



Advisory Board 'Plus' Meeting February 27-28 2014

Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in The Hague

Attendants: Jos Bazelmans (NL), Patrizia Bianconi (IT), Annemarie Bos (NWO), Julia Brungs (IFLA), Hilde de Clercq (BE), Eimear O'Connell (IE), Nynke Cornelissen (NL), Rand Eppich (ECTP), Henri van Faassen (NL), Jennifer Gravendaal (NL), Ekaterini Hambouri (EC), Tonte Hegard (NO), Quirine van der Hoeven (NL), Jan van 't Hof (NL), Els Jacobs (Europeana), Maria Teresa Jaquinta (ICROM), Friedrich Lueth (EAA), Laurie Neale (Europa Nostra), Roeland Ordelman (Beeld en Geluid), Flora van Regteren Altena (NL), Raphael Roig (ICOM), Eva Stegmeijer (NL), Alexandra Warr (EHLF)

Not able to attend: ICOMOS, Council of Europe, UNESCO

First session, Thursday February 27

Welcome speech by Mrs Marjan Hammersma, Director General of Culture and Media

Outline of the Workshop by Mr Jan van 't Hof, Chair (The Netherlands)

This session aims to:

- Ask the Advisory Board 'Plus' for advice on the content and cooperation of the Joint Programming Initiative Cultural Heritage (JPICH). Particularly, the Action Programme (AP) will be discussed. The collaboration with NGO's and IGO's will be reported in a concept paper. Extra networks were invited to extend the AB in this vital moment.
- Address strategic issues concerning the JPI and the AP
- Discuss the first set of proposed joint activities, optionally join activities or add new proposals.

Welcome on behalf of Antonia Recchia by Mrs Patrizia Bianconi (Italy)

Mrs Bianconi presented us with an overview of the aims, organization and the state of play of the JPI. She stressed the importance of advice regarding the AP. This JPI started in 2009 and the Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) was approved March 2013 in Rome and is now accessible online.¹ The next step will be to implement the SRA, which will be translated via the AP.

An analysis was provided of the first (pilot) Call. The second call will be launched before the second week of March.² This call called Heritage Plus is a so-called ERANET plus call, which means it will be co-funded by the European Commission (EC). The JPI underlines the importance of International cooperation which includes involving NGO's and other countries. For this cooperation the Heritage Portal will be used as a knowledge-hub.

Discussion

Following Mrs Bianconi's introduction some questions and remarks were made. A summary of the main topics discussed:

The question was raised by Mrs Jaquinta (ICCROM) if this could be the first steps towards a European Department of Cultural Heritage. She also inquired if our national ministries have already been influenced by the JPI. Mrs Bianconi noted that the experience of a joint call was very important. However, she also stressed the importance of the insight that JPI is not just about calls, even though they are a strong instrument, it is the groundwork on which we are building. The national ministries are involved in spreading information on the JPI and the launch of the calls. Mr Bazelmans (NL) explained that money is being reallocated towards international cooperation, money previously allocated to national research was reallocated to the calls. He also explains how having an international initiative stimulated the Netherlands to form a national network, how it was an incentive to get together. Before this JPI the national network was very fragmented.

Introductory Presentation on the contents of the workshop by Mr Jan van 't Hof (The Netherlands)

The SRA was established via a bottom-up process. We have now reached the phase of finalising an AP which is to implement the SRA. A draft of the AP was distributed by the task leader (NL) via email. The aim of JPI is alignment of national research programmes. The question for the near future of the JPI is how to develop the consortium. The Advisory Board 'Plus' is asked for strategic advice

¹ <http://heritageportal.eu/News-Events/Latest-News/STRATEGIC-RESEARCH-AGENDA-FOR-CULTURAL-HERITAGE-IN-EUROPE-PUBLISHED.15617.shortcut.html>

<http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/2014/02/strategic-research-agenda-sra/>

² <http://heritageportal.eu/News-Events/Latest-News/JPICH-launches-HERITAGE-Plus-call-for-research-funding-proposals.15659.shortcut.html>

on joining activities, specific advice on the AP and suggestions for activities are most welcome.

Coffee Break

Introductory Round

Introduction to the Concept of the JPI in general by Mrs Ekaterini Hambouri (European Commission)

The European Research Area (ERA) is still to be established. There are three key stages of the implementation of the JPI's. Writing a Vision Document, writing a SRA and the implementation of the SRA. The key factor to the future of the JPI is alignment. The JPICH belongs to the first wave of JPI's. Cultural heritage should be regarded as a resource, in terms of quality of life/economics, source of inspiration and in the urban domain. Nature is an important factor to cultural heritage, the EC is currently looking at re-naturing of cities and nature based solutions in relation to cultural heritage. Within Horizon 2020 a heritage Expert Group (EG) for 2014 is expected to be set up. This EG consists of trans-disciplinary members and multi-stakeholders. They will look at innovative financing modes and new governance modes.

