived from perception. It is both something tangible and a source of feelings and emotions, entering fully into the range of indicators to be considered when assessing the well-being of a population.

A reading of the Convention reveals the social dimension of landscape, which becomes the condition for its participatory and political function. Article 5 (general measures) states:

*«Each Party undertakes:*

- a) to recognise landscapes in law as an essential component of people's surroundings, an expression of the diversity of their shared cultural and natural heritage, and a foundation of their identity.*
- b) to establish and implement landscape policies aimed at landscape protection, management and planning through the adoption of the specific measures set out in Article 6.*
- c) to establish procedures for the participation of the general public, local and regional authorities, and other parties with an interest in the definition and implementation of the landscape policies mentioned in paragraph b above.*
- d) to integrate landscape into its regional and town planning policies and in its cultural, environmental, agricultural, social and economic policies, as well as in any other policies with possible direct or indirect impact on landscape» (art. 5).*

In conclusion, we can say that the European Landscape Convention is a regulatory source that has prompted a renewed interest in the landscape over the last twenty years. This concept, as we will be able to investigate as the project progresses, is guiding reflections on new regulations and integrated planning actions aimed at awareness and care of the fragility of the cultural heritage of which the landscape is a predominant part. In fact, the Convention prescribes the creation of Landscape Observatories on a national, regional and local scale as identification, monitoring and design tools through which to encourage participatory planning measures.

Our aim is to investigate and contribute to the proposal/creation of:

*«un approccio circolare e non lineare e segmentato come quello organizzato da pratiche di governo che a scala nazionale e regionale continuano a tenere separati il discorso sulle pratiche ambientali e sul paesaggio dal discorso sull'organizzazione e manutenzione del territorio e del patrimonio storico-artistico» (Quaini, 2014, p. 17).*

(a circular and not linear and segmented approach as organised by government practices that at national and regional scales continue to keep the discourse on environmental practices and landscape separate from the discourse on the organisation and maintenance of the territory and historical-artistic heritage)

## PART II – FROM CONCEPTION TO COMPLETION: THE EVOLUTION OF THE INVESTIGATION

### 2 Methods and evolution of the investigation

In this first chapter, it was demonstrated how the concept of Cultural Heritage, with or without qualifiers (such as cultural, national, regional, natural, etc.), has become a key term used to encompass an increasingly broad spectrum of assets. Heritage, as we have observed through the stages of the above-mentioned international conventions, includes almost everything inherited from past generations that we should preserve for the benefit of future generations: material culture (monuments, works of art, books, archives, collections, etc.), landscapes and biodiversity, and intangible culture (folklore, traditions, etc.). This broad range of “objects” (and their meanings) has given rise to an intense scientific debate concerning the processes of patrimonialization (Graham, Ashworth, Tunbridge, 2016; Harrison, 2020; Waterton, Watson, 2015). This debate will form the theoretical framework within which we will operate and continue to explore as the project progresses.

Starting from this preliminary theoretical framework, the key concepts identified will be developed through further investigation. The critical analysis that will continue in the coming months will integrate the study of the literature with an investigation focused on two main areas: planning tools (Urban Master plans and Regional landscape plans) and the Catalogues and Observatories dedicated to cultural and landscape heritage (Mibact, UNESCO, Historic Rural Landscapes, Landscape Observatories).

The investigation will be conducted with a dual purpose: to reflect on the methodologies and tools currently adopted for the identification, protection, and preservation of cultural and landscape heritage; and to identify the potential presence of community engagement strategies and analyse the methodologies for implementing participatory planning processes.

As for the planning tools, we will examine the impact of the conventions presented in paragraph 2, particularly the 2004 Code of Cultural and Landscape Heritage. Based on this normative source, we will investigate the territorial planning tools in which these regulations are (or not) specifically applied. We will review urban plans and Regional Landscape Plans, analysing the knowledge territorial frameworks to identify the role and interpretations of cultural heritage in relation to these instruments. Particular attention will be given to the issue of community participation. In the field of urban and territorial planning, community participation in decision-making processes has been established since the late 1990s, contributing to the development of

numerous methods and tools that can provide valuable insights for this study<sup>12</sup>. The objective of this phase will be focused both on the identification of criteria for cultural heritage definition, including in the process community engagement, and on the analysis of methods through which cultural heritage can become a tool for project development and risk reduction

