



**Creating synergies with Cultural Heritage JPI Partnership and advanced economies USA, Japan, together with Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa and neighbouring Mediterranean countries: extending cooperation at a global level**

**Contents**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Task 4.2 – methodologies and approach**
- 3. Landscape of Cultural Heritage outside of Europe**
- 4. Benefits and Barriers to international collaboration**
- 5. Conclusion**
- 6. Next Step**

**Annex 1 – Country Profiles**

**Annex 2 – List of contacts**

**Gail Lambourne and Karen Buchanan, AHRC, UK**

## **1. Introduction**

The EU Joint Programming Initiative Cultural Heritage and Global Change (JPI-CH) is an innovative and collaborative research initiative that will streamline and coordinate national research programmes to enable more efficient and effective use of scarce financial resources, exploit synergies and avoid duplication. With seventeen Member States and eight observer countries participating, the JPI-CH has produced a Strategic Research Agenda document to help identify, address and tackle the research challenges faced by the cultural heritage sector, not only to protect cultural heritage but also to help Europe's future economic growth and jobs market.

### **Strategic Research Agenda (SRA)**

The SRA has been developed purposely with the aim to present cultural heritage as a holistic, integrated research area. Using the JPI-CH 2010 Vision document as a starting point, input was requested from a wide range of stakeholders across Europe reflecting the three key facets of cultural heritage: the tangible, intangible, and digital. Every Member State participating in the JPI-CH set up a National Consultation Panel (NCP) of individual experts who did not represent any particular organisation or discipline. Each Panel identified research areas, activities, gaps and needs across the three facets of tangible, intangible and digital cultural heritage. This input, supported by Foresight studies, further consultation and expert analysis, was used to identify four priority research areas. These are: developing a reflective society; connecting people with heritage; creating knowledge; and safeguarding our cultural heritage resource.

## **2. Task 4.2**

The aim of Task 4.2 is to identify opportunities and specific needs for advanced cooperation and coordination with JPI-CH. This concept paper has been produced to outline possible areas for synergy on results obtained through the three phases explained below.

### **Methodologies and Approach**

To achieve the objectives set out above we took a three phase approach.

#### **Phase One: Consultation with JPI/JHEP partners**

To explore cooperation beyond Europe it was essential to gather information on existing contacts and relationships already developed by JPI/JHEP partners and the current level of engagement with the countries identified in the description of work.

In February 2013 all JPI/JHEP partners were sent an email requiring them to complete a template with details of any contacts they have in the following countries, USA, Japan, Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa and neighbourhood Mediterranean countries. The template was based on a stakeholder template originally developed by Workpackage 6, Deliverable 6.1 strategic communication and dissemination plan. We received responses from four (five including AHRC) partners by the deadline in March 2013. We are unsure if the small response is simply due to limited time and resource by partners to engage with the task, or more disappointingly a lack of contacts and relationships with

fore mentioned countries. From the information provided thirty four names of either individuals or organisations were identified, with different levels of engagement from previous collaborations to names of known organisations but with no previous contact. Names of contacts were provided for all the countries identified, with the exception of Russia where no contacts were identified. To identify people to invite to the workshop we followed up any suggestions we received from the JPI partners, with some contacts leading to additional contacts and potential invites. We also contacted, where possible European offices in BRICS countries and other European offices with international contacts.

To ensure we had appropriate expertise and representation at the workshop, and to decide who to invite, we produced a ranked list of contacts in priority order. To produce the ranked list we considered the spread of subject expertise, the individual's role, knowledge and experience. We aimed to have at least one representative from each of the BRICS countries, and one neighbourhood Mediterranean country from both the east and the south regions. We then considered how we might fill the gaps in expertise/subject area by inviting other contacts. Timing proved to be a big issue in guaranteeing people's attendance at the workshop, in some cases people required more advanced notice due to other commitments and even where some had initially accepted the invitation, issues with making travel and visa arrangements were not possible given the timeframe.

