

Value creation in industrial heritage management. Evidence from the City of Paper (Fabriano, Italy)

Mara Cerquetti

*Department of Education, Cultural Heritage and Tourism, University of Macerata, Italy,
e-mail: mara.cerquetti@unimc.it*

Abstract: The paper discusses the open, inclusive, dynamic, proactive notion of cultural heritage that is emerging in the international scientific debate. Some significant innovations are examined first: the overcoming of the dualism between tangible and intangible cultural heritage, the increasing role of local communities in the processes of heritage recognition, safeguarding and enhancement and the need for valorisation as a democratic mandate. Aiming at developing this approach, the second step of the research focuses on industrial heritage, investigating its specific features and values. A case study is provided in order to understand some crucial issues concerning industrial heritage management and value creation. Focusing on the City of Paper (Fabriano, Italy), the activities carried out by the Museum of Paper and Watermark and by the Institute of Paper History Gianfranco Fedrigoni (ISTOCARTA) are analysed in-depth, highlighting the role of collaboration among the different actors involved in industrial heritage management in order to promote sustainable local development.

Keywords: industrial heritage management, paper, museum, archive, value of production.

1. Introduction

Authenticity. What consumers really want is the title of a successful book by James H. Pine and B. Joseph Gilmore II published ten years ago (2007) [1]. The authors, who had already launched the concept of “experience economy” (1998) [2], focused here on consumer behaviour and on the increasing search for authenticity in consumption. In the field of social sciences this trend is a widely shared assumption: scholars talk about a return to the roots [3], an authenticity obsession [4], and the quest for genuineness, reality and truth in consumption [5] as a consequence of the increasing movement and standardisation of goods, capital, services, people, technology and information within a global context. Particularly, the increasing process of globalization that is affecting contemporary society has provoked not only a faster interchange of products and ideas and dissemination of knowledge, but also a progressive separation of labour, capital, technology and other productive factors from specific spatio-temporal coordinates, with significant effects on the relationship between culture, identity and community [6]. De-territorialisation has modified the processes of mass consumption, generating a cultural reaction and new trends which consider genuineness and authenticity as the most valued factors.

This new cultural mindset could have a relevant impact on the future of cultural heritage, especially on the sustainable use of industrial heritage, contributing to the competitiveness of made-in products and thus to the development of areas of ancient industrialisation: from de-territorialisation to re-territorialisation.

Sharing these remarks, after going over the evolution of the meaning of cultural heritage, this chapter focuses on industrial heritage, analysing its main features and its role in “glocal” society. Some crucial issues in industrial heritage management are investigated through a case study. The field research examines the City of Paper (Fabriano, Italy), focusing on the activities carried out by the Museum of Paper and Watermark and by the Institute of Paper History Gianfranco Fedrigoni (ISTOCARTA): the former is a local museum of an ancient productive activity located in Fabriano (paper manufacturing), while the latter is an institute which has collected the historical archive of an ancient paper factory founded in Fabriano in the 18th century (Miliani Paper Mill). The research is aimed at understanding if and how these cultural organisations succeed in satisfying the need for authenticity expressed by new audiences. The paper also focuses on the contribution they give and could give to the sustainable development of Fabriano, analysing their capability to develop all the opportunities provided by local networks.

2. The evolving meaning of cultural heritage

Since the beginning of the 21st century, thanks to the UNESCO Conventions for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) [7] and on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005) [8], the meaning of cultural heritage has been evolving into an *open, inclusive, dynamic* and *proactive* concept [9]. As is widely shared by the international professional and scientific community, nowadays cultural heritage also includes intangible evidence, such as “practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills” [10], could foster cultural pluralism, and finally has an active and changing nature, resulting from the interaction between people and places through time and from the cross-fertilisation among different cultural identities. Moreover, it is gaining an increasing role in promoting local and regional development and in supporting external relations. In a nutshell, as argued by Loulanski [11], when defining cultural heritage, the conceptual focus has to be shifted 1) from monuments to people, 2) from objects to functions, and thus 3) from preservation *per se* to purposeful preservation and sustainable use and development.

In Europe, following and developing this approach, the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural heritage for Society, adopted in Faro on October 27, 2005 [12], pointed out the need for cultural heritage valorisation as a democratic mandate in support of cultural diversity and sustainable development. The Faro Convention considers cultural heritage a precious resource in the integration of the different dimensions of development – cultural, environmental, socio-economic –, highlighting its possible contribution to other policies. As argued in the explanatory report, the framework convention develops “the complex idea of ‘valorisation’ [...], integrating a chain of actions in the public interest: identification, study, interpretation, protection, conservation and presentation. The idea of ‘valorisation’ is, like cultural heritage itself, multi-dimensional: it involves ‘giving value to’ the ethical, cultural, ecological, economic, social and political dimensions of a heritage. As a resource for personal and communal development, cultural heritage is an asset which requires preservation, and thus its valorisation can be considered as one factor of development”. Council of Europe [13].