As for the catalogues, the following will primarily be taken into consideration:

- *Catalogo generale dei beni culturali*<sup>13</sup> (Italian Cultural Heritage General Catalogue): it is the official institutional database of Italian Cultural Heritage, managed by ICCD (Institute of the General Catalogue and Documentation) within the MIC - Italian Ministry of Culture.
- UNESCO Catalogues: the *World Heritage Online Map Platform* (WHOMP)<sup>14</sup>, online GIS monitoring tool for World Heritage, linked to existing UNESCO databases, and the *UNESCO List of Intangible Cultural Heritage*<sup>15</sup>, an annually updated list of intangible CH, categorized based on different topic (Region, country, type, year...);
- *Catalogo dei Paesaggi rurali storici*<sup>16</sup> (Historical rural landscape catalogue): it is an initiative promoted by the MIPAAF- Ministero delle Politiche Agricole, Alimentari e Forestali (Italian Ministry of Agriculture, food and forestry policies ) since 2010 and from which derives the national register of historic rural landscapes (defined through the three criteria of significance, integrity and vulnerability) and the National Observatory of Rural Landscape, Agricultural Practices and Traditional Knowledge.

As for the observatories, we will focus on a survey of Landscape Observatories and the projects and initiatives carried out by the most active institutions and agencies, as well as the role they play in promoting the involvement and awareness of the population in the management and protection of their living space from a participatory planning perspective. As already introduced in the paragraph above, while addressing the landscape as a driver for sustainable development, the European Landscape Convention introduces the creation of the Landscape Observatories. They

---

<sup>12</sup> A vast literature exists on the topic. We refer mainly to: Crosta and Davidoff, 1983; Balducci 1995; Balducci 1996

<sup>13</sup> Online source: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/wh-gis/> (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

<sup>14</sup> Online source: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists> (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

<sup>15</sup> Online source: <https://www.reterurale.it/registropaesaggi> (Last Access: 01/06/2024)

<sup>16</sup> Today called *MASAF - Ministero dell'agricoltura, della sovranità alimentare e delle foreste* (Ministry of Agriculture, Food Sovereignty and Forestry)

become a monitoring instrument for territorial transformation and social-historical values landscape education.

The emphasis we place on landscape heritage derives from the role of the landscape as a bridge between environmental sciences and social and human sciences. For this reason, it acquires a prominent historical-environmental value both in the national and international theoretical debate and in territorial planning actions, also from the perspective of risk prevention, prediction, and mitigation (Antrop, 2005; Carallo, Dossche, Epifani, Matarazzo, Pierucci, 2022; Ceretti, Pierucci, 2021; De Lucia, 2023).

The analysis of planning instruments, catalogues and monitoring tools for cultural and landscape heritage aims to:

- Understand the different study methodologies.
- Analyse the proposed documentation and the categories in use.
- Examine the forms and methods of participation and community engagement provided.

The final objective of this phase of the investigation is to identify a holistic methodology for evaluating Cultural Heritage, which includes communities in the definition processes, as they are key actors in the historical and social dynamics that shape heritage and landscape. This will aim to improve multi-risk assessments, thereby facilitating the creation of comprehensive risk scenarios that can then be used as a common knowledge framework for integrating different planning tools, including urban, territorial, and civil protection planning.

The final activity of the project will be the empirical application of the theoretical analysis, through the identification of one (or more) case studies in which to test the developed methodology. Criteria for identifying the case studies will be determined based on the analyses conducted in the first stages of the work. These must necessarily take into account the demographic and social characteristics of the selected communities, as well as the relevance of the territorial context. Furthermore, it will be important to assess the availability of the local administration and the various participating stakeholders to engage in the process. The wish is for the fostering of a virtuous process of active citizenship and the adoption of a proactive care attitude towards heritage, also through the geographical-historical study of practices introduced by communities in managing their living spaces and past environmental disruptions. This study constitutes a crucial moment in raising awareness of the fragility of every territory (Magnaghi, 2010).

The expected outcome is to offer a contribution that is not only theoretical but also practical, which can participate in defining methodologies for integrating various instruments for territorial governance and protection, valuing intangible assets and Cultural Heritage exposure for multi-risk assessment. To this end, the outcome of the work will be tested in several case studies to improve this tool and verify its applicability.

