Partnership as a Strategy to Achieve Optimal Participatory Governance and Risk Mitigation (of Cultural and Natural Heritage)

Kocovic, Milica
Institute of Economic Sciences
Belgrade, Serbia
milica.kocovic@ien.bg.ac.rs[*]

Djukic, Vesna
Faculty of Drama Arts
Belgrade, Serbia
djukic.vesna@gmail.com[♦]

Abstract

In addition to the scientific public this paper may be of interest also to wider public, professionals, and all potential initiators of changes. The term *participatory governance* may be interpreted as a process that allows shared responsibility of management models, wherein the responsibility is shared and decisions are taken by communities rather than by individuals. It is already wide spread trend to participate in community values by different sector actors, and various forms partnerships.

In this paper, in addition to relevant institutions (cultural institutions, tourism organizations, civil organizations, NGOs, public companies such as the National Parks), we propose possible alternative ways of integrative management and PG. We emphasized the importance of local community involvement (thru ecocultural tourism, and other ways of participation by creation of new jobs), but also private sector (such as insurance companies, infrastructure etc.) in the managing and important questions about natural and cultural heritage. The cultural, touristic, heritage, natural issues, should be treated interdisciplinary and by multisectoral approach.

Keywords: partnership; participatory governance; heritage; new system solutions; risk management

Introduction

In light of global changes, financial challenges, and all known problems faced by transitional and developing societies, responsibility is not just on traditional organizational structures to pursue objectives of general interest with aim to protect, manage and valorize cultural and natural heritage. The contemporary world is characterized by extremely fast development and experiencing and consequential structural changes which have high impact on societies, economics, governments and public administration (Farazmand, 2004, 2009). In order to achieve new suggested Millennium development Goals[79] set globally, every actor on local level should have on mind those challenges and think of strategies to deal with them. The main idea of all mentioned goals is determined as communion of common concerns. While much has been written in recent years separately about those topics, there is a plenty of practical and scientific space to develop and connect

---

[*]   Milica Kocovic, *associate researcher at Institute of Economic sciences, this paper will be part of macro project : no. 17901 and no. 47009 Ministry of Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.*

[♦]   Vesna Djukic, *full professor on Faculty of Drama* Arts on Cultural Policy and Cultural tourism.

[79]   By the UN: The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015, main goals: 1.Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; 2. Achieve universal primary education; 3. Promote gender equality and empower women; 4. Reduce child mortality; 5. Improve maternal health; 6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; 7. Ensure environmental sustainability; 8. Develop a global partnership for development;

the fields, in order to adequately address the question of the common goods/challenges.

Our main research questions:

i. How to create a new system solution (for use, managing, conservation and risk mitigation of cultural and natural heritage, creation of new touristic products and local integration)?

ii. Is participatory governance model that should be applied in order to achieve sustainable development of national parks and its heritage?

iii. What type of (new) management model and/or partnership we are suggesting?

iv. What type of integrated governance is preferred with aim to increase synergy and involvement of the stakeholders at the local level?

v. How to minimize *transitional disease* (sluggish bureaucracy and lazy administration; unemployment, poverty, corruption etc.).

Our recommendations are encouraged by many previous relevant papers, cases, and on the example of the National Park *Djerdap* (accompanying cultural and natural heritage) in Serbia, with respect to the previous scientific and professional literature relevant to the topic.

1. Theoretical review of participatory governance and partnership strategy

Participatory governance (PG) occurs as a response to the problems that characterize transitional societies in developing countries. The way in which PG provides its positive impacts on vulnerable societies shocks is through the: higher transparency, active multisectoral cooperation, fair distribution and greater inclusion of local people. There are four forms that characterize developing countries in the sense of institutional changes: decentralisation - viz. deconcentration, delegation, devolution, and privatisation/partnership (Rondinelli & Nellis 1986; Rondinelli *et al*.1987; Blair 1995, 1998; Osmani 2000). The idea of PG is defined as a strategic and interactive people-centred process of seeking the active involvement of relevant stakeholders in the framework of public action — i.e. public authorities and bodies, private actors, civil society organisations, NGOs, the volunteering sector and interested people — in decision-making, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of cultural heritage policies and programmes, to increase accountability and transparency of public resource investments as well as to build public trust in policy decisions. (EENC, 2015) Thus, PG is the way to achieve greater equity, through decentralization of power, management, decision-making and accountability. Grounded in the theory of participatory democracy more generally, it offers a theory and practices of public engagement through deliberative processes (Fischer, 2010). The modernly social discourses and repetitive crises have highlighted the problems and state failure in resolving them (Farazmand 2004; Carment 2003; Patrick 2007; Call 2011; Asaduzzaman *et al*. 2015). Those diagnosed challenges led to the urgent need of creating stronger and more efficient partnerships between stakeholders in order to resolve newly emerging communities challenges in relation to disaster management, climate change adaptation, global health issues including HIV/AIDS, widespread structural poverty, corruption and terrorism (Farazmand 2009; Fukuyama 2004; Young *et al*. 2012; Frantzeskaki *et al*. 2013; Sami *et al.* 2002; Mert 2009; Kolk *et al*. 2008; Bontenbal 2009; Nisar 2012; Nayarko 2011; Ramiah & Reich 2006; Bantham *et al*. 2003; Morsink *et al*. 2011; Buseand, Harmer 2007; Asaduzzaman *et al*. 2015). In short PG is a way of ensuring factual democracy. Community-based organizations (CBOs), local governments, and deconcentrated sectoral agencies, as well as private organizations such as NGOs and firms, should be linked more coherently in order to support improved empowerment, governance, service provision, and private sector growth. A spatially framed approach, which links such local organizations through their respective roles and relationships at local government and community levels, promises to improve coordination, synergy, efficiency, and responsiveness in local development processes (Helling *et al.*, 2005). Helling also mentioned four core elements to achieve participatory governance: empowerment, local

governance, service provision, and private sector growth ; three enabling elements a favorable policy; institutional environment, capacity enhancement, and resource transfers (Helling *et al.*, 2005).

