POLITECNICO DI TORINO
Repository ISTITUZIONALE

The territory and the small museums: The Case of Piemonte

Original
The territory and the small museums: The Case of Piemonte / Minucciani, V.. - In: TAFTER JOURNAL. - ISSN 1974-563X. - ELETTRONICO. - 92(2017), pp. 1-10.

Availability:
This version is available at: 11583/2663383 since: 2017-01-18T19:08:45Z

Publisher:
Monti &Taft s.r.l.

Published
DOI:

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

03 November 2026

Tafter Journal
Esperienze e strumenti per cultura e territorio

The territory and the small museums: The Case of Piemonte

The architectural debate, as the cultural one, focus inevitably the attention on the big museums, when they are involved with the museum theme. From the eighties, decade in which museums, on the verge of death, have gloriously resuscitated, the bigger one have grown more and more under the guide (and gesture) of various archistar: beginning with the Louvre with Pei, following by the British with Foster, from the Prado with Moneo, to the Museumsinsel with Chipperfield… to say nothing of the recent cases of the Tate or the San Francisco MoMa. The first one, over a relatively short period, has proceeded to an extension; the second one has become the largest museum of contemporary art in the world.

Italy is not an exception. From the Uffizi to Vatican Museums, from Sforza Castle in Milan to the Egyptian Museum in Turin, the great projects, and the biggest investments, have involved these institutions during the last years.

However, the universe of museums is not composed of internationally renowned structures, able to attract hundreds of thousands, and often millions, of visitors. This is particularly true for the Italian case: an indispensable starting point for this discussion is the last census Istat, carried out in 2011 (disclosed in 2013), and related to museums, archaeological sites and monuments. It is necessary to mention briefly some conclusions.

This report **[1]** includes “museums and similar institutions…” **[2]** , it records 4.588 of them and emerges that almost a town on three hosts at least one museum or similar structure. A heritage estimated in 1.5 institutions every 100 kmq and almost one every 13 thousands inhabitants. In 2011, the visitors of Italian museums were almost 104 million.
It turned out that “big museums”, we will soon see what requirements implies this definition, usually are located in urban centres of a certain size and in a few regions. However, alongside these poles of greatest attraction, it is clear that the territory has a broad and rich set of cultural sites, of which the 17% is fragmented in municipalities with less than 2000 inhabitants.

In fact, the census insists on the clear distinction between big, small and extra small museums. The report makes clear that not even the 1% of the total Italian museums can be considered big (it is explained that a big museum is able to host 500.000 visitors a year), while three out of four are small and extra small structures, which don’t register more than 10.000 tickets for year.

The distinction between big and small is about the collections (the big museums contain more than 50.000 objects, the small ones less than 100), about the human resources (the big museums employee almost 80 professionals, the small ones just one and some are without staff).

Another important distinction are the financial resources: if the 30% of the Italian museums accesses to the public funding, for the small ones the percentage goes down to 17%; the 52% of the big ones catch private funding, but only the 9% of the small ones is able to do the same. Only little more than the 30% of the museums obtains with the tickets more than 20.000 euros. Finally, the 51% of the big museums produces revenues through the so-called additional services, while only the 9% of the small ones does the same.

However, the big numbers of the large museums, in some way, are reversed about other features, for example the relationship with the territory: only the 6% of the big museums provides indications about other cultural resources in the area, compared to the 40% of the small ones.

In addition, if the 1% of the big museums, alone, absorbes nearly half of the total audience and clearly more foreign tourists than the small museums, the last ones attract more the young and the less young people. On the total of visitors, in fact, the young people are the 20% in the big museums and the 30% in the small museums; the elderly were the 19% in the big museums and the 31% in the small ones. Therefore, the comparisons are changed.

