



Advisory Board Meeting April 11 2013

Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed te Amersfoort

Attendants: Jos Bazelmans (RCE), Patrizia Bianconi (MiBAC), Giovanni Boccardi (UNESCO), Annemarie Bos (NWO), Eimear O'Connell (Heritage Council), Ian Doyle (Heritage Council), Jennifer Gravendaal (RCE), Jan van 't Hof (RCE), Maria Theresa Jaquinta (ICCROM), Gail Lambourne (AHRC), Laurie Neale (Europa Nostra), Isabel Rodriguez Maribona (ECTP), Kees Somer (OCW), Eva Stegmeijer (RCE), Alberto de Tagle (ICCROM).

Apologies: France Desmarais (ICOM) Benjamin Mouton (ICOMOS) Mikhael de Thyse (Council of Europe).

Welcome speech on behalf of the director by Jos Bazelmans (chair of the day)

Outline of the day (The Netherlands)

We started by all jotting down our expectations of the day on a post-it to see if we had reached these expectations at the end of the day.

Summary of the JPI Cultural Heritage (Italy)

Mrs. Bianconi presented us with an overview of the aims, organization and the state of play of JPI. She stressed the importance of input for the Action Programme. This JPI started in 2009 and the Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) was approved March 2013 in Rome which leads us to the Action Programme (AP) which will implement the SRA. Our first Call, the Joint Pilot Call, open between 10.01.2013 and 05.04.2013, has had 89 applications. The second Call for proposal will be held within ERA NET PLUS. The important message Mrs. Bianconi wanted to send out is we need joint activities, not just joint calls. For this we are in need of an inventory of activities and priorities.

→ Please see Mrs. Bianconi's presentation for further information.

Presentation of the Strategic Research Agenda (United Kingdom)

Mrs. Lambourne gave us an elaboration on the process of the creation of the SRA. Within the National Consultation Panels the same balance was sought as there is a balance between the three types of heritage; tangible, intangible and digital. From the Expert Group of our JPI a group of four was selected to give advice. Each research panel was asked to review the common framework, to add to research areas and to rank each group's priorities. The conclusion was that there seems to be a very good correlation between national and European priorities. What was very clear from the beginning is that it is of great importance to not see tangible, intangible and digital heritage as separate issues. Eighty-six separate priority research areas were identified and the input that was used all came from the NCPs, no other input was added by the WP leader. The aim was to keep the process transparent. What was notable was the issue of climate change, there was nothing said about it by the NCPs which is why it wasn't added to the SRA. → Please see Mrs. Lambourne's presentation for further information.

Discussion

Following the presentation on the SRA we held a discussion. A summary of the main topics discussed:

The SRA will hopefully be published in April; the European Commission wants it as soon as possible. The primary source of the SRA is the already established JHEP Dow which was developed by the Expert Group and the Scientific Committee. In relation to transparency of the establishment of the SRA, the explanation of the translation to the SRA will be published on the website.

The issue was raised how the connection will be made between different countries because international organizations should work on different levels. How can the SRA have a future with all the different national departments in mind? Therefore we need an SRA that can be tested and continued. The Director General (ICCRUM) is interested in sharing documentation and standards with us. We will need a first phase of testing and adjusting.

To implement the SRA we need the AP. The SRA is a vision of what we want for at least the next ten years. Now we need to define the tools we need for the AP which will be the living instrument and concentrate on how to implement it in all the different countries. To do this we should keep in mind to maintain an upper level at least for communicating so we will be able to report our progress in a couple of years.

We should start by creating networks and using existing networks to be able to map what has already been done. An analysis on the 89 call proposals will show us which of the SRA topics are alive and necessary.

We should also start communicating with others who have already

implemented an SRA. This way implementation will become easier and the AP can be presented to the commission in a stronger manner.

Coffee Break

Presentation of the Communications and Dissemination Plan (Ireland)

We need to use the *heritageportal* as a tool for our networks. Therefore we need to bring the portal under the attention. Society should be seen as the engine of research. By using the *heritageportal's* brands and logos we can spread information and bring the portal under the attention. It would be good if the Advisory Board could become more involved with the *heritageportal*. By using the portal as a network we should be able to minimize duplication in research.

→ Please see Mrs. O'Connell's presentation for further information.

Discussion

Following the presentation on the Communications and Dissemination Plan we held a discussion. A summary of the main topics discussed:

The question was raised if we should also provide materials for research on the websites. And if we do this, which level of access should this have. We need a list of completed research projects and we need to provide people with links to broader websites, which go beyond European borders.

Both ICCROM and UNESCO have consultation panels available which we can ask for help. ICCROM already has a lot of experience with maintaining a forum and building a network around it. ICCROM offered to help us with looking for the right partners. ICCROM also asked to be kept informed via frequent updates.

