Throughout Europe religious buildings are closing

In the Netherlands, it is expected that within 10 years two-thirds of the churches will close and that the current 150 monasteries will be reduced to five. The diocese of Utrecht aims to reduce its 300 churches to 20.

The rhythm varies depending on the country, region or denomination, but the tendency is clear.

While the main underlying cause is reduced religious observance, other factors are also at work – mercantilism, which requires that decisions should be made on quantitative, measurable outcomes; pressures on government spending; urban development and insensitive planning decisions; the need to raise money to pay off debts; the reluctance of church tax payers to sign up, as their parents did, to a lifetime’s allegiance.

More fundamental trends include a decline in the value of ‘things beautiful’; Europe’s reluctance to look to its historic roots; a breakdown in local communities; reduced commitment to public space; a loss of interest in history, a dismissal of all that is not immediate…

Attitudes towards the use of religious buildings for activities other than worship vary around Europe, but to many it appears that, as congregations decline, opening buildings to appropriate non-worship activities such as concerts is worthwhile and certainly preferable to closure.

The difficulties of keeping buildings welcoming, informative and open, combined with a lack of an effective way of charging for entrance mean that the Mont St Michel has had more visitors in the past five years than in the whole of the Middle Ages – but how to divert tourists to smaller, less known churches.

The sector’s enormous potential is already demonstrated by the success of sites such as Notre-Dame, the Acropolis, Westminster Abbey, the Jewish Synagogue in Amsterdam or by the millions of pilgrims making their way to St Jacques de Compostelle.

Here, the challenge is not how to increase numbers – the Mont St Michel has had more visitors in the past five years than in the whole of the Middle Ages – but how to divert tourists to smaller, less known churches. The difficulties of keeping buildings welcoming, informative and open, combined with a lack of an effective way of charging for entrance mean that Europe’s wider religious heritage is seriously under-represented in tourist offices.

While multiple closures appear inevitable, care needs to be taken to ensure that there is proper and full consultation of all parties including the non-church going public before any decision is taken. All alternatives need to be examined including part sale, new uses, sharing with other denominations… Buildings of outstanding architectural or historic interest cannot be closed. Suitable management structures, therefore, need to be developed to ensure their future long-term well-being.

Development plans need to be drawn up that permit communities to appreciate the value of ‘their’ local religious heritage, to explore its potential and to understand how best this can be exploited.

What is to be done?

While religious buildings are in materially better condition than they have been for over a century, their management is often under-resourced and ill trained to respond with energy to the challenges of the 21st century.

The changes that are urgently required do not clearly fall within the remit of any of the main stakeholders - the religious bodies whose principal objectives lie with the spiritual needs of their flocks rather than in the upkeep of historic buildings; governments trying to cut spending; regional authorities arbitrating insufficient resources; historic monument bodies allocating meagre funding to the preservation of precious fabric.
to provide necessary floor space. More famous is London’s St Martin-in-the-Fields, which, following a £36 million renovation scheme, employs 200 people in a variety of outreach programmes. McKinsey estimate at 1.6 million the number of volunteers using faith buildings in the UK for non-worship activities with needy groups such as immigrants, the unemployed, the young, and the sick - numbers far outweighing any other volunteer group in the country.

Raising funding to maintain and repair buildings that are locked and unused is not the solution

Efforts should be concentrated on discussing the potential use for buildings, on ‘marketing’ them to the worshipping and the non-worshipping public and on implementing the organisational and physical changes required.

There is no single recipe, but the work of FRH members already provides many useful pointers as to which are successful and where action could usefully be taken.

A number of FRH members manage portfolios of religious buildings that would otherwise have had to close. Many do not have access to government funding and have developed successful mixed professional and volunteer management teams that promote the use of their buildings for non-faith activities as well as keeping them open for worship. As potential sustainable long-term managers of important parts of Europe’s cultural heritage these different business models merit serious comparative study.

One FRH member concentrates its energies in encouraging ‘its’ churches to remain open and welcoming and to provide accessible information to visitors. Its 300 members each subscribes to a ‘charter’ and in return benefits from joint marketing initiatives. That churches can be ‘marketed’ is demonstrated by another association that in three years increased visitor numbers to ‘its’ 153 places of worship from 25,000 to 95,000 before government funding was withdrawn. Interestingly most of these visitors were local....