Around twenty contacts were invited to participate in international workshop, with ten confirming their attendance. The final attendance at the workshop had eight participants as two invitees had difficulties in obtaining their visa in the time from accepting the invitation to the date of the workshop.

### **Phase Two: International workshop**

The international workshop took place on July 9, 2013 at the British Library, London UK. Before the workshop participants were provided with the executive summary of the Strategic Research Agenda and they were asked to complete a questionnaire providing information of the cultural heritage landscape in their country. The country profiles attached in Annex 1 have been prepared using this information, with the exception of Russia, China and Egypt where representation at the workshop was not possible.

We used a professional facilitator, George Gawlinski, who we met with in advance of the workshop to agree a format for the day. At the workshop participants were divided into four groups: USA and Brazil; Japan and India; South Africa; Israel and Moldova. A member of the JPI-CH partnership joined each group to facilitate the discussion. The morning session focused on gathering information from the participants on how cultural heritage is structured within their country and what the priorities (including research priorities) were. The afternoon session focused upon how collaborative activities could work and explored possibilities within the JPI. We were unable to find representatives to attend the workshop from all the target countries.

### **Phase Three: Consultation with other stakeholders**

We identified two countries where we considered engagement was essential to the task - these were China and Russia. Unfortunately we were unable to establish contacts to invite to the workshop so further work was required. For China we used AHRC contacts, those with extensive knowledge and experience of cultural heritage in China. For Russia,

again we used information provided by AHRC contacts and internet searches (see country profiles for further information).

We also found contacts in Egypt who provided interesting and relevant information.

### **3. Landscape of Cultural Heritage outside Europe**

A full view of cultural heritage for each country can be found in the country profiles in **Annex 1** however, we have summarised some of the most common points below.

- Tended to be a focus on tangible heritage – buildings, monuments, artefacts, landscape, archaeology
- Conflicting histories, conflicts and political agendas have a huge influence on if and how cultural heritage is preserved. Particularly areas where there have been issues with ownership etc (Israel for example, Brazil with indigenous, African, European influences) and where material from these countries is held within European institutions
- Still some issues for countries understanding what heritage they already have, perhaps because of previous conflict or because there is a need to just document and understand the huge volume of material that exists
- There is a need to engage people/communities with their heritage
- Different laws and heritage managed at different levels i.e government, municipal, regional, locally – this tended to be organised in similar ways across the countries present at the workshop.
- An increasing role for philanthropic sector and NGOs
- Most countries have some dedicated agencies or national organisations for cultural heritage, although other departments (planning, agriculture) might also have responsibility for heritage
- Research driven by universities with strong heritage studies department in some countries. There is some research undertaken in museums
- The participants identified there is a role for private companies in heritage policy and planning

### **Response to JPICH Strategic Research Agenda**

Each participant received a copy of the executive summary of the Strategic Research Agenda before the workshop.

The four priority areas within the Strategic Research Agenda were welcomed by all and often were similar priorities to those outlined in their countries national strategies. Overwhelmingly, participants felt 'connecting people to heritage' a priority, both in terms of citizens and policy makers/government. In particular, how to engage diverse communities and diverse heritages was a popular theme and participants would welcome creative ways/approaches to engage different groups and communities. Participants also expressed an interest in sharing information/research on heritage management, again in the context of culturally diverse communities and identities.

A full copy of the published Strategic Research Agenda has since been sent to all participants so they can distribute it to their contacts.

#### 4. Benefits and Barriers to international collaboration

During the afternoon session the participants were asked to discuss the potential and possibilities for international collaboration. The session focused on four areas; how could we add value to their existing activities; the implications of international cooperation/collaboration; barriers/difficulties to collaboration; and how it could work. A summary of the main benefits and barriers is outlined in the table below. This should be taken into consideration when exploring potential new partnerships.