## References

Antrop M. (2005), Why Landscapes of the Past are Important for the Future, «Landscape and Urban Planning», 70, pp. 21-34.

Arpin R. et alii (2000), Notre Patrimoine, un Présent du Passé, Québec, Groupe-conseil sur la politique du patrimoine culturel du Québec.

Baldeschi P. (2011), Paesaggio e territorio, Firenze, Le Lettere.

Balducci A. (1995), Progettazione partecipata tra tradizione e innovazione, «Urbanistica», 103, pp. 113-117.

Balducci A. (1996), L'urbanistica partecipata, «Territorio», 2, pp. 17-20.

Besse J.-M. (2000), Voir la terre. Six essais sur le paysage et la géographie, Parigi, Actes Sud/ENSP Centre du paysage.

Carallo S., Dossche R., Epifani F., Matarazzo N., Pierucci G. (2022), Geo-pratiche per la cura dei territori. Strumenti di mitigazione, prevenzione e gestione per comunità resilienti, Roma, Società Geografia Italiana.

Castiglioni B. (2010), Educare al Paesaggio, traduzione Italiana del report Education an Landscape for Children, Consiglio d'Europa, Museo di Storia Naturale e Archeologia di Montebelluna (TV), [http://www.italianostraeducazione.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/003\\_Castiglioni\\_Educare-al-Paesaggio.pdf](http://www.italianostraeducazione.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/003_Castiglioni_Educare-al-Paesaggio.pdf).

Ceretti C., Pierucci G. (a cura di) (2021), Mitigazione del rischio ambientale: lettura geostoriche e governance territoriale, «Geotema», anno XXV Supplemento.

Cerutti S., Grumo R., Pioletti A. M. (2021), Visioni strategiche, creative e sostenibili per il patrimonio culturale. Un mosaico di esperienze, Atti del XXXIII Congresso Geografico Italiano «Geografie in movimento» (Padova, 8-13 settembre 2021), Roma, Cleup, vol. 2, pp. 333-338.

Cevasco R. (2007), Memoria verde. Nuovi spazi per la geografia, Reggio Emilia, Diabasis.

Crosta P. L., Davidoff P. (1983), L'urbanista di parte. Ruolo sociale del tecnico e partecipazione popolare nei processi di pianificazione urbana, Milano, Franco Angeli.

Colavitti A.M., Serra S., Usai A. (2018), Locus amoenus: Pianificare il patrimonio culturale per una nuova geografia dello sviluppo, Firenze, Altralinea edizioni.

D'Antone C. (2008), La tutela del paesaggio. Il quadro normativo nazionale: dalla Costituzione al Codice Urbani, in Pazzagli R. (a cura di), Il paesaggio della Toscana tra storia e tutela, Pisa, ETS, pp. 149-158.

De Lucia G. (a cura di) (2023), Patrimonio culturale e rischio. Storia, analisi e prevenzione di un patrimonio resiliente, Milano, CittaStudi Edizioni.

De Marchi B. (2015), Risk Governance and the Integration of Different Types of Knowledge, in U. Fra.Paleo (a cura di), Risk Governance, Springer Netherlands, (pp. 149–165 [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9328-5\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9328-5_9)

Dematteis G., Magnaghi A. (2018), Patrimonio territoriale e coraltà produttiva: nuove frontiere per i sistemi economici locali, «Scienze del Territorio», 6, pp. 12-25.

Farinelli F (1982), Storia del concetto geografico di paesaggio, in Aa.Vv., Paesaggio: immagine e realtà, Milano, Electa, pp. 151-158.

Ferrazzi S., (2020), The Notion of “Cultural Heritage” in the International Field: Behind Origin and Evolution of a Concept, «The International Journal for the Semiotics of Law», 34, pp. 743–768 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-020-09739-0>

Gaillard J. C., Mercer J. (2012), From knowledge to action: Bridging gaps in disaster risk reduction, Progress in Human Geography, 37, pp. 93–114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132512446717>

Gambi L. (1964), Geografia fisica e geografia umana di fronte ai concetti di valore, in Id., Questioni di geografia, Napoli, Edizioni scientifiche Italiane, pp. 15-50.