The Convention concludes that public policies must integrate these different dimensions “so as to permit heritages to be used as factors in integrated development”. Council of Europe [14].

The adoption of this approach opens new challenges for institutions and organisations working in the field of cultural heritage: from participatory governance to collaboration

with other sectors, from citizen and stakeholder *engagement* to bottom-up and community-driven approaches [15]. There is an increasing success for new institutional and managerial models aimed at performing the innovative meaning of cultural heritage, broadening cultural participation and generating social and economic impacts beyond heritage boundaries.

3. Managing industrial heritage: key issues for value creation

According to this innovative, wide definition of heritage and of its use, the legacy of humanity and its environment has finally covered tangible and intangible industrial heritage. According to ICOMOS (International Council on Museums and Sites) and TICCIH (The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage), the industrial heritage's field "focuses on the remains of industry – industrial sites, structures and infrastructure, machinery and equipment, housing, settlements, landscapes, products, processes, embedded knowledge and skills, documents and records, as well as the use and treatment of this heritage in the present. Industrial heritage includes not only the remains of the Industrial Revolution, but also the traditional precursors from earlier centuries that reflect increased technical specialization, intensified productive capacity, and distribution and consumption beyond local markets, hallmarks of the rise of industrialization. Industrial heritage also includes the planning, policy-making and rehabilitation necessary to manage these remains in the face of deindustrialization" [16].

Nowadays, tangible and intangible territorial sediments of industrial history are understood as the whole of local endogenous potentialities that are able to ensure a new competitiveness to areas characterised by an ancient industrialisation and now in search of a new identity [17]. Local territorial features arising from industrial history are becoming relevant factors of the competitive strategies boosted by traditional industrial areas, providing an active local substratum to support sustainable development: some of these processes just exploit local resources, while other ones are activating a virtuous cycle among local actors to promote an integrated development. The concept of *milieu* arises, including both the local and territorial basis of a given collective identity and the whole of its endogenous development potentialities.

In the UK, "Ironbridge George Museum has set the pace [...] with the deliberate intention of providing the new town with a sense of identity that drew on the area's long association with iron and steel". Hewison [18]. A true heritage obsession has followed, feeding the development of the heritage industry and running the risk of providing an improved version of the past: "in the face of apparent decline and disintegration, it is not surprising that the past seems a better place". Hewison [19]. The proliferation of eco-museums all around the world is one of the main results of this trend [20] and of its contradictions, finding it difficult to achieve a shared local representation and to activate a real and effective convergence among different actors: local communities, scholars and institutions [21].

These issues call for an analysis of the relationships between the territory and its heritage through the concept of the *territorial local system* as an experience implying and allowing the contemporary presence and closeness of different actors and building up by doing and through the *mise en valeur* of local specific assets [22]. Adopting this approach, local industrial heritage could become a core factor for the development of the territorial local system if it is recognised, used and enhanced by local networks and enterprises. As argued by Montella [23], cultural heritage could generate a *value of production*, referring to market uses flowing from cultural heritage and profits for enterprises operating in different sectors, e.g. restoration, publishing, tourism, construction, real estate business, performing arts, etc.

According to the resource-based view [24] and to the recent marketing studies investigating the country-of-origin effect, in a global market that is strongly contested, the success of enterprises and local systems depends on the capability to effectively enhance the distinctive features of place-specific assets and productions and the associated symbolic values [25]. Therefore, especially in the last ten years, corporate history and its heritage have started to be considered as strategic assets to face the economic and financial crisis and a potential competitive advantage ensuring a long-term market success [26]. Cultural heritage that has traditionally stratified in a given production area could be a key factor for local sustainable development [27]: the corporate *savoir faire* and the historical place-specific habitus could increase the value of contemporary products and thus satisfy the symbolic needs of consumers in search of authenticity [28]. Just to provide an example, it could be sufficient to remember that in 2015 the section on corporate archives of the ICA (International Council on Archives) chose as the title for its annual conference *How history can be a business*.

Following this approach, made-in-Italy industry should invest in tangible and intangible assets featuring corporate history and production in order to increase the value of products, brands and corporate identity [29]. In territorial and corporate marketing strategies, a central role has to be assigned to industrial and corporate museums and archives as organisations that could enhance industrial and corporate know-how and support the communication of the brand value for commercial and tourism purposes in the international market. On that basis, several industrial and corporate museums and archives have been born in the last few years. In Italy this phenomenon is particularly relevant for two reasons: because of the high number of museums belonging to those categories and because in many cases these institutions have been founded by enterprises that have a long corporate tradition, produce goods that are real icons of the made-in-Italy worldwide and are tightly rooted in their territory contributing to defining its identity [30]. These institutions are places for the conservation and enhancement of industrial and corporate heritage and have an important role in fostering industrial and corporate culture, identity and communication, for internal and external marketing purposes [31] and the competitiveness of the territorial system [32].