There are further examples of visitors being encouraged to purchase single tickets, giving access to a number of churches and thus diversifying their interest. This model suits best the larger tourist destinations.

Approaches such as these require a clear sense of objective and buy-in from stakeholders. One FRH member has obtained regional funding to enable it to help local churches to prepare business plans, to forecast future use and revenues, and to plan resource needs and spending on repairs. Another has started to provide grants for the preparation of such plans.

Maintenance is a chronic problem in religious buildings where, often, major repairs could have been avoided if suitable protection, particularly from water ingress, had been provided earlier. Several FRH members are promoting training in maintenance, the formalisation of maintenance plans and collective maintenance agreements with a single supplier covering a portfolio of buildings.

Other FRH members are active in the preparation of inventories of contents. There are various schools of thought as to the best way to protect artefacts from theft and the other source of loss, perhaps more important, that can best be described as ‘benign neglect’. At one extreme is the view that churches should be proud of their possessions, put them on display and keep churches open. This view maintains that a determined thief will cause more damage by breaking into a locked building and that the risk of neglect. At the other extreme are those who believe that artefacts should best be locked up and that inventories should be kept secret as otherwise they provide a ‘thief’s shopping list’.

Some FRH members have developed methodologies whereby artefacts and vestments are grouped within a single place of worship, thus ensuring that they are both satisfactorily maintained, protected and on exhibition to visitors, but available for return to their church of origin for use for services. Further FRH members have staged large national exhibitions of church artefacts demonstrating to the general public the astonishing workmanship of articles ‘hidden’ within religious buildings. The protection and promotion of artefacts represents as big a challenge to the sector as the maintenance of the buildings themselves.

One interesting project developed by an FRH member under the banner ‘Europe’s Biggest Museum’ is to raise finance for university students to compete in the search for the most interesting religious artefacts in their region. The sponsor’s prize money is used to restore the winning artefact. It may prove possible to extend this project, which brings much useful publicity to the sector, both across borders and also to a wider public for example via the social outreach programmes of commercial companies.

Money is a chronic issue in the sector. The amount provided by grant-making FRH members is necessarily modest but does provide much needed encouragement to recipients and often helps to provoke further funding. It also targets areas where funding is not readily available elsewhere such as in preparing business plans, installation of WCs and kitchen facilities or the repair of buildings that, although unalisted, are of value.

An interesting initiative in the UK is the annual bicycle ride round local churches that, by encouraging individual sponsorship, raises an annual £ 2 million for church repairs. Prizes are also given by some FRH members to reward worthwhile adaptations of religious buildings or successful restoration of artefacts.

What can FRH do to help?

In view of the size of the challenge, the resources of FRH and its members are woefully inadequate. They do provide, however, much useful material on which to develop future policies in support of Europe’s religious heritage.

One of FRH’s roles is to bring members together, to help them to understand their underlying complementarities despite differences of language, region and culture and assist them, as appropriate, to work together to develop cross-border projects.

FRH also works to ensure that the cause of religious heritage is better known.

The EU has, historically, placed little weight on the place of culture as a binding force in the European ideal. Happily, this situation is beginning to change. While currently only 0.15% of the EU’s budget is spent on culture, the initial draft for the next six year spending programme shows a welcome increase with an allocation of €1.85 billion to ‘Creative Europe’ compared with €1.46 billion in the current spending round. This reflects the decision, in the EU’s foreign policy, that one of its three focus areas is ‘reinforcing cooperation on cultural heritage’.

What is still regrettable, however, is the systematic secular bias given to discussion about culture. Europe’s religious heritage – the 500,000 buildings themselves, churches, chapels, synagogues, mosques, cathedrals, monasteries, convents; their contents, furnishings, monuments, sculptures, paintings, frescos, silver, vestments, libraries; the architects, artists & musicians they have inspired over the centuries; their record of national, local and individual history dating back well over a 1,000 years – which represents a unique and essential part of Europe’s cultural identity is largely ignored!

Again, FRH is pleased to note that attitudes are beginning to change.