Benefits	Barriers
Working as a collective helps organisations raise the profile of heritage within government departments – setting priorities and to leverage funding	Although good communication takes place up and down the hierarchical structure, between government departments and then municipal/regional/local agencies – there is less communication across government departments. Needs 'joined up' approach to allow for coordinated approach to multidisciplinary research
Knowledge sharing and developing best practice, raising standards of care for example	Collaboration can be difficult for countries with difficult/conflicted histories, political or otherwise. e.g diasporas, migration
Promotes an integrated approach to heritage protection	International collaboration can be expensive so other ways to engage need to be considered
Exchange of researchers enables exchange of knowledge and expertise	Merging of cultures, people, knowledge – can threaten cultural heritage in Europe/local heritage. Need to preserve identity
Possible sharing of economic and social resources	Differences in technological advancement can make sharing information/data difficult
Increase public interest in cultural heritage	Migration of different communities may lead to different definitions of cultural heritage
Can stimulate change	Language – not just the language spoken to but different terminology used, interpretation etc
International partnerships can help support strategic thinking and development of policies	
Promotes greater diversity of culture, and the value of culture	

#### 5. Conclusions

There is a real willingness and enthusiasm to participate and share information. It is acknowledge that countries outside of Europe have rich and diverse cultural heritage, with different structures and related policies to govern it. However, looking to the SRA priorities, there were two areas high on everyone's agenda - connecting people with heritage and the protection of heritage. This sharing of priorities means there is potential for collaboration and participation. All participants were interested in sharing information and knowledge, and this could provide lots of benefits with little additional resource/input required.

The participants welcomed the opportunity to attend the workshop but international workshops are expensive and require a lot of resource to organise. JPI Partners should explore other ways of engaging and a strategy for engagement is needed. A strategy for engagement would keep up the momentum and exchange of information but this needs to be coordinated and maintained. We felt the task would have benefited from exploratory work prior to the workshop or more extended research, for example a survey or consultation could have provided a more general view – if an engagement strategy is developed, it is recommended that further exploratory work is carried out. The difficulty in holding a workshop is we only gathered views from individuals representing their country, rather than a broader audience.

Further engagement with some countries is needed, for example China and Russia where partners could not provide contacts and little information could be found via the internet. In some cases the political implications when engaging with different countries should be taken into consideration. For example, the current embargo with Russia means AHRC (UK) is now unable to engage with Russian organisations.

## **6. Next Steps**

For the JPI to succeed in extending cooperation in cultural heritage beyond Europe, further work is needed and engagement with non-JPI partners should be an on-going process. Some suggestions are:

1. Consider developing a strategy to engage the broader international heritage community, including exploratory work to understand the structures etc of countries.
2. Heritage Portal promoted internationally to reach a more global audience.
3. Many participants considered sharing information in the form of case studies would be a powerful tool for international engagement. The JPI could produce case studies to use as examples, perhaps using the pilot call projects as a starting point.
4. In order to capture a broader audience the JPI could have a stand at an international conference/session on cultural heritage.
5. Roles on advisory groups, task force, peer review could include non-JPI countries and non-European countries.
6. Include participants in distribution lists, information about the SRA and on the Heritage Portal. Perhaps we could exchange information every 6-12 months?
7. Need to be cautious about applying a European model to international cooperation.
8. Engaging with NGOs (workpackage 4.3) and engaging with cross-national funders/organisations such as the Global Heritage Fund ([www.globalheritagefund.org](http://www.globalheritagefund.org)) or World Monuments Fund ([www.wmf.org](http://www.wmf.org)) would help develop wider international links.
9. Consider other models of engagement. One suggestion is to explore how digital technologies could be used to stimulate the exchange of ideas and experience across countries.
10. Agreement across partners at the workshop on the Strategic Research Agenda priorities – the priorities, therefore, could be useful as a framework for the JPI partnership, either collectively or individually, to engage with those countries.
11. Not easy to make the distinction between cultural heritage itself (inc tourism, protection etc) and cultural heritage research – some countries less able to

commit to research priorities as they are struggling with the scale and scope of the area, e.g. in areas the JPI identified as an enabling framework and in particular, infrastructure (for example India).

**Annex 1** Country/Participant Profiles

**Annex 2** List of names supplied by partners, workshop attendees, contacts after workshop