The capacity to attract young people and old people is important. It is related with the so-called attention to the visitor. Exactly one century ago, Gilman created the expression museum fatigue **[3]** and, with a series of photographs that had much effect, he demonstrated that the way in which the museum object were exposed didn't pay attention to the comfort of the visitor. This last one, in fact, went out from the museum exhausted also from a physical point of view. The centrality of the collection took advantage of the one for whom conservation and exhibition were dedicated: the audience. That famous article introduced a strategic field for the Museography: the one that is called "visitor studies". This idea generated the awareness that doesn't exist a generic audience, but various and specific ones: divided by age, by cultural background, by expectations, by ability of concentration and memorization. All of this resulted in a key word, nowadays repeatedly used: "hospitality".

If we rethink to the previous cases, the fact that the most of the extensions of the big museums – often guaranteeing more spaces for the collections – are destined to manage the audience is a motive of reflection. It is clear in the Louvre, in the Prado and in the Museumsinsel. However, also in San Francisco the former building designed by Botta seems to become an enormous entrance for the new structure. It is useful to repeat the concept: the problem seems to be the necessity to find spaces in order to manage the audience, although the word used is actually welcoming areas. As I said, we are talking about the key word that should underline the renewed attention for the visitors. I take the liberty to object.

The world celebrates the bold architectural structures and the innovative formal solutions, but rarely someone provide information on the equivalent museographical (and museological) vision. The architecture of the container still takes advantage on the architecture of the content (which is the real reason that push to visit a museum). If you enter in the new Acropolis Museum in Athens or in the renovated Prado in Madrid, after a queue stemmed by barriers adequate to an airport check-in, you will be greeted by huge and modern spaces, but also by the gauntlet of metal detectors among which you will pass a little intimidated or even fearful (although you have nothing to reproach). Then, monumental information desks will welcome you with staff not always motivated (there are various exceptions) and the brochures are not always clearly interpretable.

It is worthless to clarify that the true hospitality should be something different.

Of course, we will go out from the Prado still excited about the meeting with Velazquez or with El Greco, but the frustrating search of the "our" path between rooms marked with roman numbers and plans that don't facilitate the orientation will leave a bitter aftertaste. We became fully aware of being a number in a indistinct crowd. A big amount of visitors doesn't correspond tout court to the museum quality (interpreted as an institution and not as a collection).

Yet, another concept that we feel resonate, for too long a time, concerns the design built around the user, or rather built on his experience (in fact it has been created the ugly expression experiential museum). However, this is often solved with the interactivity or with the pure use of senses (which can be declined in various ways), but the real experience is personal, far from being passive and above all it is strongly influenced and guided by its incipit. Any museographer knows well that the entrance has a strong impact on the visitor and the way in which the experience of the visit begins will be crucial for the next time. In other words, the way in which a person in greeted will influence not only the state of mind, but also the intellectual attitude with which the visit will be made.

After the museum's entrance has been crossed, the experience has already begun: metal detectors and information desks are the first, staggering epiphany.

However, as we said, not all the museums are big – quite the contrary, in Italy three quarters are considered small or even extra small. In these structures, the hospitality is very different. We have seen how they know to attract an audience less international (often), but also the young people and the elderly: categories symmetrically difficult and hard to please. Obviously, the quality of the service (and not just the collection) makes the difference.

The small museum has hardly extraterritorial significance, nor it can usually afford avant-garde architectural structures that can be of interest for the media. People talks little about small museums and often only in local communication networks. Almost never it is a state museum: sometimes it is regional, mostly municipal or even private (think of the company museums, but also of the many museums born from the work of cultural associations or from the passion of someone). It is obvious that the state delegates the management and the regulation to the regions, less obvious is that the state ignore them in its official guidelines and in its legislative decrees.

The data emerged from the Census of 2011 are already clear about this, so that the final report states that "the Italian model is characterized by small size organizations": thus small museums have to be considered the intrinsic feature of our country. In the following years we have seen a further accentuation of this phenomenon. From this point of view, I would like to present the case of Piemonte, where in 2011 Istat found 397 museums. Just five years later, in 2016 the official website of the region shows 479 museums. The numbers become even surprising when we consider that I am conducing a detailed research **[5]** and I have detected, until now, about 900 museums. Of course, the reasons for this discrepancy could be many: the opening of new institutions (to which, however, often correspond the same amount of closures), the fact that the smallest structures could have been ignored by the regional or national census, and finally the fact that many of them (private or extra small) aren't taken into consideration because they don't comply with the minimum requirements (and later we will talk about these requirements). Apart from that, these data are very significant: provisionally, can we conclude that today the museums in Italy could be more than double those surveyed by Istat in 2011 and so they are probably more than ten thousand, of which no more than a hundred can be defined big? Here, then, the large numbers of small museums are delineated even better.