In 2015, the European parliament approved a paper entitled ‘Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe’, which initially contained no reference to religious heritage. Following active intervention by FRH, the final version included the statement: Religious heritage is one of the pillars of European culture and identity. It is the largest “museum” in Europe and covers every corner of the continent.
FRH has been nominated as one of the stakeholders in the 2018 ‘European Year of Cultural Heritage’. It is organising the ‘Torch’ initiative by which a treasure box will be carried around Europe collecting individual testimonies from local personalities about religious buildings. The Torch, which started from Leeuwarden in the Netherlands in January, will be delivered in Paris on 11th – 13th October at the conference that FRH is organising with its French partner – la Sauvegarde de l’Art Français - to encourage a real debate on the future of Europe’s religious heritage.

The EU has also provided some much appreciated financial support to FRH in the form of a grant of €1 million over four years on condition that FRH raises matched funding of €250,000.

In view of the complexities of the challenges facing religious heritage, the diversity of the aims of its multiple stakeholders and the general lack of credible information on which to build a forward-looking policy for the sector, further study is required not only to underline the value of this heritage but, more importantly, to identify the changes that are needed to assist it to adapt successfully to the constraints of the 21st century and to provide guidelines for its future.

The arguments as to why religious heritage is important need to be clearly made.

- **Social Value:** Religious buildings bind communities together through the worship and non-worship activities that take place within them. They are often the only public buildings remaining.
- **Economic Value:** Places of worship attract visitors from afar and from nearby. Religious buildings represent five out of ten of Europe’s most visited sites and make a major contribution to tourism GDP.
- **Environmental value:** Their physical presence in the cityscape or rural environment enlivens all who pass by.
- **Cultural value:** Sacred buildings, their contents and their history represent, and by far, the biggest single portfolio of Europe’s historic patrimony.

The biggest challenge facing the sector in developing greater use of religious buildings and in promoting religious heritage tourism is one of organisation.

A particularly promising vector is the development of volunteer support groups, which not only work to preserve this heritage but also help to bring social cohesion to both rural and urban areas. All over Europe, associations are being set up, often in support of single buildings. Such associations benefit from the unpaid enthusiasm of determined individuals, not always worshippers, for whom their religious building represents an important repository of local or family history and a centre of community value.

If the sector is to build on this volunteer effort, it will have to find ways to provide professional training and a way to federate individual associations so that each does not have to ‘reinvent the wheel’.

FRH is already working to provide active help for the development of such a ‘network’ through the crossborder sharing of experience and the provision of useful international electronic support tools.

Religiana, a project being developed by FRH in association with UK member, the National Churches Trust, is one such tool.

The Internet contains an ever-increasing wealth of information about individual churches and their contents. Religiana sets out to link this into a simplified standardised format that will allow travellers to see at a glance the religious heritage present within a locality, to help search by specific interest, to see when buildings are open and to obtain feedback from other visitors.

The traditional pilgrimage routes that have criss-crossed Europe for over a millennium are attracting increasing numbers. Religiana sets out to provide information on the buildings to be visited on such routes, and help in the development of itineraries.

It will also provide a platform to publicise events in religious buildings and will allow building managers to reach a far wider audience and promote support for their building.

More ambitiously, Religiana aims to provide a payment portal for visitors wishing to make donations to churches they visit. The transfer of tax credits on such donations between European member states is not yet possible, but finding ways of achieving such transfers between selective countries is one of FRH’s objectives.

Longer term, it is hoped that Religiana will provide the underlying quantitative information necessary to build a convincing case for religious heritage.

A new edition of Religiana is currently under development but its future is hampered by lack of resources.

The issues facing Europe’s Religious Heritage are complex, not open to simple solutions and urgent. Their sheer scale is daunting.

There is much that can be done - but this requires considerably more resources than that currently available either to FRH or to its members.

Please help us ensure that our generation rises to the challenge!

Olivier de Rohan
The Friends of FRH

The Friends of FRH is an independent association set up by la Fondation Roi Baudouin.

Its aims are to:
• Promote a better understanding of the sector’s needs and advocate positive change;
• Promote FRH as the European federator of like-minded organisations;
• Provide a source of volunteer support;
• Attract donations and introduce FRH to major donors.

Roseline de Carmoy and Philippe le Hodey are the patrons of the Friends’ group in co-ordination with Sarah de Lencquesaing.

Park Abbey – Leuven
Friends were invited to participate in FRH’s 2017 AGM, which was held in the 900-year-old Parkabdij (Park Abbey) in Leuven, Belgium. Recently converted into a public space, a music centre, a museum and a research centre for organic farming while, at the same time, retaining its fine church and historic accommodation for its monks, this is a remarkable example of how fine historic religious heritage can be transformed and made relevant to the needs of the 21st century.