4. Towards the enhancement of industrial heritage: a case study

4.1. Research methodology

Analysing industrial heritage through the lens of the VRIO framework [33], the intangible place and time-specific assets embedded in made-in products could be considered as *rare*, *inimitable* and *valuable* resources, that are achieving a growing appreciation in the global market, and then becoming potential factors of differentiation and success. However, in order to ensure an effective competitive advantage, they have to be well *organised*.

Adopting this approach, the field research focuses on an exploratory case study, that has been holistically investigated collecting both qualitative and quantitative data [34]. The case of paper manufacturing historically rooted in Fabriano has been considered, analysing the role and activities of two important institutions in charge of conserving and enhancing Fabriano's industrial heritage: the Museum of Paper and Watermark and the Institute of Paper History Gianfranco Fedrigoni (ISTOCARTA).

In doing this case study research, data have been extracted from different sources: websites, videos and documentaries and public documents and publications on paper manufacturing in Fabriano – both its history and its valorisation. The self-evaluation form

(2016) [35] filled in by the Museum of Paper and Watermark has been analysed too. Then, two face-to-face semi-structured interviews have been conducted, interviewing the person in charge of Culture and Tourism in the Municipality of Fabriano and who also runs the Museum of Paper and Watermark (May 9, 2017) and the coordinator of the Institute of Paper History Gianfranco Fedrigoni (May 19, 2017).

After briefly going over the history of paper production in Fabriano, the sedimentation of cultural heritage and its successive “heritisation” and use are considered, highlighting strengths and weaknesses of the current cultural offer.

4.2. Fabriano: a history of innovations

During the interview, Giorgio Pellegrini, the person running the Museum of Paper and Watermark, said that Fabriano could be considered as “the Silicon Valley of the Middle Ages”. Paper, invented in China by Ts’Ai Lun in 105 B.C., was introduced to Fabriano during the second half of the 13th century by the Arabs. Fabriano rapidly became the cradle of paper, a leading centre for its production and trade, thanks to the technological innovations introduced and improved by its paper mills [36]. Fabriano’s paper masters: (1) implemented the multiple hammer mill for the preparation of raw material, rags; (2) introduced an animal gelatine to make the paper liquid-resistant, suitable for ink writing without deterioration; (3) and finally invented the watermark, which gives an exclusive and unique value to paper, making it possible to diversify and personalise paper thanks to the addition of simple and 3D effects. “Watermarks are also used as a quality indicator and as a security feature, for instance on banknotes” [37].

The quality of the paper made in Fabriano progressively increased turning into the most diffused writing material in Europe, cheaper than parchment and other supports. During the 14th and 15th centuries, paper manufacturing constantly thrived. A particular contribution to the development of paper industry was given by the Chiavelli family, who also purchased fulling-mills (*gualchiere*) from small manufacturers. The leading role of Fabriano in that period is confirmed by the Council Statute of 1436 prohibiting “anyone from erecting within a radius of 50 miles from Fabriano buildings for paper manufacturing and the teaching of the paper making secrets to those not residing within the Council territory, pending a fine of 50 ducats” [38].

During the following centuries the art of paper slowly declined, losing competitiveness because of the development and success of the French, German, English and Dutch industries. At the end of the 18th century, Fabriano’s paper industry improved its fortunes thanks to the entrepreneurial skills of Pietro Miliani (1744-1817), a modest employee who transformed paper manufacturing from an artisanal activity to an industrial one. The Miliani Paper Mill, founded in 1782 in association with Antonio Vallemani, introduced product innovations and almost immediately attained a relevant commercial development with the slogan “Made in Italy since 1264”. Paper manufacturing continued with Giuseppe Miliani, who introduced the Miliani Paper Mill to the international marketplace, and with Giambattista Miliani.

In 1931 a syndicate of banks and national institutes took over the Miliani Paper Mill, which became a joint-stock company in 1972. In 1982 its majority shareholder was the State Printing Office (*Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato*). In 2002, the Fabriano Paper Mill became part of the Fedrigoni Group [39], which took the place of the State Printing Office, and backed it with significant new investments. The Fedrigoni Group from Verona is the second European group in the field of special papers. Fedrigoni S.p.A. was born in 2011 through the amalgamation of Fedrigoni Cartiere, Cartiere Miliani Fabriano and Fabriano Securities.

On October 18, 2013 Fabriano was designated UNESCO Creative City in the section Crafts and Folk art [40]. Borrowing the words by Giorgio Pellegrini, if it is still difficult to find the City of *Paper* on a *paper* map (*la Città della Carta sulla carta*), this important award could support the brand of the city and its heritage.