The panorama that these museums are able to offer is of an exceptional interest.

To keep the example of Piemonte, and it is probable that few of its inhabitants know, it is possible to visit hundreds of "traditional museums" (more than two hundred ethno-anthropological museums) and many others placed within historical, artistic and religious monuments. There are "unpredictable" museums dedicated to different subjects: at least seven museums are dedicated to the gold **[5]** , three to the

emigration **[6]** , one to the umbrella **[7]** , two to the hat **[8]** and one to the ancient postcard **[9]**. In Piemonte, anyone can visit the museum of the False in the Castle of Verrone (BI) and the Magic Museum in Cherasco (CN); others are dedicated to individual craft: two to the saddler **[10]**, two to the chimney sweep **[11]** and two to the smuggler **[12]** (if we can define it a “profession”). Then, another ten are outdoor museums **[13]** and many are private: in addition to corporate museums (in the industrial, agricultural or wine and food sector), there are museums on the most various themes: from the Museo dell’Arredamento Borghese del ‘700 e ‘800 in Piemonte in Marentino (TO), to the Museo della Bicicletta in Bra (CN) and to the Museo delle Carrozze (NV).

The architectures that host the small museums deserve a specific mention.

Very rarely, there are the means and the opportunities to design new specific buildings. Conversely, apart from the museum houses, for which the location is obligated, small museums are often settled in places previously used for other functions and these spaces are not always sufficiently adapted for this purpose. It happens, however, that they are set up in historic buildings recovered into a museum. There are numerous cases in which the synergy between the historical building and the museum emphasizes the link with the territory. In Piemonte, for example, there are various castles and historic buildings in which a museum has been placed.

Some cases, among others, deserve to be mentioned. One of these is the castle of Barolo, overlooking the famous landscape of the Langhe and dates back to the first millennium, even if, during the time, it has endured additions and renovations. In 1970, after a period of neglect (in which, however, it was possible to visit some of the rooms), the castle was purchased by the municipality of Barolo and it was restored in order to become the headquarter of the Regional Winehouse, where all the municipalities of the Barolo area were represented. At the beginning of the new millennium, the project *WiMu*, the Wine Museum, has become reality. This case is exemplary for various aspects that highlight some positive boosts: the force of a traditional and prestigious production that asks to preserve and communicate itself; the link with the territory (and the multiplicity of public and private entities that have supported the project); the availability of not indifferent resources; the involvement of a real star of set-up, the French Francois Cofino, fresh from the successes of the Museo del Cinema and of the Museo dell’Automobile in Turin.

The building alterations haven’t been many (among these, certainly, the measures indispensable to guarantee safety and to remove the architectural barriers), while some of the architectural characteristics of the castle (from the panoramic roof to the visual glimpses of the windows) have been cleverly integrated in the exhibition itinerary. In the castle there are also some rooms that testify the building’s historic past (first of all the room in which stayed as a guest Silvio Pellico) and so there is the memory of the teaching activity, carried out in the days in which in the castle there was a college. The museum has undoubtedly increased the tourist attractiveness of the area, inextricably linked to the landscape and to the food and wine. Even the Castle of Verrone has an important meaning for the local community. Fully recovered on recent years, today a part of it hosts the Town Hall, while another part remains private and in the last one in 2015 was opened the Falseum, the Museum of False. In this case didin’t exist a real collection, or a particular tradition on which insert a museum – such as the one on which is based the WiMu. At the base of the Falseum there is a simply idea of the journalist Errico Buonanno, put into practice through an interactive and technological exhibition curated by Massimo Venegoni and Laura Gorni. Also in this case, the synergy between the public (the municipality of Verrone) and the private (a temporary association of companies) has guaranteed a successful initiative. Even in this case, the building alterations haven’t been important as the setting up: the evocative spaces of the castle, from the frescoed halls to the almost inaccessible rooms, have made, without any doubt, the visit more attractive.