PG as we see it, as a means is the system solution to meet the goals. Our goals of this paper are presented at research questions, but it is also applicable in other examples. And partnership is a strategy that assumes connection of public, private and NGO sector, without which it is impossible to encircle socio-cultural cycles and achieve above mentioned goals (Djukic, 2010) .

Partnership could be seen as a legal form of business operation between two or more individuals who share management and profits.[80] It is almost any kind of relationship between individuals and groups (Harriss, 2000), who shares responsibility, power and achievements (Farazmand, 2004), interests and aspirations (Binagwa, 2005). Partnerships are flexibly, but at the same time forcefully, because they create stronger link between stakeholders which leads to synergies with more likely to achieve desired goals. It also contributes to creativity, involvement, the quality of positive governance and, service delivery, administration, political support as well as stability among governments, citizens, the private sector, and NGOs (Farazmand, 2004). Local government approaches are created with the aim to strengthen democratic values and create stronger nets between local governments, state agencies and civil society institutions with intent to achieve sustainable and dynamic development. There are also few prospective how we should look on the strategic options of integration. We see linking strategy (read partnership) as a basic support of integration management. From a theoretical point of view linking strategy is often implemented to facilitate provision of financial resources and better international acceptance and recognition of participants. From the perspective of cultural management, this strategy is primarily related to productions; from the standpoint of cultural policies it implies a partnership of public, private and NGO sector (Djukic, 2010) . Thus, this strategy from the standpoint of any public policy, is being implemented in order to facilitate financing (which is a very critical point when we talk about issues related to: culture, heritage, ecology, tourism, traditional crafts, social entrepreneurships, as well as an integrated activity of those different departments). Local government scale is likely to be more appropriate for strategic planning and decision making linked to medium-term, crosssectoral resource allocation and promotion of local economic development (Helling *et al.*, 2005).

About mentioned there are world recognized approaches of participatory budgeting, intergovernmental systems, and local governance. Effective and efficient world pioneer programs have helped with the acceptance of the idea of participatory governance[81]. Also parts of this paper related to cultural and natural heritage will be supplemented with concrete examples relating to participatory management culture/cultural/natural heritage, mostly European cases.

Participatory governance and partnership have been recognized and applied by various international organizations such as the World Bank, UNDP , UNESCO, the US Agency for International Development, U.N. Habitat, European Union etc.

It is very well known that adopting more integrative management at local level, is not simple task at all. Realization of desired outcomes assumes strengthened institutions at the local level. This applies particularly to the less privileged regions, far from the big cities. To effectively integrate local development processes Helling pointed to some challenges that should include:

i. changing attitudes and practices in the public sector and civil society;

ii. managing complex processes involving both governmental and non-governmental actors at several levels;

iii. surmounting institutional boundaries among sector, local government, and community-based

---

[80] Internet source: *Entrepreneuer online magasin*.
[81] Such as: India, Brazil, Mexico, Spain, UK, Norway, and many more African, Asian countries. also parts of this paper related to cultural and natural heritage will be supplemented with concrete examples relating to participatory management culture / cultural / natural heritage.

organizations;

iv. and realigning relations of power to favor local actors rather than national actors, and communities and civil society rather than public officials.

Authors also suggests that more integrated approach could be achieved easier with respect of diagnostic methodologies that should be applied for linking sectoral, local government, and community support approaches; context-relevant prescriptions for adapting institutional arrangements to local conditions; and systematic methods for coordinating across sectors and levels (Helling *et al.*, 2005). There are also few prospective how we should consider strategic options of integration. We see linking/networking strategy (read partnership) as a basic support of integration management. From a theoretical point of view linking strategy is often implemented to facilitate provision of financial resources and better international acceptance and recognition of participants. From the perspective of cultural management, integration strategy is primarily related to productions, from the standpoint of cultural policies it implies a partnership of public, private and NGO sector (Djukic, 2010). Thus, this strategy from the standpoint of any public policy, is being implemented in order to facilitate financing (which is a very critical point when we talk about issues related to: culture, heritage, ecology, tourism, traditional crafts, social entrepreneurships, as well as an integrated activity of those different departments). In the paper, we propose a new system solution for the specific example of NP Djerdap. New system solution represent all the solutions that the system does not know, based on the forecast of the future situations (Djukic, 2010).

Favorable environment for the local initiative and pluralism is created by involving local population and building human and social capacities. More effective collaboration between public sector and nongovernmental organizations, more responsive and legitimate forms of social capital, better performing organizations, and individuals more capable of working together to solve problems also enhance the capacity for local development (Helling *et al.*, 2005). Economic security of the poor as an integral part of the drive towards decentralization, because an economically insecure group of people can hardly be expected to express other needs. Before raising the awareness and spreading state of mind on importance of managing cultural issues at local level of chosen community, basic needs from elementary Maslow scale must be satisfied. NGOs and civil organizations have been recognized by role and successfully addressing the influence and points to the issue of poverty.

Better integration could be achieved also by focus on social capital, strengthening civil society and organizations, by timely provided technical assistance, capacity building, and networking all the sectors by official documents, common development strategies and market actions.

Integrating sectoral, local government, and community support approaches involves providing technical guidance about harmonizing methods, actions, multidisciplinary approach, multisectoral organizational arrangements and partnerships to facilitate collaboration.

Essentially tips for achieving new forms of integration :

i.   integrate activities across the sectors by creating common strategies

ii. develop networks and channels of cooperation at the local level

iii. ensure community inclusion and active participation in governance

iv. provide a climate for capacity building and lifelong learning and creative finding solutions

v. execute the conversion of old public buildings that are not used in offices for new initiatives

The World Heritage Manual dedicated to Managing Tourism has a useful chapter on 'Involving stakeholders: the benefits and challenges of public participation. An effective participatory approach that delivers reciprocal benefits to the cultural property and to society depends on understanding:

• Who participates in decision-making, assessment, planning, implementation and evaluation processes, and how?

• Who contributes with experience, knowledge and skills, and how?

• Who benefits economically, socio-culturally and psychologically, and how? (Pedersen, 2002).