Gambi L. (1973) , Una geografia per la storia, Torino, Einaudi.

Gambi L. (1986), La costruzione dei piani paesistici, «Urbanistica», 85, pp. 102-105.

Graham B., Ashworth G., Tunbridge J. (2016), A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy, Londra, New York, Routledge.

Grumo R. (2019), Il paesaggio come produzione sociale e la condivisione negli strumenti di pianificazione. Il Piano Urbanistico Generale (PUG) di Bari, «Placetelling. Collana di Studi Geografici sui luoghi e sulle loro rappresentazioni», 2, pp. 67-78.

Guarducci A., Rombai L. (2017), Paesaggio e territorio, il possibile contributo della geografia. Concetti e metodi, «Scienze del Territorio», 5 (Storia del Territorio), pp. 19-25.

Harrison R. (2020), *Heritage Futures: Comparative Approaches to Natural and Cultural Heritage Practices*, Londra, UCL Press.

ICOMOS (1976), *Venice Charter under review by ICOMOS*, ICOMOS Newsletter, 8, Paris.

ICOMOS (1987), *Washington Charter - charter for the conservation of historic towns and urban areas*.

International Museums Office (1931), *The Athens Charter for the restoration of historic monuments*.

International Council on Monuments and Sites (1964), *The Venice Charter: International charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites*.

International Museums Office (1931), *The Athens Charter for the restoration of historic monuments*.

Lanzani A. (2008), *Paesaggio e pianificazione nella riflessione di Gambi e nelle più recenti pratiche di governo del territorio*, «Quaderni storici», XLIII, 127/1, pp. 111-154.

Magnaghi A. (2000), *Progetto locale*, Torino, Bollati Boringhieri.

Masotti L. (2017), *Raffigurare lo spazio, governare il territorio. Percorsi di ricerca geostorica per la mitigazione del rischio ambientale*, Bologna, Patròn Editore.

Munjeri, D. (2004). *Tangible and Intangible Heritage: from difference to convergence*, «Museum International», 56(1-2), pp. 12–20. doi:10.1111/j.1350-0775.2004.00453.x

Quaini M. (2008), *Premessa*, «Quaderni storici», XLIII, 127/1, pp. 3-14.

Quaini M. (a cura di) (2009), *I paesaggi italiani. Fra nostalgia e trasformazione*, Roma, Società Geografica Italiana.

Quaini M. (2014), *Nello spirito della Convenzione Europea: una rete di Osservatori locali del paesaggio per creare cittadinanza attiva*, in Quaini M., Gemignani C. A. (a cura di), *Cantiere Paesaggio. Materiali per la costituzione degli Osservatori locali*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, pp. 9-33.

Salgaro S. (2021), *La gestione del rischio: l'apporto della lettura geo-storica*, in Cerreti C., Pierucci G. (a cura di), *Mitigazione del rischio ambientale: letture geostoriche e governance territoriale*, «Geotema», pp. 5-15.

Sereno P. (2001), *Il paesaggio bene culturale complesso*, in Maria Mautone (a cura di), *I beni culturali. Risorse per l'organizzazione del territorio*, Bologna, Patròn, pp. 129-138.

Settis S. (2010), *Paesaggio Costituzione cemento. La battaglia per l'ambiente contro il degrado civile*, Torino, Einaudi.

Turco A. (a cura di) (2014), *Paesaggio, luogo, ambiente. La configuratività territoriale come bene comune*, Milano, Unicopli.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (1972), *Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage*.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2003), *Charter on the preservation of Digital Heritage*.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2003), *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*.

Vecco M., (2010), *A definition of cultural heritage: From the tangible to the intangible*, «*Journal of Cultural Heritage*», 11, pp. 321–324.

Vecvagars (2006), *Valuing damage and losses in cultural assets after a disaster: concept paper and research options*, United Nation Publication-Cepal, 2006.

Yahaya A. (2006), *The Scope and Definitions of Heritage: From Tangible to Intangible*, «*International Journal of Heritage Studies*», 12/3, pp. 292-300.

Waterton E., Watson S. *Heritage as a Focus of Research: Past, Present and New Directions*, in E. Waterton e S. Watson (a cura di) (2015), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, Londra, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-17.

Zerbi M. C. (1993), *Paesaggi della geografia*, Torino, Giappichelli.