It was mentioned that it is unclear if the SRA is also meant to go beyond European borders. The UK has already started working on going beyond Europe's borders by making an inventory of our contact points in the BRICS countries, the USA and Japan.

Presentation of the scope of the Action Programme (The Netherlands) & Presentation on the involvement of IGO's and NGO's (the Netherlands)

The emphasis in this presentation was on the importance of sharing knowledge. An example is consulting the AB to gain information on which Stakeholders to approach. We need to create an alignment with ambitions of others and we need to make an inventory of the actions already performed. To share our knowledge the Netherlands came up with the idea of a matrix to fill in which will be discussed further below.

→ Please see Mr. van 't Hof's presentation for further information.

Presentations by NGO's and IGO's

Before lunch we had the opportunity to get a short introduction to the NGOs and IGOs which were represented at our AB Meeting.

Mrs. Laurie Neal gave a short introduction to her organization, Europa Nostra:

- Based in Civil Society, looking for volunteers
- Launched a most endangered heritage list which needs an action plan to find a solution for these endangered sites
- Shared knowledge via websites
- Once a year a forum is held which could also contribute to sharing knowledge that already exists
- Europa Nostra also gives indicators which show us the impact and the added value of cultural heritage on our society and Economy
- The next forum will be on how cultural heritage affects other sectors (for example: agriculture, tourism, sustainability)

This is all off course highly relevant for JPI which brings us to the idea of creating a common agenda where we can find each others events.

Mrs. Maria Teresa Jaquinta and Mr. de Tagle gave a short introduction to ICCROM:

- It started out by studying and disseminating methods
- A centre of excellence with the most updated library for conservation
- It is known for giving trainings but this is not the only thing ICCROM does
- It's research lab is integrated in a network of research laboratories
- ICCROM offers assistance to national an regional projects
- Also to ICCROM Civil Society is of great importance as are the other sectors (agriculture, tourism etc)

Lunch

After lunch Mr. Boccardi gave us an introduction to UNESCO:

- The aim of this UN-agency is sustainable development, peace and security
- UNESCO finds that most of the problems heritage experiences are related to either pressure from development or the environment. The language of cultural heritage needs to be adapted to the Global Agenda
- A few examples of the questions UNESCO addresses are: How can heritage contribute to a green economy? How can we reduce environmental footprint in combination with cultural heritage? How can cultural heritage contribute to job security?
- The UNESCO aims should be connected to the JPI SRA, UNESCO is already experienced and we should contact the representatives of UNESCO within the 17 countries participating in JPI for the AP

- There is a need for ambassadors of the JPI.

The last introduction was given by Mrs. Rodriguez Maribona on ECTP:

- The ECTP is finding ways to avoid a gap between research results and exploiting it by Industry
- The European Construction Platform has been accepted as one of the seen places of cultural heritage and since 2004 it has been working together with a group of people to identify priorities of the platform in cultural heritage
- The SRA of ECTP is similar to the JPI and the actions are already implemented in an Action Plan
- The Calls/Topics from the SRA are also found in other research areas, trade and construction also treat cultural heritage as a typical field
- 125 people are involved with ECTP with nearly 50% of the members coming from the industry (SME's and bigger companies). It is possible therefore to have the industry involved.

There is a synergy possible between ECTP and JPI, these projects have a lot in common and JPI can learn from ECTP since an SRA and an AP have already been established successfully. They are complementary.

Follow-up of Action Programme and IGO's/NGO's: discussion and working table (The Netherlands)

1. Advice, tips and tricks from AB regarding involvement of stakeholders: Who can/should we involve? How can we involve them? What is the AB's experience of AB members with involving the industry and SME's? Which role could the AB members play, in order to promote inclusiveness of stakeholder both in the JPI and the network NGO's and IGO's?

The answer to who we can approach is IGO's, NGO's involved in cultural heritage (Europa Nostra, ICOM, ICOMOS, ICCROM) How to approach this could be by sharing information via the web, email. Keeping each other informed by sharing agendas. We can also encourage Private/ Public partnerships. For example: Fraunhofer is involved in a project in Pompeii. This is collaboration between a University in Germany and an institute in Italy.

The involvement of the Industry is fully reflected in ECTP, where nearly 50 % of the members are industrial, and important companies, such as Vinci, ZRMK and Saint-Gobain have been coordinating the Focus Area Cultural Heritage.

According to UNESCO there are a lot of possible partners in the tourism sector. We could also approach the insurance industry (disaster, risks) because they have the knowhow. The media should also be kept in mind for the marketing factor.

To promote inclusiveness we should ask the question why? Why is it interesting for stakeholders to get involved? It cannot only be about sharing knowledge and avoiding duplication, there needs to be something more to it. With ECTP it was some companies' interest in research which convinced others to follow them in this common goal. The outcome of the SRA is aiming at evidence to make heritage more important both politically and socially. Therefore we need to provide ultimate evidence that cultural heritage does contribute to society.