Efficiency and effective public sector demands horizontal changes and interactions between national agencies, local governments and other organizations that share governance at the local level, so policy coherence and technical competence will be ensured. This will lead to creation of opportunities for greater local discretion and stronger accountability. All stakeholders at different levels in a participatory approach should take part in the decision making process. New system solutions with more integrative management approach with the desire to achieve synergies requires strengthening the power of all local actors.

2. Good examples of participatory governance

The most progressive projects have developed in the developing countries especially Brazil and India. These innovations were influenced by work parties and social movements. Projects included deliberative processes analogous to citizen juries but have more formally integrated them into the policy processes of established governmental institutions. Particular importance has: public budgeting in Porto Alegre , Brazil case, one of the most innovative participatory governance practice. It was started by work party bottom-up system of budgetary deliberations geared to the needs of local community. All interested sides (community groups, interested citizens, city administrators, representatives etc.), could come twice a year to have transparent talk and decide budgetary issues. India case of people's development planning in Kerala was also a bottom-up system of participatory planning. This was five year project of participatory planning on village-level where villages got the help by higher amount budget for planning development, actions and monitoring outcomes. The project was rated as promoting decentralization and good governance practices (Fischer 2000; Fischer 2010).

Examples of creative practices addressed to heritage are given by European Expert Network on Culture. Their paper is about mapping good participatory governance practices in heritage (EENC, 2015) .

The field of cultural heritage management demonstrate a very wide range of activities and types of engagement with diverse social groups and diverse types of heritage, achieving a multiplicity of outcomes and impacts, as could be seen by Table 1. We decided to chose those examples, because ideas are partially applicable to our research questions. There are also more good examples, related to civil and community inclusion and managing processes. The methodology they use is structured by making a distinction between top-down / bottom-up projects (initiated by institutions/community) and the Wilcox/Simon framework[82]. Combination of the Wilcox Ladder of Participation with Nina Simon's participation framework to distinguish different levels of participation.

Table 1. Examples of good participatory governance projects connected with heritage.

Examples of Top-Down projects	Shortly about	Target groups	The main objectives
Spain- *Románico Norte and Románico Atlántico*	If heritage has to become a course for local development, it must be valuated by society!	Everyone, special attention on: school children, tourist guides, residants.	Wilcox/Simon: Consultation Restoration (churches, monasteries, sorounding land, variety of purposes to use those buildings).
Greece - Diazoma	Initiative for all stakeholders: institutions and citizens to adopt an acient theatre	Stakeholder approach, everyone who want to participate	Wilcox/Simon: Contributory Research, participation,

---

[82] This framework is a combination of the Wilcox Ladder of Participation (informing, consultation, contributory) with Nina Simon's participation framework (deciding together, acting together, hosting) to distinguish different levels of participation.

			restoration, enhacement, financing, participation, with the aim of promotion ancient ancient theatres in Greece
Malta- The Muza Project	MUSA- National museum of Art	Citizens, community	Wilcox/Simon: Contributory
	Community curation		Synergy creation, co-creation, constant interface and empowerment
Germany – Digitising the Stadtgeschichtliches Museum Leipzig	The Museum of City History Leipzig	everyone	Wilcox/Simon: Contributory
	New form of museum, use of new media, research of auditorium-feedback		Transformed the museum into one that now addresses the needs of a modern public. Cooperation with other institutions, researchers
Belgium - Gemeenschapsarchief AMVB	The Archive and Museum of Flemish Life in Brussels (AMVB)	everyone	Wilcox/Simon: Contributory
	Give a voice to youngsters and their parents in Brussels	Children, young people, teachers, parents..	Call for teachers, students, parents to contribute to local schools through educational programs, exhibitions, etc .. interaction to a new offer, which will approach others ..
	Maintenance management systems that control fires		Sharing expiriences, participation on verious levels
Denmark – Danish Butterfly Atlas	Online atlas	Everyone	Wilcox/Simon Contributory
	Iteractive maps, engagement with the public	Public is also encouraged to collect	Targeting and mapping butterfly spices, insects, distribution
The Netherlands - National Landscape Drentsche Aa	The Dutch National Landscape Drentsche Aa is a successful example of integrated natural and cultural heritage management!	Community cooperation	Wilcox/Simon: Deciding together / acting together
	Use of digital media	Stakeholder approach, professionals, volounteers.	Landscape biography and digital landscape atlas for planing actions
United Kingdom - Derby Silk Mill	World's first factory- as a museum	Everyone	Wilcox/Simon: Deciding together / acting together
		Public as management	Encouraging visitors and volunteers to become citizen curators, designers and makers.

	Adopt a Monument!	Stakeholder approach	Wilcox/Simon: Acting together
Finland - Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum	pet it, do the brend of it!	Everyone	Finding the adopter; Museum is managing, contracting, adopters should encrease the visibility
Slovenia - The Slovenian Network for the interpretation of Heritage	A local network of *heritage communities*	Everyone	Wilcox/Simon: Acting together
		Stakeholder approach, started by NGOs	The Slovenian Network of NGOs for the interpretation of Heritage.
Estonia - programme for owners of public buildings	Open air museum for rural heritage and farm architecture	community	Wilcox/Simon: Acting together
	Involving citizens to importance issues of heritage	citizens	Educate the owners to manage restaurate, preserve..

All of projects we chose are top-down projects. There are also few bright projects bottom-up, where initiations started from citizens, after success they got different partners. Light example of sustainable project is Italian project La Paranza. La pranza is formed as a cooperative in Naples with the aim to manage and valorize a large network of Paleochristian catacombs that lie underneath the neighborhood. This abandoned places pushed and stimulated young people of the neighborhood to take care of the area, trying to keep it partially clean and leading guided tours on demand. Also, very good example is the case of Portugal. The Portuguese Association of Archaeologists is one of the oldest civic cultural heritage association created in Europe, completely independent of the State and does not receive any public subsidy or grant. It is the best and most inspiring example of how the so-called *civil society*. Authors gave an examples of co-creative projects with completely stakeholder approach, state, private, NGOs, Civil society, characterized by strong creativity approaches, innovations, education.