In general, we can say that there are a lot of castle, mansions and large or small historical buildings (or parts of them) that have played an important role in the community's history and in which the destination as a museum has been an opportunity for the requalification, restoration and renovation or, at least, for a maintenance that alone prevents the deterioration and the ruin. Usually, the citizen engagement has been decisive: rarely a small museum can survive without it.

It is also for this reason, in addition to the many features mentioned in the first part, that the small museums paint a picture that is a world apart. Precisely from this observation has born the intuition of Professor Giancarlo Dall'Ara, academic and professor of marketing in tourism, which founded in 2007 the National Associations of Small Museums in order to open a reflection on these cultural institutions. The aim is to highlight the particular characteristics of small museums, by promoting a specific management culture. The reactions have been immediately very encouraging, as much in the awareness of the staff involved as in the sensitivity of the public administration at any level **[14]** . Over the years, with some difficulties, because the resources in this field are very few, but with equal persistence, this thinking has evolved thanks to the regular meetings of the National Conferences of the Association that have seen the involvement not only of academics and experts, but also and especially of enthusiast people. In summary, the Association has allowed the awareness of some key points on which it is necessary to focus.

First of all, the small museum is not a not big museum, but an institution with an unique identity that already emerges from the 2011 census data: with the words of Dall'Ara, a small museum is "the result of a particular way of management that offers original experiences in a friendly atmosphere and shows a strong link with the territory and the local community" **[15]** . It appears evident that, for example, the staff (which in many cases is made by volunteers) plays a role of fundamental importance: the staff is able to transmit passion and, from this point of view, the public is very sensitive. Equally obvious is the centrality of the visitor, who in the small museum doesn't really feel just a number, but a person, or better an expected and well-accepted guest. It is understandable that especially small museums, in spite of difficulties, put the true hospitality in practice.

However, it is important to define with more frankness the characteristic of a small museum. Surely, there are quantitative features as collections, spaces, staff, schedules, resources, limited visitors – but not necessarily everything together. Actually, there are also quantitative features. Among these, some represent difficulties and weaknesses (staff without clearly defined roles, lack of additional services, deficient records, not optimal storage conditions, poverty of the setting up – but not necessary all together). Others represent potentials and strengths (close links with the territory, passionate human resources, creativity, hospitality of the audience, wise use of the web 2.0). Once again it appears that the smallness is not a denial or a restriction, but it is a peculiar character of the museum that makes it a category of its own.

The critical point of this large half-submerged heritage is, as expected, its management. In 2011, as already mentioned, it appeared that the small museums had on average about a professional and many didn't have one. Almost the 90% of Italian museums had no more than 5 employees and, in fact, the 60% partially solved the problem with the support of volunteers (there were about 17.000). It is an ambivalent information. On one hand, volunteers can provide to the chronic lack of staff, on the other they can't guarantee a constant and intensive commitment as the real employees. They often don't have the necessary training, but, just because they are volunteers, they have a passionate involvement that is inevitably detected by the public.

The latter data should be emphasized. The museum has to relate with people and the heritage conservation, the exposure and the interpretation are directed ultimately to the human promotion. The so-called heritage valorisation is actually the enhancement of the visitors, because this commitment should be addressed to the personal and cultural growth of the audience. From this point of view, it appears that the small museums transmit more and even accommodate more. They don't have immense lobby, they don't have metal detectors and they have services reduced to the essential (sometimes not even those). However, they keep fragile and unique stories, the loss of which would be really irreparable because they often are the only keepers and witnesses.

It is important to repeat once again one of the conclusions drawn by Istat: the small organizations, weak in the media and cultural animation abilities, characterize the Italian model. Despite this, it does not seem that the Legislator takes them into the right consideration. Despite the small museums are the Italian peculiarity, everyone talks about the mega-structures with millions of visitors.