2. Input from AB regarding own ambitions in relation to the four research priorities. Please specify to each of the four priorities separately:

Developing a reflective society (identity and perception; values; ethics). **Connecting people with heritage** (protection through use; sustainability; security; heritage information). **Creating knowledge** (linking information; change; methods and measurement; integrating risks). **Safeguarding our cultural heritage resource** (conservation; adaptation and mitigation).

We need to prove the value of cultural heritage. To develop a reflective society we need to come up with think tanks, a forum for discussion and other activities to develop such a society.

Discussing this question led us to discuss the issue of how to make investing in research in cultural heritage interesting. We should involve economics and scientists for funding reasons. A lot of work has already been done but it is disconnected. If we don't address this issue there's the danger that the JPI has to find its own way. Getting connected and informing each other is of great importance.

It is also considered of great importance to show the intrinsic value of our project, namely solidarity and uniqueness. Linking 'all' as 'vehicle' for implementation, we need a system to link information, for this we can rely on the already existing networks provided by the NGOs and IGOs.

3. More general strategic advice of the AB in the development of the Action Programme. General thoughts on elements of Action Programme, is current matrix workable? Filling in the matrix Please give us two or three tips.

On itself the matrix is an enabler to show us the possibilities for the AP. We want to get a clearly organized overview of all the challenges and topics of the SRA on the one hand and how we can enable to implement them on the other. The questions **what** and **how** are asked vertically and horizontally. ICCROM advises us to start the matrix by visualizing the final goal and to broaden the scope of the JPI as a whole.

Conclusion of the meeting (The Netherlands & Italy)

At this stage of the meeting a final round of advice was given, a short summary of this advice: We should not only focus on heritage but also on

other societal challenges. Stay in touch with and make more use of the AB. The AB can share its own frameworks and goals. We should also make sure that the relevance of cultural heritage is made clear to society to connect the people. Therefore we need to focus our discussion and go back to the spreadsheets of the NCPs. Maybe reconsider the matrix. To improve the input of the AP we should also check the websites of the IGOs and NGOs and Net Heritage.

Addendum: proposed recommendations by ICCROM

1: To ensure the transparency of the process of establishment of the SRA, the AB considers advisable that the explanation of the translation to the SRA would be published on the website.

2: the AB considered that it would be important to have a first phase of testing and adjusting of the SRA.

3: The AB recommends defining suitable tools for the AP and concentrate on how to implement it in all the different countries. To do this [JHEP] should maintain an upper level of governance in the medium term, which will ensure the communication and progress reporting.

4: AB recommends analysing existing networks to get adequate knowledge on ongoing initiatives.

5: the AB recommends creating platform of communication with other JPI that have already implemented an SRA.

6: it is hoped that the Advisory Board [AB] could become an active supporter of the heritageportal.

7: AB recommends dedicating a section in the heritageportal to a list of completed research projects with links to other websites, even beyond European borders to the scientific community.

8: In view of the Workshop BRICS countries, the USA and Japan proposed to be held in the summer AB recommends GL to get in contact with international organisations (UNESCO, ICCROM, COUNCIL OF EUROPE, ICOMOS, ICOM, EUROPA NOSTRA) represented in the AB for inputs regarding suitable experts.

9: proposed synergy Europa Nostra-JHEP: AB considers that Europa Nostra is all highly relevant for JPI and recommends creating and sharing a common agenda of events.

10: proposed synergy ICCROM-JHEP: a) the organisation in the ICCROM 2012-2013 Biennium Programme of Activities of a Forum on Conservation Science -which some JHEP partners are already involved in- could constitute a perfect occasion of synergy together with the creation of knowledge and b) sharing scientific documentation through network initiatives, such as Fastionline (<http://www.fastionline.org/>)

11: Proposed synergy UNESCO-JHEP: The UNESCO aims should be connected to the JPI SRA, UNESCO is already experienced and JHEP should contact the representatives of UNESCO within the 17 countries participating in JPI for the AP. There is a need for ambassadors of the JPI.

12: proposed synergy ECTP-JHEP: there is a synergy possible between ECTP and JPI, these projects have a lot in common and JPI can learn from ECTP since an SRA and an AP have already been established successfully. They are complementary.

13: AB recommends IGO's, NGO's involved in cultural heritage (Europa Nostra, ICOM, ICOMOS, ICCROM) by sharing information via the web, email, by sharing agendas. AB also encourages private / public partnerships.

14: JHEP could contribute to prove the value of cultural heritage and to develop a "reflective society" through think tanks, fora for discussion and other activities at this end.

15: AB advises to improve the matrix visualizing the final goal and to broaden the scope of the JPI as a whole.