The authors done very important job showed in publication, where is possible to see more details about projects Mapping of practices in the EU Member States on Participatory governance of cultural heritage to support the OMC working group under the same name (Work Plan for Culture 2015-2018) (EENC, 2015). Based on examples of good practices in represented examples, we can see that all of the good participatory governance practices are characterized by more flexible institutional approach (towards cultural institutions, museums new variants). Creativity, multidisciplinary approach, innovation, participation in decision-making processes and creation of strategies as an integrated process of relevant parties is very important. Multi-sectoral partnerships, with continual educative learning programs with the aim of increasing and built the total capacities.

3. Case study of National Park Djerdap: recommendations to achieve participatory governance and risk mitigation of heritage

A special focus of our work concerns the protected areas, as territorial denominator of cultural and natural heritage. Protected areas as cultural artifacts, have a long history. Over time the idea on the purpose of protected areas evolved, from the simple concept of large, wild area used for consumption, to nature protection and promotion of cultural values. In that sense, significant development of environmental science during the sixties, which led to the wide acceptance of the need for a systematic approach to planning and managing natural resources. Recognized economic impact of tourism and heritage in protected areas, made new view of their development importance at the local, regional and national level.

The protected areas are a clearly defined geographical space that has been recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means with a view to long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem and cultural values (IUCN, 2008).

The World Heritage Convention recognizes that heritage can be defined as 'monuments, groups of buildings and sites'. In practice, a broad set of typologies has developed that includes: urban centers, archaeological sites, industrial heritage, cultural landscapes, heritage routes but also different kinds of natural heritage and mixed properties.

The Convention of World Heritage recognizes four different types of World Heritage property, having on mind cultural and natural heritage definitions:

• Cultural properties (monuments, groups of buildings, sites), that meet the definition in Article 1 of the Convention (i.e. they meet one or more of criteria i–vi),

• Natural properties (natural features, geological and physiographical formations, natural sites), that meet the definition in Article 2 of the Convention (i.e. they meet one or more of criteria vii–x),

• Mixed properties (if they satisfy a part or the whole of the definitions of both cultural and natural heritage laid out in Articles 1 and 2 of the Convention. Properties should meet one or more of criteria (i)–(vi) and one or more of criteria (vii)–(x),

• Cultural landscapes 'represent the "combined works of nature and of man" designated in Article 1 of the Convention (UNESCO/ICCROM/ICOMOS/IUCN, 2012/13).[83]

Protected areas are appropriate examples for the subject of research, since they include both natural and cultural assets, which as such, create the need for inter-ministerial and inter-sectoral approach in management.[84] Given that protected areas are characterized by distinct geographical area, with its municipalities, cities and villages, this introduces in the analysis the need to establish adequate management models.

Our very important goal is finding a solution to identify, mitigate and reduce the negative impacts of potential risks that could endanger the sustainability of protected areas, with a rich heritage within.

We have commitment to apostrophize the importance of risk management activities and their involvement in the overall process of managing at some form of new system solution.

Since heritage issues become more complex in time, there is a need to be more quick and precise in addressing to the challenges. Good governance practice must be shifted to a wider, more inclusive approach to heritage management and greater community engagement. More inclusive approach 'new paradigm for protected areas' seen by Adrian Phillips and re-presented in the IUCN Guidelines for Management Planning of Protected Areas in 2003. New paradigm for protected areas highlights very effectively the increased importance of more inclusive approach to heritage management and community engagement. Much of this guidance applies to cultural sites too, so it is desired way of new approach to management of

---

[83]   Article 1 For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as *cultural heritage*; - 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; - sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and of man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of Outstanding Universal Value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological points of view.

   Article 2 For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as *natural heritage*: - 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. Criteria (see also Operational Guidelines Paragraph: 46, 47, 77).

[84]   Within the categorization of protected areas, it is particularly welcome take for example national parks, since they include the natural and cultural heritage.

natural heritage, which already exists in many parts of the world. The future success of heritage management systems, in particular for World Heritage, will depend greatly on their ability to:

• employ a values-led approach ,

• deliver approaches that anticipate and manage change,

• invest in the relationship between heritage and society, constantly examining why and how cultural heritage should be conserved and for whom and with whom. (UNESCO/ICCROM/ICOMOS/IUCN, 2013).

Case of National Park Djerdap will give information about direction to create new system solution with adequate strategies. National Park *Djerdap* is one of the most important protected areas in Serbia, which is characterized by rich cultural heritage, that comes from various historical eras ranging from the Neolithic period. This indicates that the riverside of the Danube was inhabited in the Neolithic period. The development of civilization in this region can be traced through archaeological sites, Roman, Turkish and modern buildings. Material evidence of culture of world importance has been discovered, relating to various epochs, civilization, religion, ethnos. *Lepenski Vir* is located on the archaeological map of Europe as a very important cultural site. In the disclosed resorts that are older than 6.000 years archeologists found deliberately erected shelters, graves, stone tools, jewelery, stone slabs with signs similar letter and sculptures of stone. Putting into operation of hydroelectric power plants *Djerdap 1* at the beginning of 1970, the old city *Tekia* and an island *Ada Kale* have been flooded ,with a large number of material and intangible cultural heritage. It is obvious that the economic, ecological and socio-cultural sustainability goals do not support each other always. Old Tekija was built on the ruins of a Roman Transdierna, created during the reign of the Roman Emperor Trajan at the beginning of a new era. We know that the village existed in the same location during the *Byzantine Empire*. The old town, sunken seventies of the twentieth century due to the construction of hydroelectric power Đerdap 1. There were the remains of the Iranian divinity *Mithra shrines*, and ancient Greek *Cybele*, *Sabasius, Hermes*. The island *Ada Kale* was located a few kilometers upstream from the current dam HPP *Djerdap I*, three kilometers downstream from the city *Tekija*. It was 1750 meters long and 500 meters wide. It represented the most essential strategic point at Djerdap to the Roman period. During the tumultuous history the structure of the population was changing, and the last inhabitants were mostly Turkish population. After the construction of HPP *Djerdap I* and the sinking of the island in 1971 population was moved to their motherland, and the fortress of the island was moved to the Romanian island *Simijan* downstream from the remains of the *Trajan's Bridge*. Particularly interesting is the fact that the way of life of residents of the island has not changed much and that the Muslim population maintained their customs and culture through a compact community. They practiced the manual production of Turkish sweets *ratluk*, the manufacture of tobacco, matches, a product of figs and olives. Old Tekija before flood concerned, was one of the richest city in the region. Tekija was very rich little city on the Danube, especially from *Smederevo* city, to the border. Greater revenues from taxes brought by the Danube river management, organized in 1933, whose director was required and Deputy Transport Minister of Serbia. *Locovi* (marine *pilots*, the elite in River Navy) had a salary as ministers. In that time in Tekija there was a lot of them. Over the Tekija, from the time of *Prince Milosh* until the Second World War, it was organized complete major export of pigs, sheeps, fish and others. So it is known that at the Viennese palace lamb was served from around the Tekija (Tekke). Attached SWOT analysis was performed based on data derived from the survey in June 2015 for the purpose of the thesis of Milica Kočović- one of the authors of this paper.