Discussion

Following Mrs Hambouri's presentation some questions and remarks were made. A summary of the main topics discussed:

The EG will interact with and advice the JPI. An appointment for the following week is scheduled for the director of the relevant EC department and the JPI chair. The EG will help set up an innovative plan for funding and governing and will advise on the general framework of the Horizon 2020 structure (probably not on topics). Because the EG will come from the Member States (MS) this will contribute to a better communication.

Presentation on Funding Possibilities Under Horizon 2020 by Mrs Annemarie Bos (NWO)

The JPI is not just about calls and getting money from the European Commission (EC). It is about the better use of money and instruments that are already available. What can be defined is the type of instruments the MS want to direct their researchers to. Mrs. Bos presented us with a guide for financing cultural heritage within Horizon 2020.

→ Please see annex B of the AP for further information on funding.

Discussion

Following Mrs Bos's presentation, some questions and remarks were made. A summary of the main topics discussed:

There is a clear focus on cultural heritage under Horizon 2020's challenge 5 and the JPI has contributed to the topics in Horizon 2020. The EG and the JPI will

work together with the EC for the alignment of cultural heritage. Cultural heritage is difficult to coordinate because it is not divided into various challenges under Horizon 2020. However, this also provides opportunities.

Second Session, Friday February 28

Introduction provided by Mr Jan van 't Hof, Chair (The Netherlands)

Yesterday was about providing an update on the JPI. Today will be about strategic advice on how the JPI should further develop itself and on specific activities under the umbrella of the action programme.

Report previous Advisory Board meeting of April 2013 by Mrs Patrizia Bianconi (Italy)

Mrs Bianconi provided us with an overview of what was discussed in the Advisory Board meeting of April 2013. Advice, tips and tricks were given regarding the involvement of stakeholders in the JPI. Networks of IGO's and NGO's are important for sharing knowledge, but also to achieve the goal of the SRA, to show that Cultural Heritage contributes to society. At present time the AP is a living document, which requires it to be updated every two to three years. We will have to identify concrete actions for the 5 main instruments of the SRA (Capability and capacity / Management strategies / Knowledge sharing / Research infrastructure / Policy, laws and regulation). We will need to answer the questions what can we do and how can we do it.

An alignment of national programmes is necessary. The outcome of the SRA aims at proving the political and social impact of cultural heritage. Mrs Bianconi stressed that we need more than international calls and the sectors we need to develop activities in collaboration with industry and tourism. Mrs Bianconi also stressed the importance of advice coming from the Advisory Board 'Plus'.

Presentation results Action Programme workshop October 2013 by Mr Jan van 't Hof (The Netherlands)

The draft of the AP is now available. What requires attention at this point is data sharing within the network and the mobility of researchers. The process of establishing the AP involved a questionnaire and the consultation of the National Consultation Panels (NCP). This resulted in a list of approximately fifty proposals for activities. During a workshop in Rome, member states have expressed their interests in these topics, and indicated whether national funds would be available. The aim now is that the MS will adopt three to five research activities. These activities will not be funded by the JPI. The funding instruments identified so far are national funds, JPI calls, and EU instruments (COST, Marie Skłodowska Curie, ERC grants, ESRI).

To enable research activities alignment of national programmes is necessary. Additionally the MS are asked to share data of which the outcome will be shared via a Matrix in the AP. The actual alignment will require political involvement. When joint activities do overlap, they could be merged which will be the next phase. The starting point of the JPI was tangible heritage, but the SRA is also focussing on intangible and digital heritage. We are relying on the input from the MS and NGO/IGO's who can all suggest new topics. During this session the remark was made that priority topics should be appointed by national funding agencies. It was also pointed out that we need to inform each other on our different national situations regarding research programmes and funding. Each MS should give an outline of the current national situation. The MS have tried to include a wide range of NCP-members in order to have an accurate representation of the national cultural heritage sector. For the SRA, NCP-members uploaded topics which were merged in the SRA. For these topics the members tried to be as inclusive as possible. Priorities for the wider future were thus defined. For the AP, the NCP's provided us with the topics they are working on in the present. And also others were welcome to provide suggestions, including MS and now IGO/NGO's.

Discussion

After Mr Van 't Hof's presentation some remarks and questions were posed. A short summary of the main topics:

JPI is not another network doing projects, but a platform to reflect on national situations and with the conclusions drawn from this reflection the JPI could adapt policies. It reflects on how to balance topics and how to proceed (funding). A major reason for establishing this JPI is to avoid duplication. However, it is simply too costly to map all the research that has been done up till now. Neale mentions Cultural Heritage counts for Europe, a survey of CH research in Europe.