4.3. The Museum of Paper and Watermark

The Museum of Paper and Watermark [41] is a public civic museum that was established in 1984 by the Municipality of Fabriano. It is a specialised museum focused on a local production tradition (paper manufacturing) and hosted in a historical building in the centre of Fabriano (the San Domenico monumental complex). The museum collects not only the tangible and intangible evidences of paper production in Fabriano (machinery and equipment) – 30% of which is a gratuitous loan by Fedrigoni S.p.A. –, but also its artistic products (watermarks, watercolours, printings, etc.). One of the purposes of the museum is to enhance all the possible uses of the finest paper made in Fabriano. The museum also has a bookshop selling publications about paper manufacturing and paper works made by paper masters in the museum.

The museum has no regulations whatsoever, nor a service charter nor an independent balance sheet. A possible scheme to understand its expenditures and revenues is arranged by the museum and partly published in the evaluation form (tab. 1). Expenditures include the contracts for 3 paper masters (*Mastri Cartai*) (109,000 euros/per year), who collaborate with the museum, and other cultural activities. They do not include museum staff (about 150,000 euros/per year) for 4 people working in the museum, for a seasonal guide (4 months) and for part of the salary of the person in charge of Culture and Tourism in the Town of Fabriano. Consumption expenses (water, electricity and gas) are about 35,000 euros/per year.

As concerns the museum's public, the Museum of Paper and Watermark attracts people who already know the brand "Fabriano". Almost one third of visitors are school children. Between 2014 and 2016 museum visitors decreased from 46,096 to 40,263 (tab. 1). In 2016, the lower number of schools visiting the museum should also be imputed to the bad publicity given by the earthquakes that affected the inner areas of Lazio, Marche and Umbria between August and October 2016. Even though the Museum of Paper and Watermark was not damaged by the earthquake, many visits were lost and activities booked by schools and visitors cancelled.

Table 1. Museum visitors and budget years 2014–2016 (Source: The Museum of Paper and Watermark)

| Year | Visitors | Budget |
|------|------------------------------------|---|
| 2014 | 46,096 (15.680 school students) | € 115,689 expenditures € 319,823 revenues |
| 2015 | 42,315 (15.279 school students) | € 120,980 expenditures € 300,133 revenues |
| 2016 | 40,263 (14.960 school students) | € 116,600.00 expenditures € 321,253 revenues |

One of the main strengths of the museum is the tight network of relationships with international partners, such as the Royal Watercolour Society, the Royal Scottish Society of Painters in Watercolour, the Corcoran College of Art and Design (Washington DC), the Biennial International Prize of Shenzhen (China), the Adelaide College of the Arts (Australia), the Bratec Lis School Moscow (Russia), and many other connections with the most

important painters in watercolour in different countries. The museum organises different activities with these institutions, such as prizes and exhibitions.

Less effective are local networks and joint projects. The museum participates in the Museum System of the Province of Ancona (*Sistema Museale della Provincia di Ancona*) [42] and in the Urban Museum Network “A thousand footsteps in and around the town” (*Rete Museale Urbana “Mille passi in Centro”*) [43]. The former is a network of public and private institutions born in 1997 and aimed at fostering the cooperation among museums and at promoting the cultural heritage of the Province of Ancona, while the latter is a project promoted by the Municipality of Fabriano in 2007, that had a scant success (more or less 100 applications up to 2017). The project, mainly addressed to schools and organised groups, was meant to be a journey into the heart of paper, printing, music, art and Italian craftsmanship, offering a full immersion in the City of Paper through a single ticket to visit different museums in Fabriano: the Museum of Paper and Watermark, the Museum of Piano and Sound, the Museum of Printing “Civilization of Writing”, the Museum of Old Trades by bicycle. In actual, there is a lack of communication, because each museum does not promote the other museums belonging to the same network, nor does it communicate the tight historical and cultural relationships between them and with the local context and its heritage. In addition, the Civic Gallery “Bruno Molajoli” is excluded from this itinerary.

The museum communication, analysed in-depth in this book by Patrizia Dragoni, is based on traditional tools such as museum boards and effective guided tours. One of the main attractions for visitors is the experience of paper manufacturing. During the visit people can see paper masters making paper sheets following ancient traditional techniques (fig. 1). It is a way to broaden the knowledge of the intangible heritage the museum has to preserve and to satisfy the need for authentic experiences expressed by new audiences. The educational activities also have laboratories actively involving young visitors – e.g. *We are all paper masters (Siamo tutti mastri cartai)* –, while residential workshops allow artists to work in the museum.



Fig. 1. Paper masters making paper sheets following ancient traditional techniques (Source: The Museum of Paper and Watermark)

The museum does not conduct surveys on visitors but the website, that was launched in 1998, provides on line visitors with a link to the TripAdvisor website to read reviews about the museum and its services.