On the basis of the accompanying SWOT analysis, we can see clearly the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to the territorial and organizational level NP Djerdap. Strengths and opportunities are reflected in the uniqueness of the position in which the National Park extends, good connection with a large number of European countries over the Danube. The potentials are reflected in the development of creative and innovative solutions that could represent new forms of tourism (alternative such as ecocultural, natural, adventure, educational etc.), touristic products, built on existing ones.

Table 2. SWOT analysis of *NP Djerdap*

	Beneficial	Harmfull
Internal	*Strengths* ➢ Unique position, transboundary ➢ Values of the National Park created by heritage ➢ Comprehensive and rich heritage ➢ Cooperation with the Romanian nature park *Portile de Fier*, and Danube cluster countries ➢ International projects- are making better visibility than national, regional, local ➢ Cultural Routes: Trail of Roman Emperors, Wine Route ➢ New organizational unit for tourism ➢ Increased number of *eco* prefix private accomodation ➢ Increased number of foreign tourists, cyclists, and other alternative forms of tourists ➢ Healthy environment forestry, wood, herbs, various number of wild animal and plant species, autochthonous varieties	*Weaknesses* ➢ Without instrumental/organizational strategy ➢ Occasional institutional cooperation ➢ Lack of expertise and capacitys ➢ Problem of legal form, NP -public institution ➢ The State does not help as a founder ➢ State expects of NP Djerdap to do business profitably, self-financing ➢ Low level of partnership with any sector ➢ Low level of skills , number of experts ➢ Low level of community inclusion ➢ Only two camps ➢ Insufficient marked maps of sites, inaccurate, old maps ➢ Insufficient number of park rangers, who are responsible for monitoring, trekking tours on the trails- in charge of everything. *The rounders* ➢ There is no service for cyclists
external	*Opportunities* ➢ Transbouday, transnational, Danube funds and Project : IBA, IPA, PBA etc. ➢ Danube as the *European highway* ➢ Danube as cheapest logistic transport option and good European connector ➢ Grate social entreprenaurship potentials ➢ Old and traditional crafts, ethnology, knowledges, Old dialect *Vlaški* (Vlashky), Vlah Magic ➢ Beekeeping, breeding animal, milk products, fisheries ➢ Alternative forms of tourism such as Ecocultural tourism ➢ New touristic routes, products, landscapes ➢ New approaches in use of heritage ➢ (Re)Use of old industrial buildings ➢ cooperation, cocreation, thrue participation governance ➢ social inclusion, capacity building, sharing knowladge	*Threats* ➢ Lack of funding threatens sustainable development ➢ The challenge to achieve the objectives, without a clear institutional development strategy ➢ Uncontrolled basic business without a strategic approach to planning, evaluation and monitoring, insufficient control activities ➢ threatened pillars of sustainable development ➢ Infrastructure and logistic accessibility are not good enough ➢ Lack of rural touristic products and services, low visibility of local supply (natural, material, intangible heritage, manufacturers of food, wine, brandy, private accommodation, etc.) ➢ catastrophic risks, natural disasters: floads, stormy winds, fires etc.

There is space for better and more active involvement of local communities in participatory governance. A large number of cooperative buildings built in the period of industrialization and socialism, which are not in use can be re-used by conversion into the new forms of multifunctional cultural institutions that will be mainstay: creativity, innovation, knowledge, mediation, greater involvement of stakeholders from all sectors. On proposed question: Do you think that the old infrastructure (factories, farms that do not work) could be used for restructuring in the new forms of cultural institutions such as HUBs, interactive museums, eco-cultural museums? Where the local population will be educated in conjunction with the necessary knowledge about the functioning of markets, environment and cultural issues, and at the same time this would be a space for the sale of products that they have to offer, where the local population woud be found in the rolle of educators and performers (old knowledge, handicrafts, customs, recepies, Vlach magic, dialect, etc ...for interested cultural tourists.). This would, of course also be a service point for information and a variety of

other products and services offered by National Park Djerdap. "We believe that this proposal could be implemented", was their anwser. We can see, that this organization is also very oppen for sugestions and necessary changes.

Weaknesses and threats are detected. One the first place of the crucial problems in Serbia in all fields, including in the areas of nature protection is insufficient control of the realization. There is also big problem with the lack of institutional frames, and consequently organizational strategies. Without having continual evaluation, monitoring and control processes and appropriate action plans, in long tearm it is not easy to achieve sustainibility. The top management of NP Djerdap also agree, and feel this problem. Also, it is not possible to reach (or at least closer) to the vision of the National Park, if previous objectives was not defined in order to achieve the main purpose, without any analysis, measures for evaluating performance, good / real strategic (eg. SWOT). It is obvious that on theritory of NP Djerdap there are no partnerships, or that is very rare. Maybe the reason of this is reflected in the mentioned lack of expertise and capacitys, State expects of NP Djerdap to do business profitably, by self-financing; low level of partnership with any sector; low level of skills, number of experts, low level of community inclusion, and not good enough supporting infrastructure.