If it is true (and it is true), that Italy is an immense open-air museum (from the historical, archaeological, artistic, architectural, landscape and naturalistic point of view), why we don't understand that even small museums are able to make system with the monuments, the landscapes and the beauties of this country? Although, this is an argument that in theory seems widely accepted and established, the laws, the funding and the policies in general seem to contradict it with facts. Despite the Mibact unites together the fields of Cultural Heritage and Tourism, the vision still seems a little divergent and anchored to a previous historical model, because it is uncommon to find interventions representative of a truly integrated vision between the two sectors.

Here comes the link with the territory, which is a strategic factor. Tourism, that for its nature is focused in centres of exceptional interest, is however capable of capillary diffusion in places that are able to support it. In not exceptional contexts only the presence of more factors of attraction is able to ensure a tourist attraction. Then, the system contemplates the historic and artistic landmarks, landscapes, heritage, cultural traditions, both small and big museums that, if taken alone, they aren't able to attract tourists, but together they can become beautiful destinations. The small museums must be aware of this potentiality, because if they don't relate themselves with the context in which they live, they are destined to disappear (and the many closures that we see are probably attributable to this). A small museum dedicated to the theme of Taste, to make an example to which I accidentally attended, was closed precisely on the Sunday in which its small town hosted a food and wine festival that attracted many hundreds of people. This museum probably has to review his business strategies. It is necessary to explain that the institutionalization of museums of the museum system has gone in this direction, but it has delegated, once again, the real effort to museums and has underestimated the "good will" of the administrations that can make a significant difference. The idea "making system" is not new: the time has shown that the low competitiveness of the small museum can't stand the competition. The solution is contained in the capacity to create collaboration and synergy. So, the museum helps to produce interest and to attract the audience, with (and not in alternative) other attractors on the territory. There have been too much talks about networks, districts, and museum systems. The last ones, in particular, are more structured and they require well-defined rules and stable aims. They, already from the nineties **[16]** , represent an increasingly form of organization by the actors of the museum offer.

The criteria by which it is necessary to organize a system can be several: for the majority of cases, they are territorial system (museums that belong to the same territory), but also they can be of thematic nature (museums concerning the same subject). It seems clear that local territorial system can contribute to the socio-economic development of the territory.

The reasons that lead to the creation of networks and of system in the museum field are undoubtedly attributable to the economic efficiency and to the complementarity of resources, to the increase of visibility and legitimacy, to the ability to better face the difficult management challenges. At the same time, we can't believe that making system is the solution tout court to all the problem that vex the small museums. The museum systems allow only in partly to achieve the goals and the critical factors success are numerous **[17]** . The deep problems, related to the smallness, remain firstly, the lack of resources, including human.

I think that the assumption of responsibility in the relationship between museum and territory should be reciprocal, precisely in in the will that has inspired to unify, in one Ministry, Culture and Tourism. It is not only the small museums that has to serve the territory, but, at the same time, also the territory needs to pay attention to him. Here, then, in order to make another example, a municipality that doesn't show, in all of his institutional websites (bur really all), the museums on its territory, it doesn't have a cultural and tourist policy sufficiently accurate. As an administration that doesn't facilitate, under many points of view, the management of its small museums, it can't be called forward-looking. The banking foundations have well understood this necessity: they periodically deliver funds destined not only to the big institutions and to the great cultural monuments, but also to the small organizations.

The fact that the link between small museums and territories is often taken for granted two implicates two concepts on which is necessary to reflect. The first is related to the conviction that if this duty relies on the small museums, the big can feel free from this assignment: fact that is not granted and not necessarily right (but that indirectly confirms that the two types of museums, small and big, can not be assimilated into a single generic definition). The second is that everyone look with suspicion at every excess of the small museum borders, as if in the connection with the territory there was all its raison d'etre: so the administration often encourages and finances it only if its activities have connections with its territory and have repercussions on it.