4.4. The Institute of Paper History Gianfranco Fedrigoni (ISTOCARTA)

The Institute of Paper History Gianfranco Fedrigoni (ISTOCARTA) [44] was established in Fabriano less than ten years ago, in 2011, by Fedrigoni S.p.A., which took over the historical Miliani Paper Mill in 2002, and was officially recognised as a legal entity in 2012. The institute, which is hosted in the historical Miliani Paper Mill building complex, is a non-profit foundation dedicated to Gianfranco Fedrigoni (1905-1990), a paper entrepreneur in the field of paper production who ran paper mills in the North of Italy. As stated by art. 2 of the Corporate By-Laws of the Association ISTOCARTA, the head office in Fabriano cannot be transferred elsewhere: “on resolution of the Board of Directors and in agreement with legal formalities, any transfer of the head office must be limited to the territory (municipal district) of Fabriano” [45].

ISTOCARTA aims at promoting the research on paper and filigranology (the study of watermarks) as well as the development and dissemination of paper sciences. As published in its website, its mission is:

- to publish research results, thus contributing to the enhancement of paper historiography;
- to organise conferences, seminars, meetings on topics and issues linked to the history of paper;
- to establish and maintain relations and promote cultural exchanges with universities, academies, museums, libraries, private and public historical archives, as well as individual scholars and researchers;
- to protect the historical, archaeological and archive heritage pertaining to the paper industry, as well as the traditional medieval techniques implemented in the paper manufacturing process;
- to carry out museum activities aimed at the conservation, maintenance and use of archive and library assets, archaeological remains, the historical paper heritage of the Miliani Paper Mill owned by Fedrigoni S.p.A.;
- to put in place cultural synergies jointly with the “Pia Università dei Cartai”, which began its editorial activity in 1986 by publishing the “Collana di Storia della Carta” (Series on Paper History) edited by Giancarlo Castagnari.

An important part of the activity carried out by the institute is the management of the archive of the Miliani Paper Mill, one of the first enterprise archive declared of noteworthy historical interest on July, 20 1964, with the following motivation: “it concerns the Archive of the Miliani Paper Mill, whose documents date back to its founding by Pietro Miliani in the second half of the 18th century and sheds light on technical and economic activities, on social problems relating to the workers employed in that period, on relationships with representatives of the world of letters, arts and politics, and on international commercial relationships”. Cavalcoli [46].

This heritage is preserved in five rooms on the ground floor of the industrial building of the Miliani Paper Mill, which now houses the offices of Fedrigoni S.p.A. It consists of bound and loose documents, photographs, watermarked paper, videos, films, drawings etc. This heritage is enriched by the technological-scientific heritage, such as a hydraulic multiple hammer mill dating back to the end of the 18th century, a screw press (1706), 793 cylindrical canvases, 269 cuttings of ancient cylindrical canvases, more than 6,000 wooden, bronze and

copper punches, 2,295 forms for handmade paper dating from the first half of 19th century, commissioned by National and International Banks and historical companies of Made in Italy excellences (FIAT, Liquore Strega, Fernet Branca, Stabilimento Ricordi, etc.).

The Institute organises many activities and takes part in different cultural projects, from conferences to exhibitions, from restorations to publications [47]. It also participates in national and international initiatives such as the Enterprise Culture Week or Digital Invasions, a project aimed at spreading digital culture and the use of open data, training and arousing awareness in public institutions on the use of the web and social media networks in a joint effort for promoting and spreading the value of culture (fig. 2). The latest exhibition organised in 2017 is *The historical Miliani Paper Mill: souvenir photos of the “nice factory”* (*Le storiche Cartiere Miliani: FOTORICORDO della “fabbrica bella”*).



Fig. 2. #invasionidigitali – Digital Invasions: programme 2015 (Source: ISTOCARTA)

Finally, the archive is an internal and external marketing resource for the Fedrigoni Group S.p.A. More specifically, when designing new products such as greeting cards, notebooks and pocketbooks, production processes creatively exploit the value of history and tradition. An example is provided by the stitch-bound watermarks notebook, whose two-colour hardcover, blue and green or red and yellow, reproduces the same pattern of ancient watermarks [48].

4.5. Research results

The City of Paper is a case of “alive” industrial heritage, where tradition and innovation meet with relevant economic impacts. The Fedrigoni Group is a leading group in Europe, employing more than two thousand employees in nine countries around the world and with important factories still working in the district of Fabriano (Fabriano, Castelrimondo and Pioraco). The Museum of Paper and Watermark and the Institute of Paper History “Gianfranco Fedrigoni” (ISTOCARTA) have an important role in enhancing place-specific paper heritage for the benefit of citizens, tourists, and all the territorial local system. In order to face the new challenges arising from the innovative definition of cultural heritage as a dynamic concept resulting from the interaction with people and of valorisation as a democratic mandate, some considerations should be made.