Northern Holland
The Friends saw several examples of fine C17th Dutch churches and participated at Leeuwarden in the launch of the ‘Torch initiative’ – FRH’s contribution to the 2018 Year of Cultural Heritage. Two regional associations - Alde Fryske Tsjerken and Oude Groninger Kerken - presented their management models. Between them, they own, maintain to a high standard and have developed mixed secular and religious use for around 130 churches many of which would otherwise be closed.

Saint-Omer – France
A town whose riches were built on the wool trade with Britain possesses many fine buildings. Friends saw the ruins of St Bertin, whose collapsed tower is a good example of post-war municipal neglect, attended a concert in the newly restored Jesuit chapel, examined the town’s remarkable mediaeval religious manuscripts and witnessed the damage suffered by the abandoned but magnificent church of St Denis, recently closed as being unsafe for use.

They were generously received by the Mayor and the town council and appreciated the remarkable efforts they and the CAPSO are making to restore the town’s religious heritage, to find new uses and to fund current maintenance. Notre-Dame, despite its magnificence and name is not officially a cathedral and thus has to be funded locally.

For further information on the Friends please contact Véronique de Bellaing at v.debellaing@frh-europe.org
Religiana

Religiana aims to become the reference site in religious heritage providing visitors with accurate information on opening hours, contact details and historical information on religious heritage sites. Religiana is free to use; adding a building to the site can be done easily and independently through the website, meaning that Religiana can grow organically and authentically.

Religiana aims to:
• Increase visitor numbers to the "Largest Museum in Europe";
• Promote churches as centres of the local community and history;
• Increase donations to places of worship by articulating needs and maximising fiscal benefits;
• Provide the factual foundation for a convincing ‘Case for Churches’.

By providing the general public with on-line multilingual information about:
• Churches and other religious buildings, their history, architecture and contents;
• Church trails and pilgrimages;
• Opening hours;
• Contact information to help facilitate visits.

Projects

By helping managers of buildings and associated NGOs to:
• Promote the interests or uses of their church or NGO;
• Build virtual communities of interested individuals;
• Advertise donation needs and ways for users to contribute to the upkeep of the building, whilst offering, relevant tax benefits.

By developing a single source of accurate, up to date information about Europe’s religious heritage to:
• Permit its systematic promotion to visitors (e.g. via tour operators or guidebooks);
• Provide factual evidence of the sector’s economic and social value.

Add your building to Religiana and:
• Access an audience of potential visitors from across Europe;
• Take advantage of translations to provide information in multiple languages;
• Collect donations and support your needs through advertising.

FRHInform

FRH Inform is a project researching the state of religious heritage on a Europe-wide scale. Its aim is to research concrete data for each European country in terms of the numbers of buildings, type and ownership. Particular attention will be paid to identifying examples of successful innovation in the sector.

Research is being carried out through literature, national reports and data gathered by NGO’s with particular attention to harnessing the knowledge of FRH members. A key focus is to obtain qualitative data over quantitative data and by setting a methodology.

Basic data for most Western European countries is already available. Results for the larger part of Eastern Europe are still being researched. The results will be available in the Members Area of the FRH website.
EUROPETOUR’s initial conclusions are that there is both a clear shortage of skills in marketing and public relations and a real need for cooperation at both regional and national levels. The project will present its final outcomes in August 2016: eight self-guided training courses for cultural tourism stakeholders in rural areas containing a series of exercises and best practices in seven languages plus an online best practice map.

Voices of Culture

One key area of the EYCH project that FRH has been working on is the participation in the stakeholder group ‘Voices of Culture and Heritage’ that brings together 35 cultural organisations to advise the European Commission on the activities and implementation of the European Year. This was an excellent opportunity for FRH to place religious heritage onto the European agenda during the meetings, which took place in April, September and December 2017. These were designed to allow for sharing feedback and exchanging ideas and experiences regarding the European Year through open dialogue with other stakeholders and the European Commission.

The Biggest Museum of Europe

FRH is currently exploring ways in which the non-worshipping public can be encouraged to appreciate the interest of the artefacts to be found in its local churches.