Based on the survey that conducted with the management of NP Djerdap[85], there has been large losses in 2014 during the floods, but also stormy winds which have caused additional damage estimated to have taken away about 70 cubic meters of wood from parts of the NP in the first degree of protection. It is unknown that the disasters endangered cultural properties. However, local communities in the region of Djerdap, suffered important material loss. Within the National Park Djerdap, still there is not fully established, nor the estimated damage caused as a result of disasters (flooding and storm winds). It is known that certain forest roads disappeared completely. This represents a great threat from potentially new damage for example fire, due to the inability to access all parts. In addition to previous procedures, which were related to the fire, after the adoption the Regulations in the case of disasters at the the Republic level ,National Park Djerdap also adopted the Risk Management Plan. Version was submitted in April 2015.

Local residents are involved in the monitoring process. Keepers of the forest on a daily basis monitor and report with respect to possible changes that have occurred in the field.

The existing forms of insurance were related to the capital assets (buildings) and insurance of employees. It is not known that NP Djerdap got any other insurance products ofer. Although the national parks are public institutions, in order to survive they are forced to do self-financing, because the state budget does not provide sufficient funds required. This is the general situation with the NP in Serbia, not only Djerdap.

Natural disasters, historically occurring like the only logical explanation of the disappearance of civilizations (Vesuvius took Pompey and the surrounding cities, Atlantis, Vinca civilization, etc.). Cultural heritage, comprehensive perspective movable and immovable (archaeological, built, historical, environmental entities), is heavily influenced by the catastrophic risks.

Risk management, in terms of cultural heritage is a major problem (especially in low-income countries), since the assessment of the value of cultural heritage as difficult as evaluation of emotional pain in insurance (Kocovic, 2015). Consequently, the damage that can strike cultural and natural heritage in NP Djerdap are additionally burdened by absence of adequate measures concerning the assessment, evaluation and risk reduction.

The simultaneous adoption of an adequate risk management strategy of natural disasters and the management of protected areas actions, but also the risks arising from the action of man, especially when we are talking about protected areas should be taken into acount. The particular goal is consideration of significance of linking strategy and possibility of application of open method of coordination (OMC), which

---

[85]   Field research have been provided from may- july, for the need of PhD thesis of Milica Kocovic, one of the authors of this paper. The theme of thesis is *Contribution of ecocultural tourism to sustainable development of protected areas with natural and cultural heritage*.

achieves the transition of cultural policy towards the convergence of different national policies in order to define and realize common goals, synchronized with the EU policy and recommendations from the Council of Europe (Djukic, 2015). Synchronization should be established initially in the Serbian framework at various levels of government (national, regional, local). Given that protected areas often cover both, urban and rural areas, participatory management framework should include boat developing strategies: for urban and rural areas.

Indian example of achieving synergies by integrating local development, in large scale rural development program has demonstrated how a broadly based approach to strengthening community-level capacities can enhance empowerment, governance, service provision, and private sector growth. This program was strongly civil inclusive, and also created networks of other local institutions allowed communities to cope more rapidly and effectively to Tsunami natural disaster. Those most affected got the essential help from self-help groups organized in partnership with state agencies and local governments by quickly and accurately channeled assistance from public agencies and donors. It took less than a month for village organizations to develop micro-plans for reconstruction after Tsunami. Community investment funds have been provided by private bank loans, and fishing communities received the first boats on which their livelihoods depend (World Bank, 2005).

As we think, social involvement and responsibility in this field is essential. It requires high level of coordination between public and private sector that can be achieved by applying of linking strategy, that is, public-private strategic partnership in the realization of a common/public interest. The significance of this strategy can be viewed in the application of principles of socially responsible behavior of insurance companies, based on which they can offer the state, donors or insured parties benefits of *ex post* or *ex ante* insurance of cultural (and natural) heritage from catastrophe risks caused by natural disasters (Kočocić *et al*. 2014; Djukic 2015).

The problem arises in determining the value of the insured object of cultural monuments. Since the cultural heritage is priceless, this problem can be solved analogously with determining the value of human life in life insurance. Since life is priceless, it determines with the insured amount which we want to ensure, regardless of its value. Pursuant with the State possibilities, (which is supposed to fund) this type of insurance is determined by a certain amount of insurance which provides concrete monument, regardless of its value. In relation to the frequency and intensity of risk to be insured, certain premiums and damages are paid, up to a maximum, which corresponds to the sum insured. So far, practice of insurance companies in Serbia has been unwilling to accept this type of insurance. For this reason we have propose compulsory insurance of the cultural heritage of catastrophic risks as some kind of hibrid model would be acceptable. The most logical way, would be that all types of insurance of common goods move from the State level, by subventions in the initial years, until awareness about the importance of insurance is created. For this kind of insurance the most merit and responsibility should have our state insurance company since this type of insurance has national interest. All sectors should be motivated to such investments (Government institutions, universities and the private sector, NGOs). Infrastructure projects should include analyzed information, on the basis of which will be able to make decision when and where *green infrastructure* has advantages over the heavy infrastructure, when it comes to the management plans and disaster risk reduction, like planting of adequate cultures that may affect the reduction of landslides, etc.

Effective measures of risk management of cultural heritage are rare and difficult to determine (due to the lack of adequate knowledge, which would require an interdisciplinary approach). It is impossible to easily determine the costs incurred losses and damage of cultural property. However, in the analysis of risks of natural disasters related to the cultural heritage, we can include general issues, to come up with elements of planning. What may be critical? Wich direction goes hazard? What is the probability of occurrence of harmful events? What is the scope and magnitude of adverse events? Relevant information can be obtained on the

basis of: historical records of past events, as well as taking into account the range of impacts that adverse event can have on cultural heritage.