The ambiguity, in which smallness and prominence still go through, is underlined by a legislation that don't consider them as discriminating factors. We see the exemplary case of two museums of Piemonte. The first is the Egyptian Museum of Turin, the oldest Egyptian museum in the world, which recently has renovated with more than 50 million of investments 10.000 mq of space for nearly 40.000 objects. This museum has been able to attract than one million of visitors in the last year: inside, in fact, the tourists can also visit a famous installation created by the winner of the Oscar for The best art direction, Dante Ferretti. This is surely a big and great museum. The second is the museum of Pelassiers, placed in a beautiful lodge on the mountains in the Maira Valley (province of Cuneo). It protects in a few squares metres the memory of a past craft: the hair collector, a unique and fragile history. In the winter months, the people unable to make other activities for the massive presence of snow, moved through the North Italy catching raw material for the local industry of wigs. The incredible effort and patience with which the crop was treated and cleared up deserves to be remembered and documented. In order to visit the museum, you have to contact the store of the town: it is not sustainable a ticket office with a dedicate staff. Around 3.500 people a year visit it and this is a very interesting fact, especially because for many months of the year the snow obstruct the access.

Well, it is clear that the two cases cited here can not be called with the same name, even if they have the same mission. According to the definition of the law, they are to be considered the same thing. It's clear that these two museums can not be evaluated with the same parameters, but in Piemonte (and this is true for all the Regions) the same standards of evaluation are applied to the Egyptian Museum and to the Museum of Palessiers… it should be necessary open the vexata quaestio about museum standards (the

set of criteria and minimum requirements fundamental for the existence of the museum and for its functioning) that are specifically applicable to “museums of any affiliation”. Although initially the logic wasn’t that of pure compliance, the fragmented nature of the policies, implemented from the economic and training point of view in order to support the qualitative growth of museums, has limited the sense of standards themselves. These, in fact, are still seen by many small museums as binding barriers rather than prospects and opportunities. This because the museum standards propose parameters calibrated on big museums and the risk is the underestimate and penalization of the small museums that can do anything else than to adapt themselves. Another example that highlights the criticalities of an approach to museums that do not consider the different peculiarities of “small” and “large” museum is the charter of museum professions. This charter is explicitly directed to all the museums and it is born from a sharable need: to consider specific skills related to various areas as collections, management, public, structures, settings up and security. It’s hard to think not only as small organizations are able to ensure a well structured management, but if that is the more appropriate for them. Instead, I believe that the skills of which small museums need nave to be flexible: the only one professional in charge that, according to Istat, they have available should know the legislation and the administrative principles, about museology, Museography, cataloguing, IT, service to the public, but also know how to obtain funding and how to design enhancement projects.

It is necessary to think a dedicated training for small museums, equal and opposite to the extreme specialization pursued for the big museums: a figure that combines scientific rigor and operational decision-making. It is wrong , in fact, to think that the smallness is an excuse to evade the requirements of seriousness. Regardless of its size, a museum can not avoid to guarantee the cataloguing, a minimal research activity, the maximum accessibility, the security, the divulgation, the connections with the territory. Symmetrically, it is important to guarantee some things to the small museums: a recognition of their role and their identity; an evaluation that is able to go beyond the simple calculation of their visitors, specific rules, dedicated resources, specific training, and institutional support.

Only a thought revolution, even a regulatory level, will bring back to the small museums the role that is up to them in the economy of the territory.

Footnotes

[1] Definition of museum from the BBCC Codex, d.lgs. 42/2004, art. 101.

[2] See glossary in ISTAT 2013, I musei, le aree archeologiche e i monumenti in Italia.