In its current form developed by member la Sauvageade de l’Art Frantais, students from the International public policy school, Sciences Po, compete to identify the artefact most meriting restoration in each of the six campus regions. Following decision by a committee of experts, money raised from sponsors is then applied to return the object to its original glory. This project, which started as an initiative of the Ecole du Louvre, has recently attracted the patronage of France’s President. It promotes both the interest of religious heritage within schools and provides much valuable cross community interaction. A key to its success is the building of a motivated management team supervising each of its various aspects.

FRH is investigating how this project can be given a European dimension and extended to other special interest groups.

Europetour

EUROPETOUR is a study to identify the skills needs of those active in rural cultural tourism across Europe, to identify shortfalls and to recommend remedial actions such as training schemes.

It is a three-year project under the K2 strategic partnership program of ERASMUS + and brings together ten partners in eight different countries – four cultural touristic networks, two tourism agencies, two economic developers, two dissemination experts, one social media expert and one training developer.

Legal identity

FRH was registered as an ASBL (Association Sans But Lucratif – a non-profit organisation) in Belgium on 29th September 2011 under number 839745430.

Statutory Aims

The aims of the Association are to “promote, encourage and support the safeguard, maintenance, conservation, restoration, accessibility and the embellishment of places of worship, their contents and their history.” FRH’s statutes specifically forbid “Religious proselytism”

Council

President
Olivier de Rohan, French, Chairman of the Sauvageade de l’Art Frantais

Secretary
Lilian Grootswagers, Dutch, Vice-Chairman of the Task Force Toekomst Kerkegebouwen

Treasurer
Michael Hoare, English, former Chairman of the National Churches Trust

Pilar Bahamonde, Spanish, Director of Llêbana Centre for Studies and Infantado Tower Museum, Poles

Robert Chatin, French, Industrialist and banker

Giannalia Cogliandro, Italian, Secretary General of ENCATC

Thomas Coomans, Belgian, professor at the K.U. Leuven, representative of the Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation

Sarah de Lencquesaing, American, Council member of French American Foundation & Heritage Society

Wencelas de Lobkowicz, French / Czech, former EU lawyer

Mara Popescu, Hungarian, Expert In Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development

Membership

FRH has two classes of membership:

• Full members – organisations that support FRH objectives

• Associate members – other organisations and individuals

FRH currently has 56 Full members and 88 Associate members in 38 countries. Details of membership are available on the FRH website.

Registered Office

67 Rue de Trèves, 1040 Bruxelles Belgium.

FRH currently employs three full-time staff aided by interns and volunteers. Potential candidates for both paid and unpaid work should consult the website.

Heritage Circle

The Heritage Circle sets out to honour all those who have made a special contribution to FRH’s development.

Luc Noppen, Belgian, Professor at University of Quebec, Montreal

Oddbjørn Sørnoen, Norwegian, Director Department for Church Buildings and Heritage Administration, Norwegian Association for Church Employers

Crippin Truman, English, former CEO of the Churches Conservation Trust

During 2017, FRH posthumously elected Angus Fowler to its Heritage Circle. Born English, but proud of his Scottish ancestry, Angus spent most of his adult life in Marburg where he became an expert in the local Hesse churches. He helped found two associations to defend abandoned churches one in East Berlin, the other in Marburg. Angus played an active role in the founding of FRH and went on to become one of its regular contributors. He will be sorely missed.
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Governance

Council

The Council, elected by its members, is responsible for FRH’s governance.

FRH seeks to associate within its Council good knowledge of the sector, competency in ensuring top quality governance and specific skills such as the supervision of complex cross-border projects. It aims to include a good spread of nationality.

Committees

Members are encouraged to participate actively in Committees:

The Executive Committee, formed of members of Council, takes day-to-day decisions, manages the office and ensures that FRH’s resources are applied effectively.

The Members’ Committee, brings together members, organises Networking Forums and other events, collates information about the sector and incubates cross-border projects.

The Development Committee, works to ensure that FRH becomes better known and its views understood by the EU Commission and other European bodies. It helps FRH to build relationships with institutional funders, major donors and the ‘Friends of FRH’.

The Finance Committee, supervises the association’s accounts and ensures financial probity.

The Governance and Nominations Committee, sets the structures under which FRH operates, manages the nomination process to committees and to the Council and maintains the internal rules and policy manuals.

Projects

FRH seeks to manage each project separately. Accounts are presented on a project-by-project basis and it is anticipated that, as these develop, independent governance structures will be set up for each of the bigger projects.