The remark is made that the topics are too broad and it might be a handicap to be overly inclusive. As a response it was explained that these broad themes can be seen as a filter after which the topics can be dealt with on a more detailed level. On the national level the mapping of ongoing activities should be considered as an ongoing process. There needs to be a constant overview of the national situation, this is the only way to alignment. The meeting with the IGO's and NGO's is pointed out as necessary to address the networks. We need a JPI position paper to define which issues JPI deals with and which parties this involves. This will enable a more strategic approach.

Presentation Heritage Portal by Mrs Eimear O'Connell (Ireland)

In this presentation Mrs O'Connell provided us with an update on the possibilities and use of the heritage portal.

→ Please visit the website for additional information www.heritageportal.eu

Coffee Break

Interactive Poster Session of the Topics

The representatives of NGO's and IGO's are invited to express their interest in the fifty activities already proposed, by adding a post-it and indicating whether they could participate financially. Also, new topics can be brought forward.

The topics were sent in by the MS that are part of the JPI. However, there is open access for other countries and organisations to join. We may need to address observer and other countries that are not yet full members, otherwise researchers from those nations are excluded from funding. Furthermore, it is suggested to be very explicit on the proceeding and the status of the activities, also in relation to the EU, in order to prevent expectations of funding. In the next meeting the task leader will ask the MS to adopt three to five topics.

Strategic Discussion on the JPI in general and the Action Programme in particular led by Mr Jan van 't Hof (The Netherlands)

After the poster sessions, the chair wrote down questions that were raised during the day which required further discussion. These questions were then merged into five main questions.

What could be the role of NGO's and IGO's regarding the JPI?

The Advisory Board members illuminate how they could contribute to the AP. This is mostly by spreading the word of concrete activities to their networks, and to collect research ideas from these networks. Furthermore, some organizations can participate themselves.

The role of the different parties should be the dissemination of information and the contribution of ideas. Europeana could play an intermediate role in this. ICCROM and ICOM suggest they can deliver potential partners for activities and ICCROM can function as a reference. EAA notes that it has between 120 and 160 sessions per year with two representative stakeholders from each EU country, they could be appointed to spread information to the communities.

IFLA could distribute information to the different library organizations and ask for feedback from the network. ICOM suggested that research programmes can be supported or promoted and become partner and give input for the call. They can also disseminate information to their network. Depending on the project theme, even participation might be possible. ECTP suggests assistance from their part in peer review of calls. EHLF can provide information sharing via the networks.

Europa Nostra remarks that it would be useful to have a very brief information package of the JPI available (what is it, why is it important, what is to be achieved) in order to efficiently inform the networks of the NGO's and IGO's on this. Also, the JPI could present itself at various meetings of the networks, for example at the Heritage Alliance. ICCROM suggests discussion via digital networks, twitter was given as an example.

Could there be a relation between the ambitions of the IGO's, NGO's and JPI?

Again the issue of alignment is addressed. Europa Nostra as the voice of civil society could contribute to raising awareness. Europa Nostra believes we should be looking further than Universities i.e. at handicrafts, guilds. ICCROM noted that they will make an effort to put JPI on the agenda.

How, as JPI, can we influence politics?

Maybe not politics but policy. In the Netherlands the national funding tools are already linked to politics. The remark was made that by choosing certain topics to do research on you are already promoting something, unintentionally we are influencing policy making. The EC remarks that the aim of JPI's is contributing to societal challenges.

What is the relevance of Cultural Heritage to Society?

It is about awareness raising. We are relevant for monuments and researchers (amongst others). We need to think how to describe the project in terms of relevance to society. We should also address young professionals. ICCROM suggests YOCOCU (YOUTH in CONSERVATION of CULTURAL heritage). Europa Nostra added that cultural heritage is not the issue of one sector and we should consciously spread the message to other sectors.

How should we approach involving other Member States?

The JPI consortium does not comprise all EU MS. However, the research community is dispersed across the whole of Europe and beyond. If universities are connected, the government might also want to join. A lot of German institutions are mentioned as potential partners, should we start convincing the governments of the MS who are not yet active to become active in the future? For this we need a very clear message on the importance of the JPI. In this message the incorporation of transparency relating to funding is brought across as the most important one. The meeting was concluded with the remark that we are in need of a discussion on a higher level for all the states involved in the JPI (i.e. the ministry of research and the funding agencies). Maybe we also need icons to lobby, think of Nobel Prize winners, artists and Ambassadors.

Thank you for all the useful suggestions and the will to help.

Conclusion of the Meeting

www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu

www.heritageportal.eu