[3] Gilman B.I. (1916), Museum Fatigue in The Scientific Monthly, Volume 2

[4] The research, certainly very difficult, considers just the data deduced from a detailed web analysis (and other data from my direct knowledge). Basically, I started from the official site of the Piemonte Region, that gathers all the museums and similar structures (www.piemonteitalia.eu/it/gestoredati/elencohome/1/musei.html). Then I consulted the official sites of the approximately 1.300 municipalities (in the page related to the cultural and touristic resources), to which resends the official website of the Piemonte Region (http://www.regione.piemonte.it/link/com_piem.htm). Finally, I checked also the various sites that are able to offer important information about museums (divided by typology or in general) as http://www.musei.it/ , www.viaggiart.com, http://www.coldiretti.it/aree/rubriche/cultura/musei/piemonte.htm, http://www.museimpresa.com/museiarchivi/, www.amossola.it/musei_ossola/it/mappa-musei-ossola,

[5] The Museo dell'Oro in Feletto (TO), The Museo Storico dell'Oro Italiano in Lerma (AL), the Miniera d'Oro of the Guia in Macugnaga (VB), the Museo storico dell'Oro Italiano in Predosa (AL), the Museo Laboratorio dell'Oro e della Pietra in Salussola (BI), the Museo Storico dell'Oro Italiano in Silvano d'Orba (AL), the Museo dell'Oro e della Bessa in Zubiena (BI).

[6] The Centro di Documentazione sull'Emigrazione in Donato (BI), the Museo Regionale dell'Emigrazione dei Pimontesi nel Mondo in Frossasco (TO) and the Museo dell'Emigrante in Roasio (VC).

[7] The Museo dell'Ombrello e del Parasole in Gignese (VB).

[8] The Museo del Cappello Borsalino in Alessandria and the Museo dell'Arte del Cappellaio in Ghiffa (VB).

[9] The Museo della Cartolina d'Epoca in Druogno (VB).

[10] The Museo "l'Arte del Sellaio" in Tigliole (AT) and in Baldichieri d'Asti (AT).

[11] The Museo dello Spazzacamino "Valle Orco" a Locana (TO) and the Museo dello Spazzacamino in Santa Maria Maggiore (VB).

[12] The "Mizoun del Countrabandier" in Argentera (CN) and the Museo della Montagna e del Contrabbando in Macugnana (VB).

[13] These museums are generally dedicated to the contemporary art, but sometimes they are focused on other themes as the Museo all'Aperto di Toponomastica di Bairo (CN), while the BAM – Bergolo-Levice Art Museum – is dedicated to the street art (CN) and the Mann is the outdoor museum of Architettura Moderna in Ivrea (TO).

[14] The official site of the National Association of Small Museums, http://www.piccolimusei.com/

[15] Giancarlo Dall'Ara, Che cosa si intende per "Piccolo Museo", in Musei accoglienti. Una nuova cultura gestionale per i Piccoli Musei" (Atti del Convegno Nazionale dei Piccoli Musei, 26-27 settembre 2014, Viterbo. Ed. ArcheoAres

[16] In particularly, see the research I sistemi museali, edited by Libera Università di Lingue e Comunicazione IULM for Aspen Institute Italia (september)

[17] Id.

Bibliography

MIBAC, D.M. 10 maggio 2001, *Atto di Indirizzo sui criteri tecnico scientifici e sugli standard di funzionamento e sviluppo dei musei*
ISTAT 2013, *I musei, le aree archeologiche e i monumenti in Italia*, Roma
LIBERA UNIVERSITÀ DI LINGUE E COMUNICAZIONE IULM per Aspen Institute Italia 2013*, I sistemi museali in Italia,* Roma-Milano

Musei accoglienti. Una nuova cultura gestionale per i Piccoli Musei, Atti del V Convegno Nazionale dei Piccoli Musei, Viterbo, Museo Nazionale Etrusco, 26-27 settembre 2014, Ed. ArcheoAres
Piccoli musei. Strumento per la crescita sostenibile del territorio, Atti del Convegno 11 dicembre 2015 Spotorno (Savona), 2016 Saperepopolare Edizioni, Torino (Ebook)
Musei accoglienti. Comunicazione e accessibilità per i Piccoli Musei. Atti del VII Convegno Nazionale dei Piccoli Musei. Monselice (PD), 29-30 aprile 2016, Saperepopolare Edizioni, Torino (Ebook)

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License