Internal Rules

The Internal Rules of the Association are set by the Council.

They are a complement to the Statutes and, in the case of contradiction, the Statutes prevail.

The Statutes and an up to date version of the Internal Rules are posted on the website.

Members, both Full and Associate, accept these Rules by subscribing to the Association. Staff accept them by signing working, internship or volunteering contracts.
Europe’s sacred heritage - architectural, movable and intangible - is central to its cultural and aesthetic roots. In a constantly evolving society, religious buildings are unique repositories of art and history, resource for sustainable development and quality of life and tools for urban regeneration.

Religious heritage deserves a key position on local, national and European political agendas.

• Greater efforts should be made to maintain public understanding of religious heritage and to transmit this interest to future generations.
• Religious heritage should be shared, welcoming and open to the public.
• Extending uses beyond worship attract the non-church-going public and contribute economically to the costs of upkeep.
• ’Religious tourism’ should be encouraged.
• Visitors should be incited to contribute financially.
• Buildings should be properly maintained and managed.
• Volunteer groups and non-traditional funding sources should be encouraged.
• Artefacts should, where possible, be maintained in situ.
• Good artefact inventories are essential.
• Closure should only take place following:
  - Full consultation with all stakeholders - religious bodies, congregations, historic buildings commissions, heritage and community associations and the worshipping and non-worshipping public.
  - Proper study of alternatives such as gifting to congregations, use by other Churches, extending use beyond that of worship...
## Accounts

### Income & expenditure

Up to 31/12/16, FRH prepared its accounts on a cash received, cash paid basis. From 1/1/17 on a full accounting basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founders / Members fees</td>
<td>17,919</td>
<td>12,178</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td>15,291</td>
<td>15,557</td>
<td>20,676</td>
<td>15,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends** General</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>23,30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiana</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major donors General</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>40,795</td>
<td>91,724</td>
<td>88,795</td>
<td>41,145</td>
<td>45,016</td>
<td>31,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiana</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRHInform</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU funding ALTERheritage</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europetour</td>
<td>12,792</td>
<td>12,792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRH Connect</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sundry income</strong></td>
<td>719</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net conference contribution</strong></td>
<td>-3,188</td>
<td>6,547</td>
<td>-256</td>
<td>9,734</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td>21,221</td>
<td>60,239</td>
<td>118,448</td>
<td>133,820</td>
<td>122,622</td>
<td>107,992</td>
<td>192,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **General expenditure** |         |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Office costs | -29,224 | -27,451| -57,382| -127,495| -98,050| -80,598| -62,041|
| Network Group | -1,511  | -104   | -350   | -282   | 0      |        |        |
| Friends of FRH | -442    | -1,502 | -303   |        |        |        |        |
| Public relations | -240    | -732   | -923   | 0      |        |        |        |

| **Project expenditure** |         |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| ALTERheritage | -361    | -2,383 | -2,978 |        |        |        |        |
| Religiana   | -23,663 | -44,338| -44,036| -16,019|        |        |        |
| FRHInform   | -1,500  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Europetour  | -1,248  | -1,898 | -2,773 |        |        |        |        |
| Two Seas    | -293    |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| FRH Connect | -74,541 |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| EYCH        | -728    |        |        |        |        |        |        |

**Surplus for the year** | 36,279 |        |        |        |        |        |        |

*Total remuneration for both office and projects, including social security and other indirect costs 77,853

### Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31/12/11</th>
<th>31/12/12</th>
<th>31/12/13</th>
<th>31/12/14</th>
<th>31/12/15</th>
<th>31/12/16</th>
<th>31/12/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated reserves</td>
<td>71,014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>16,462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant monies received, but as yet unspent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities</td>
<td>-290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>58,535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31/12/11</th>
<th>31/12/12</th>
<th>31/12/13</th>
<th>31/12/14</th>
<th>31/12/15</th>
<th>31/12/16</th>
<th>31/12/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRH cash balances</td>
<td>13,105</td>
<td>45,918</td>
<td>106,661</td>
<td>87,596</td>
<td>60,569</td>
<td>39,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends**</td>
<td>19,505</td>
<td>13,305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>58,535</td>
<td>167,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not included in income prior to 31/12/16**
“All over Europe, our shared culture of tangible and intangible religious heritage needs to be safeguarded for future generations to enjoy.”

Olivier de Rohan, FRH President