Every state should predict the compulsory insurance of the cultural heritage of catastrophic risks, under the catastrophic risk management strategies. A key role in launching this initiative should have a Ministry of Culture, which would be credited to the budget funds for the financing of insurance premiums. Ministry of Culture, as a competent, also should conclude an insurance contract for cultural heritage. Cultural heritage as part of our national identity must be protected from the destructive impact of natural catastrophes and the best way of protection is adequate form of insurance. In addition with this proposal goes the fact that the cultural heritage and the diverse nature are most important triggers for the development tough ecocultural tourism and other creative initiatives. Ecocultural tourism with rich heritage in NP Djerdap also stimulates higher involvence of community, by power to create and hold the value on local level. All old buildings from industrial era that are not in use, should be available to community as a space for initiatives and creation. In NP Đerdap there are a lot of examples of old public infrastructures that is unused.

New approaches in management should actively incorporate effective treatment of all relevant *ingredients* in the field of protected areas. The aim of such integrated approach is to create synergy effects, to make sustainable development achieved. Sustainable development in protected areas is characterized by: greater social involvement of local communities, raised economic performances, with active attention to environmental issues, natural and cultural authenticity.

3. Discussion: Principles to achieve sustainable development of Heritage

The freshest principles are given by European Commission. Objectives on cultural heritage are given in report Getting Cultural heritage to work for Europe. Report argues that the EU should vigorously promote the innovative use of cultural heritage for economic growth and jobs, social cohesion and environmental sustainability. Three main objectives, by tree basic sustainable pillars are :

1. Economy: Promoting innovative finance, investment, governance, management and business models to increase the effectiveness of cultural heritage as an economic production factor. An alternative approach consists in the private sector getting more involved in cultural heritage, in order to optimize its use within its own business model. This would build on the potential of historic areas as well as intangible assets to nurture new manufacturing, service and creative industries attracting investment in the fabric of heritage as well as creating growth and jobs.

2. Society: Promoting the innovative use of cultural heritage to encourage integration, inclusiveness, cohesion and participation. Heritage management system in which local communities often bear little responsibility for their own cultural landscapes, monuments, collections and intangible heritage. Innovative use of cultural heritage has the potential to actively engage people - thereby helping to secure integration, inclusiveness, social cohesion and sound investment, all necessary ingredients of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

3. Environment: Promoting innovative and sustainable use of cultural heritage to enable it to realize its full potential in contributing to the sustainable development of European landscapes and environments. Cultural heritage plays an important role in the sustainable development of rural and urban cultural landscapes. The research, planning and management of these cultural landscapes have been traditionally split. Science is often mono-disciplinary, policies are mostly single-sectoral and the management of landscapes shows a strong divide between nature and heritage management. This often leads to miscommunication, inefficient use of resources and loss of cultural and ecological assets (EC, 2015).

As we could evaluate, almost all of mentioned examples of good practices have applied mostly of all that EC suggested. Especially important example in order of comparison and implementing some blue-prints into our

model is Norway example, of integrative approach to deal with both cultural and natural heritage, with high involve of local community and regular use of new media. UK example- *Derby Silk*, is grate inspiration for re-use of buildings. Similar is with Finland, Estonian examples on how we can treat heritage with innovative prospective. Other examples are good because they all points to necessity of target/public active involve.

Very important prospective in regard with heritage is to look at them as a common goods. Common goods are also able to create values. With aim to point on possibility of heritage to create jobs, cohesion and participation, EC suggested four actions, that rely on their findings, also grate examples.

1. Heritage led to urban regeneration,
2. Sustaining Cultural landscapes,
3. Inclusive governance,
4. Innovative business models for cultural heritage (EC, 2015).

What applies to all activities that it is desirable by their recommendation is to take into account 30 best practices, and base on their findings create good specific model. Everything they suggested is about and with an aim to increase knowledge; building capacities; job creation and growth, improving quality of life on local level; stronger and better link among actors; experimental and creative approaches; use of new technology; re-use etc.

Historians, economists and social scientists have done a lot of research on the management of common goods, common land and common resources since the nineties. These show that common management can actually be very sustainable if it is in accordance with situation-tailored, or situation-specific types of governance. The potential of heritage contribution to environmental protection, social capital and economic growth is being increasingly recognized. The artificial isolation of heritage concerns from other sectors would be simply unfeasible, since external factors would 'continue to penalize heritage practice just as isolated heritage management decision-making would penalize the relationship of heritage to its context (Boccardi 2012). We insist on the importance of risk reduction and mitigation of dangers of heritage because risks threatens the existence of heritage in its authentic form. Threatened heritage is an issue that excludes all the benefits which could be achieved from creative and innovative use of it.

Conclusion

Paper reflects basic theory, examples and best practices in order to capture the importance of partnership strategies in participatory governance, with active participation in the decision-making process. We saw that efficiency and effective public sector demands horizontal changes and better institutional interactions that share governance at the local level, so policy coherence is ensured with achieved technical competences. This will lead to creation of greater opportunities on local level for every interested part to get involved. We suggest new system solution with more integrative management approach connecting many different sectors, departments, variables, as we could see in shown Case study of NP Djerdap, with the aim of achieving better social, economic, environmental, cultural effects.New system solution through-establishment of institutionalized strategic partnership in the form of a new legal entity. Establishing a legal and political interdependence, economic, value-ideological and organizational instruments are *must do steps* for mentioned legal entity, to ensure the operationalization of strategic decisions. The mandatory monitoring and control of activities, according to the plan, with internal and external evaluation by actors and other target groups (local population, tourists, sectors). Integrative planning protection and use of heritage which includes: ecology, environmental protection, culture, tourism, economy, employment, insurance options for heritage from the catastrophic risk etc. Our goals and contributions are reflected in the finding and proposing new system solutions in the management of heritage by identification of challenges, especially in the context of risk management on the example of NP Djerdap. This findings are specifically applicable on this example, but some aspects could be re-used. Similar as in European and Worlds examples and best practices we

mentioned in paper, related to the topic, because they illustrate and motivate for further actions, an use of heritage. Examples also show high inclusion of all sectors in order to achieve desired goals. All stakeholders at different levels in a participatory approach should take part in the decision making process. And very important finding is that achieving desired synergies, requires strengthening the power of all local actors. We proposed participative management with linking strategies, because such a form of integrated action leads to social prosperity, creating new opportunities for work and development of the community with respect to sustainable development. This also reduces the *transitional diseases* faced by post-transition economies and developing countries, especially important in Case of Djerdap, because NP is located in very poor region of Serbia. We pointed out the possibility of heritage to create economic value through comprehensive connectivity and mutual support of sectors, disciplines, institutions and departments, thru re-use of old infrastructure and creation new forms of cultural institutions. Those propose HUBs would cherish creativity, by multidisciplinary approach, innovation, participation in decision-making processes and creation of new linking strategies. Re-used buildings of former cooperatives with new use value on NP Djerdap territory, will present infrastructural backup for multi-sector partnerships, with continual educative learning programs with the aim of increasing and built the total capacities, by sharing knowledge. With provided infrastructure and partnership, heritage seen as common good will contribute to sustainable development by new collective arrangements and strategies on the local and level.