The research results reveal that the museum does well, even though it is a small institution with scant financial resources. The availability of a corpus of professional employees, including paper masters and guides, is one of its main strengths, ensuring the quality of its cultural services. It also allows satisfying the need for authenticity through the real experience of paper manufacturing – e.g. the laboratory *We are all paper masters* in the museum. Nevertheless, the decrease of visitors over the last three years calls for a close examination of the marketing and communication strategies adopted by the museum. First of all, the lack of a systematic analysis of museum audiences has to be registered. Data about museum visitors and non-visitors should be collected and analysed both to reach specific audiences through a targeted communication and to understand visitors’ needs and expectations. In order to better involve local communities, the innovation of the museum on-line and on-site communication should be considered, broadening the experiential approach already adopted by the museum through the additional contribution of ICTs.

Given that the types of innovations could be very expensive, the role of local networks has to be re-examined. Networks could be a means not only to achieve cost advantages, especially economies of scale and scope, but also to extend the experience and the knowledge of the local culture and identity beyond the doors of the museum [49]. These networks should involve all the museums and cultural institutions working in Fabriano and its area and local enterprises as a territorial local system. Particularly, the cooperation between the Museum of Paper and Watermark and ISTOCARTA has to be developed. Even though they are historically and culturally connected, they do not intertwine in a real partnership able to effectively promote local industrial heritage and to contribute to local sustainable development. The archive of the Miliani Paper Mill managed by ISTOCARTA could and should be a relevant asset for museum innovation, for example through the rotation of collections. Moreover, ISTOCARTA could increase its national and international partnerships, also involving the main made-in-Italy brands who worked with the Miliani Paper Mill (FIAT, Liquore Strega, Fernet Branca, Stabilimento Ricordi, etc.).

5. Conclusions

As argued by Perfetto and Presenza, “the success of a cultural project of Industrial Heritage is intrinsically linked to the ability to generate a dense network of relationships” and “each element should establish bilateral relationships with other elements”. Perfetto, Presenza [50].

The case study here discussed confirms that Fabriano’s industrial heritage has a multi-dimensional value satisfying needs expressed by new audiences, spreading knowledge on industrial history and increasing the value of the industrial historical brand “Cartiere Mil-

iani”. It also reveals that the future of Fabriano’s territorial local system lies in the quality of its partnerships. International partnerships already developed by the Museum of Paper and Watermark and by ISTOCARTA are an important way to position the “Fabriano” brand on the global market both as the City of Paper and as a UNESCO Creative City. Nevertheless, the need for value creation and co-creation by continually innovating the cultural offer calls for an improvement of local networks able to satisfy both cultural needs, by enhancing the deep relationship between local industrial museums and archives and their context, thus obtaining a wider knowledge about the territory as a whole, and economic needs, by overcoming cultural institutions’ structural and organisational weaknesses through cost reduction (transaction costs, average costs per unit, and fixed costs) and the saturation of the production capacity.

References

1. Pine II B.J., Gilmore J.H. *Authenticity: What consumers really want*. Harvard Business School Press, 2007.
2. Pine II B.J., Gilmore J.H. *Welcome to the Experience Economy*. Harvard Business Review 1 (1998), available from: <<https://hbr.org/1998/07/welcome-to-the-experience-economy>>.
3. Lanternari V. *Valorizzazione del folklore e dei «beni culturali». Musei come centri e simboli di identità storico-culturale*. In: Dai “primitivi” al “postmoderno”. *Tre percorsi di saggi storico-antropologici*. Liguori, 2006, 199–213.
4. Lipovetsky G. *La mania dell’autentico*. In: J. Garcin, ed. *Nuovi miti di oggi. Da Barthes alla Smart*. Il Saggiatore, 2008, 99–101.
5. Grayson K., Martinec R. *Consumer Perceptions of Iconicity and Indexicality and their Influence on Assessments of Authentic Market Offerings*. Journal of Consumer Research, 31/2 (2004) 296–312; Beverland M.B., Farrelly F.J. *The Quest for Authenticity in Consumption: Consumers’ Purposive Choice of Authentic Cues to Shape Experienced Outcomes*. Journal of Consumer Research 36/5 (2010) 838–856.
6. Arnould E.J., Price L.L. *Authenticating Acts and Authoritative Performances: Questing for Self and Community*. In: D.G. Mick, S. Ratneshwar, C. Huffman, eds. *The Way of Consumption: Contemporary Perspectives on Consumer Motives, Goals and Desires*. Routledge, 2000, 140–163.
7. UNESCO. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris, 17 October 2003, available from: <<https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention>>.
8. UNESCO. *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. Paris, 21 October 2005, available from: <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001429/142919e.pdf>>.
9. See: Jokilehto J. *Definitions of Cultural Heritage*, ICCROM, ICCROM Working Group ‘Heritage and Society’, 2005; Vecco M. *A definition of cultural heritage: from tangible to intangible*. Journal of Cultural Heritage 11 (2010) 321–324; Vecco M. *Economie du patrimoine monumental*, Economica, 2017.
10. UNESCO. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris, 17 October 2003, art. 2.
11. Loulanski T. *Revising the concept for cultural heritage: the argument for a functional approach*. International Journal of Cultural Property 13 (2006) 207–233.
12. Council of Europe. *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. Faro, 27 October 2005, available from: <http://www.ecco-eu.org/fileadmin/user_upload/CETS_199.docxFARO_CONVENTION.pdf>.
13. Council of Europe. *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. CETS No. 199, Explanatory Report, 2005, art. 5, b. In English “valorisation” has a much narrower meaning. The Faro Convention adopts here the French meaning of “valorise” (*valoriser*) as “accord value”.

14. Council of Europe. *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. CETS No. 199, Explanatory Report, 2005, art. 5, g.
15. See: Simon N. *The Participatory Museum*. Museum 2.0, 2010; Waterton E., Watson S. *Heritage and Community engagement. Collaboration or Contestation?*. Routledge, 2011; Bennett R., Kerrigan F., O'Reilly D., eds. *New Horizons in Arts, Heritage, Nonprofit and Social Marketing*. Routledge, 2012; Black G. *Transforming Museums in the Twenty-first Century*. Routledge, 2012; Scott C.A., ed. *Museums and Public Value. Creating Sustainable Futures*. Ashgate, 2013; Golinelli G., ed. *Cultural Heritage and Value Creation. Towards New Pathways*. Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2015; Taheri B., O'Gorman K., Baxter I. *Contemporary issues in museums and heritage marketing management: introduction to the special issue*. Journal of Marketing Management 32 (2016) 15–16.
16. *Memorandum of Understanding between ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) and TICCIH (The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage) regarding a Framework for Collaboration on the Conservation of Industrial Heritage*. November 10, 2014, available from: <<http://ticcih.org/about/icomosticcih-memorandum-of-understanding/>>.
17. See: Alfrey J., Putnam T. *The Industrial heritage: managing resources and uses*. Routledge, 1992; Dansero E. *Distretti industriali e ambiente: un percorso di ricerca*. Sviluppo Locale 7 (1998) 93–112; Dansero E., Emanuel C., Governa F., edited by. *I patrimoni industriali. Una geografia per lo sviluppo locale*. FrancoAngeli, 2003; Damborn P. *Patrimoine industriel et développement local*. Editions Jean Delaville, 2004.
18. Hewison R. *The Heritage Industry. Britain in a climate of decline*. A Methuen Paperback, 1987, 92–93.
19. Hewison R. *The Heritage Industry. Britain in a climate of decline*. A Methuen Paperback, 1987, 43.
20. Lipovetsky G. *La mania dell'autentico*. In: J. Garcin, ed. *Nuovi miti di oggi. Da Barthes alla Smart*. Il Saggiatore, 2008, 99.
21. Petrucci M.A. *Dall'archeologia industriale agli ecomusei. L'evoluzione del significato e del ruolo dei patrimoni industriali*. In: E. Dansero C. Giaimo, A. Spaziantè, eds. *Patrimoni industriali e sviluppo locale*. FrancoAngeli, 2003, 53–66.
22. Dansero E., Governa F. *Patrimoni industriali e sviluppo locale*. In: E. Dansero C. Giaimo, A. Spaziantè, eds. *Patrimoni industriali e sviluppo locale*. FrancoAngeli, 2003, 27.
23. See: Montella M. *Valore e valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale storico*. Mondadori Electa, 2009; Montella M. *Conoscenza e informazione del cultural heritage come spazio d'impresa*. Sinergie 76 (2008) 91–11.
24. See: Barney J. *Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage*. Journal of Management 17 (1991) 99–120; Grant R.M. *The Resource-based Theory of Competitive Advantage: Implications for Strategy Formulation*. California Management Review 33 (1991) 114–135.
25. See: Cross R., Baird L. *Technology is not enough: Improving performance by building organizational memory*. Sloan Management Review 41/3 (2000) 69–78; Chiarvesio M., Di Maria E. *Innovazione, comunicazione e presidio dei mercati. Le performance delle imprese del made in Italy*. Mercati e Competitività 1 (2012) 131–153; Napolitano R., Marino V. *Cultural Heritage e Made in Italy. Casi ed esperienze di marketing internazionale*. Editoriale Scientifica, 2016.
26. See: Montemaggi M., Severino F. *Heritage marketing. La storia dell'impresa italiana come vantaggio competitivo*. FrancoAngeli 2007; Futurebrand. *Made in. The value of Country of Origin for future brands*. Futurebrand, 2014–2015; Fondazione Symbola-Unioncamere. *Io sono cultura – 2017. L'Italia della qualità e della bellezza sfida la crisi*. Quaderni di Symbola, 2017.
27. *Beni Culturali nel Bilancio Sociale di Impresa*. Associazione Amici della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, 2005.
28. See: Pine II B.J., Gilmore J.H. *Authenticity: What consumers really want*. Harvard Business School Press, 2007; Bucci A., Codeluppi V., Ferraresi M. *Il made in Italy. Natura, settori e problemi*. Carocci, 2011.
29. See: Montella M. *Valore e valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale storico*, Mondadori Electa, 2009; Bertoli G., Resciniti R. *Made in Italy e country of origin effect*. Mercati e Competitività 2

- (2013) 13–36; Fontana A. *Manuale di Storytelling: raccontare con efficacia prodotti, marchi e identità d'impresa*. Etas Libri, 2013; Liggeri D. *La comunicazione di musei e archivi d'impresa. Metodologie dell'informazione e strategie mediatiche*. Lubrina, 2015.
30. Bonti M. *The corporate museums and their social function: some evidence from Italy*. European Scientific Journal 1 (2014) 141–150.
 31. See: Nissley N., Casey A. *The Politics of the Exhibition: Viewing Corporate Museums Through the Paradigmatic Lens of Organizational Memory*. British Journal of Management 13 (2002) 35–45; Stigliani I., Ravasi D. *Organizational artefacts and the expression of identity in corporate museums at Alfa-Romeo, Kartell, and Piaggio*. In: L. Lerpold, D. Ravasi, J. van Rekom, G. Soene, eds. *Organizational Identity in Practice*. Routledge, 2007, 197–214; Montella M.M. *Musei d'impresa come strumento di comunicazione. Possibili innovazioni di prodotto, processo, organizzazione*. Esperienze d'impresa 2 (2010) 147–163; Seligson J. *Corporate, culture? One part education, one part sales: This is the corporate museum*. Museum 89/6 (2010) 34–41; Montella M.M. *Marketing del cultural heritage territoriale e musei di impresa. Un caso di analisi*. Mercati e Competitività 4 (2013) 33–51; Castellani P., Rossato C. *On the communication value of the company museum and archives*. Journal of Communication Management 18/3 (2014) 240–253; Montella M.M. *Nuovi strumenti di internal marketing e knowledge management. I musei d'impresa*. Sviluppo e organizzazione 260 (2014) 66–74; Pitkowska K.K. *The Corporate Museum: a new type of museum created as a component of marketing company*. The International Journal of the Inclusive Museum 6/2 (2014) 29–37; Vacca F. *Knowledge in Memory: Corporate and Museum Archives*. Fashion Practice –The Journal of Design Creative Process & the Fashion Industry 6/2 (2014) 273–288; Chirco M. ...*C'era una volta un'impresa... L'Heritage Marketing come nuova leva strategica applicata*. Eurilink, 2016.
 32. Alberti F.G., Giusti, J.D. *Cultural heritage, tourism and regional competitiveness: The Motor Valley cluster*. City, Culture and Society 3/4 (2012) 261–273.
 33. Barney J. *Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage*. Journal of Management 17 (1991) 99–120.
 34. Yin R.K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Sage Publications, 2003.
 35. Regione Marche, Servizio Internazionalizzazione, Cultura, Turismo e Commercio – Progetto Museo Diffuso. *Scheda di autovalutazione dei musei e delle raccolte museali*, available from: <<http://wsausei.cultura.marche.it/Informazioni/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=v0sMVOycKb8%3D&tabid=38>>.
 36. Castagnari G., Mannucci U., eds. *L'arte della carta a Fabriano*, Comune di Fabriano – Cartiere Miliani Fabriano, 1996³; Corinaldesi G. *Carte e cartiere di Fabriano dalle origini ai nostri giorni*. Tesi di laurea in Lettere, Università degli Studi “La Sapienza”, Roma, a.a. 1947–1948. Edizioni mcf, 2015.
 37. <<http://fabrianocreativa.it/detail.php?page=48>>.
 38. <<http://www.museodellacarta.com/docs/lastoria/ichiavelli.asp>>.
 39. <<http://www.fedrigoni.com/>>. See also: <<https://fabriano.com/en/>>.
 40. <<http://fabrianocreativa.it/>>.
 41. <<http://www.museodellacarta.com/default.asp>>.
 42. <<http://www.musan.it/nuovo/index.php>>.
 43. <<http://www.museodellacarta.com/docs/extra/millepassiincentro.asp>>.
 44. <<http://istocarta.it/en/>>.
 45. <<http://istocarta.it/download.php?ida=15>>.
 46. Cavalcoli V. *L'archivio storico delle cartiere Miliani di Fabriano*. ISTOCARTA, 2014, 15 (own translation).
 47. See the latest volume published by the institute: Castagnari G., ed. *The mould. Paper-and mould-makers in the history of Western paper*. ISTOCARTA, 2016.
 48. See: <<https://www.fabrianoboutique.it/en/quaderni-filigrane.html>>.
 49. Montella M. *Musei e beni culturali. Verso un modello di governance*. Mondadori Electa, 2003.
 50. Perfetto M.C., Presenza A. *The business ecosystem approach applied to the industrial heritage management*. Enlightening Tourism. A Pathmaking Journal 6/2 (2016) 153.