We think that institutions on territory of NP Djerdap (NP Djerdap, Touristic organizations, museums, galleries, NGOs, municipalities, private sector companies etc.) could have very important roll in pushing community, contracting, educating, building stronger local level, because stronger engagement of community also reduces management costs. To ensure that heritage creates additional value, we need the survival of heritage, and that is why we pointing out necessary measures in the activities of risk management, as well as the role of different actors.

References

ASADUZZAMAN, M; KAIVO-OJA, J.; STENVALL, J. (2015) *Strengthening Local Governance in Developing Countries: Partnership as an Alternative Approach*. New York: Springer Science Business Media.

BAIOCCI, G. (2003) Participation, Activism, and Politics: The Porto Alegre Experiment. In Boccardi, G. (ed.) (2012) *Introduction to Heritage and Sustainable Development.* Paper presented at Special Module on Sustainable Development during the ICCROM's course on Conservation Built Heritage.

BOURDIEU, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

CALL, T. (2011) Beyond the'Failed State': toward conceptual alternatives. *European Journal of International Relations*, 17 (2).

CARMENT (2003) Assessing state failure: implications for theory and policy.*Third World Quarterly*, 24 (3).

COOKIE, B.; KOTHARI, U. (2001) Participation: The New Tyranny *Zed Books,* London. *Deepening Democracy*. New York.

Council of Europe (2009) *, Heritage and beyond*.

DJUKIC V. (2010) State and Culture. *Studies of contemporary cultural policy*. Belgrade: FDU.

DJUKIC,V. (2015) *Problems with insurance of cultural heritage from catastrophe risks caused by natural disasters in Serbia, Catastrophic risks and sustainable development.* Belgrade: Faculty of Economics, Publishing Centre.

EC (2015) *Getting cultural heritage to work for Europe*. Report of the Horizon 2020, Expert Group on Cultural Heritage.

EENC (2015) *Mapping of practices in the EU Member States on Participatory governance of cultural heritage to support the OMC working group under the same name (Work Plan for Culture 2015-2018)*. In Sani, M.; Lynch, B.; Visser, J.; Gariboldi, A. (eds.) (2015) *Short Analytical Report*. June.

FARAZMAND, A. (2004a) *Sound Governance in the Age of Globalization: A Conceptual Framework*. InSound.

FARAZMAND, A. (2004b) *Globalization and governance: A theoretical analysis*. InSound Governance: Policyand Administrative Innovation, Praeger Publishers.

FISCHER, F. (2000) *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment: The Politics of Local Knowledge.* Durham: Duke University Press.

FISCHER, F. (2009) *Democracy and Expertise: Reorienting Policy Inquiry*. Oxford: Oxford.

FISCHER, F. (2010) Participatory Governance. *Regulation & Governance Working Paper*, 24.

FISHKIN, S. (2009) *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press.

FUNG, A.; WRIGHT, O. (2003*) Deeping Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Governance*. Policy and Administrative Innovation, Praeger Publishers.

IUCN (2008) *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. IUCN, Gland, Cambridge

KOCOVIC, J., PAUNOVIC, B.; JOVOVIC, M. (2014) Mogućnosti upravljanja katastrofalnim rizicima. *Novi ekonomist*, VIII (16), Bijeljina: University of East Sarajevo - Faculty of Business Economy.

KOCOVIC, M. (2015) The role of protected areas in managing catastrophic risks and contribution to sustainable development. *Catastrophic risks and sustainable development,* Belgrade: Faculty of Economics, Publishing Centre.

OJHA, H. (2006) *Techno-bureaucratic Doxa and Challenges for Deliberative Governance: The Case of Community Foretry Policy and Practice in Nepal*. Policy and Society.

OSMANI, R. (2007) Participatory Governance: An Overview of the Issues Evidence*. In *Participatory Governance and the Millennium Development Goals. New York.*

PATRICK, S. (2007) Failed'states and global security: empirical questions and policy dilemmas. *International Studies Review, 9 (4)*.

RONDINELLI, A.; McCULOUGH, S.; JONHSON R. W. (1987) Decentralization of Public Services in Developing Countries: A Framework for Policy Analysis and Implementation. *Working Paper in Decentralization in Developing Country Series*. Research Triangle Institute: Research Triangle Park, N. C.

RONDINELLI, A.; NELLIS, J. R. (1986) Assessing Decentralization Policies in Developing Countries: The Case for Cautious Optimism. *Development Policy Review*, 4, 3-23.

The World Bank (2005) *Linking Community Empowerment, Decentralized Governance, and Public Service Provision Through a Local Development Framewor,* Helling et al., discussion paper, NO. 0535, Washington.

UNESCO; ICCROM; ICOMOS; IUCN (2013), *Managing Cultural World Heritage*.

UNESCO (2013) *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.

USAID (1995) *Assessing Democratic Decentralization*. A CIDE Concept Paper: Blair, H. Washington, D. C.

WARREN, E. (2007) Institutionalizing Deliberative Democracy,*.// in S. Rosenberg Deliberation, Participation and Democracy: Can the People Govern? London/NY.*

World Heritage Report (2014), *Engaging local communities in Stewardship of World Heritage*, paper nr 40.

World Heritage Manual 1 (2002), *Managing Tourism at World Heritage Sites: A Practical Manual for World Heritage Site Managers* Pedersen, A. et.al., UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris.