



H2020-Adhoc-2014-20-RTD-G.A. No. 699523 – JHEP2

**Support to the implementation of the Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) of the Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage and Global Change (JPI CH)**

Instrument: Coordination and Support Action

**Deliverable D2.4**

**First report of activities of knowledge exchange with heritage practice**

Due date of deliverable: *June, 2017*

Actual submission date: *June, 2017*

Lead beneficiary for this Deliverable: RCL (Research Council of Lithuania)

Start date of project: 1<sup>st</sup> January 2016

Duration: 4 years

Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities (Italy)

Project Coordinator: Antonia Pasqua RECCHIA

Coordination and Support Action within Horizon 2020 (2014-2020)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

## Table of contents

Introduction .....	3
T.2.2. “Heritage practice”: implementation strategy .....	3
T.2.2. „Heritage practice“: activities .....	6
First activity: identification phase .....	7
Second activity: discussion phase .....	7
Third activity: implementation phase .....	9
Conclusions .....	9

## Introduction

Communication remains among the issues of constant reminder in most of the documents regarding JPI's and alignment processes: "communication to the research community of the existence, scope and opportunities offered by the JPIs needs to be strengthened"<sup>1</sup>. In the process of communication JPI's connections with practice is among the priorities of all JPI's: "turning science into practice through new partnerships and dedicated programme management, including strategic community building, translating science into policies, driving new innovation models and disseminating and communicating research results to support their exploitation, and leveraging and testing new tools and ways of cooperation, setting up new instruments and facilitating mutual learning"<sup>2</sup>. Thus, generally JPI's express intention of moving towards the end user. JPICH also aims to act as a node for research based heritage practice in Europe. Expanding the outline of awareness on JPICH is among the strategic objectives of JPICH. The purpose of T. 2.2 is to contribute to this process.

There are many ways how to stimulate this process. While formulating specific tasks for "Heritage practice" within the WP2 "Implementation of joint activities including joint calls" it is envisaged that at least 3 different activities will be undertaken during this CSA aiming to implement this objective. It was indicated that variable geometry is an important aspect in the activities, drawing on the main priorities of the different partners in heritage practice, which suggest a wide range of possible activities to be explored: dedicated workshops, exchange visits, training modules etc.

The initial phase of JHEP2 has been dedicated to prepare the format, objectives and audiences of activities. Deliverable 2.4 aims to do the first report on activities of knowledge exchange with heritage practice. This includes two main aspects:

*(a) elaboration and justification of the strategy for the implementation of the tasks delegated to T.2.2 "Heritage practice";*

*(b) description of all three activities foreseen to implement as a result of T.2.2.*

This will enable to evaluate their presumable impact and contribution of T.2.2 for JPICH as an active actor open for the active contact with heritage practice.

### T.2.2. "Heritage practice": implementation strategy

Future Strategy Vision of JPICH identify that "there is still not enough visibility of research results financed through the joint calls or the potential applicability of these results. Different activities (e.g., the 2017 and 2018 Parade) are being promoted to tackle this issue, but there is still room for improvement."<sup>3</sup> The process of knowledge transfer/exchange with heritage practitioners should become one of the tools to improve this process by bring visibility to JPICH among heritage practitioners.

---

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Implementation Group GPC 3 "Monitoring and Evaluating JPIs", Brussels, 15 June 2016, ERAC-GPC 1310/16, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> JPIs launch brochure. 2016.12.02. Brussels.

<sup>3</sup> *JPI Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge strategy for Europe. Future Strategy Vision, main achievements and future goals*, approved by the JPICH GB on 8/6/2017, p. 8.

In the questionnaire which was performed in first half of y. 2016 more than 170 institutions were mentioned as possible interested parties form heritage practice (for the more detailed results of the questionnaire see the deliverable 2.3). On the one hand such a big (and probably not the final) number of possible interested parties shows a huge potential for the range of forms of cooperation between JPICH and different institutions of heritage practice. On the other hand it is clear that implementation of specific actions foreseen by T.2.2 cannot cover the whole range of institutions. Therefore the selection should be done. It was suggested that the solution could be to choose one specific thematic area where the communication of the knowledge created by JPICH could be targeted on a specific field of cultural heritage. Therefore **historic urban landscapes of 20<sup>th</sup> century have been chosen as a thematic area.**

Europe shares a huge number of historic urban landscapes inspired by diverse political and cultural ideologies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Many of these places are being recognized as heritage sites (i.e. historic urban landscape of Kaunas 1918-1940 (Lithuania) recently was awarded as European heritage label site). At the same time “Madrid document” identifies that “too many of the heritage structures and buildings of the twentieth century are at risk. They are threatened by a general lack of appreciation and recognition, and all too often they are pressured by redevelopment or unsympathetic change or simply by neglect. There is also some confusion about the basic principles of conservation that should be applied to twentieth-century sites and places.”<sup>4</sup> Almost a hundred of nominations related to 20<sup>th</sup> century have been listed on the World Monuments Fund Watch List since 1996 and calls international attention to cultural heritage sites facing imminent threats and challenges<sup>5</sup>. It clearly identifies that issues of the recent heritage is among the most important problems within a cultural heritage sector and this must be given a special attention in different contexts. Research can play an important role in this process.

Among the most problematic issues within the sector of 20<sup>th</sup> century heritage is a value definition. When understanding modernity we have to discuss not only about the ideas and forms which represent classical narrative of Modern Movement, but also to recognize the places where modernity reveals itself without iconic buildings or distinctive urban plans, but as a part of the development narrative (i.e. historic urban landscapes). In such cases as Kaunas, Gdynia or many others around the Europe and outside the Europe, urban landscapes of modern movement usually are in very central urban areas and include huge number buildings of different functional types. A strong pressure for the development makes this heritage especially fragile. Therefore it is crucially important to “to reach consensus using participatory planning and stakeholder consultations on what values to protect for transmission to future generations and to determine the attributes that carry these values”<sup>6</sup>. The question of value is also among a central issues of JPICH: “There is a vast range of tangible, intangible and digital heritage, with new heritage being ‘discovered’ and created all the time. This makes it a huge task to understand and to decide what to preserve, conserve and protect. In times of limited resources, there is a risk of spreading resources too thinly, and there are difficult decisions to be made on approaches and prioritization.”<sup>7</sup>

Selection of the historic urban landscapes of modern movement as a focus issue also brings another important aspect related to JPICH: the interrelation of T. 2.2 “Heritage practice” with other activities foreseen in T.2.3 “Follow up activities Action Programme and Cultural Heritage Governance strategies”. As

---

<sup>4</sup> Madrid document. Second ed., November 2014. See: [http://www.icomos-isc20c.org/pdf/madrid\\_doc\\_10.26.pdf](http://www.icomos-isc20c.org/pdf/madrid_doc_10.26.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> Watch sites since 1996. See: <https://www.wmf.org/watch>.

<sup>6</sup> UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape., 10 November 2011. See: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/638>.

<sup>7</sup> *JPI Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge strategy for Europe. Future Strategy Vision, main achievements and future goals*, approved by the JPICH GB on 8/6/2017, p. 7.

it is indicated in Deliverable 2.6 of Task 2.3 the “aim of the implementation of joint activities within JHEP2 is to establish a long-term cooperation between JPICH partners, organizations in the field of cultural heritage – including NGO’s and IGO’s – and other relevant parties. This cooperation relates to networking, exchange of knowledge, mobility of experts, collecting best practices, formulating standards etc.” It is obvious that the objectives of T.2.2 and T.2.3 are rather close and opens an opportunity for synergies. It is also crucial to mention, that T.2.3 intended “to develop activities not as single events, but as ongoing processes of collaboration which aim at concrete results. A meeting, conference or workshop can be part of this long-term cooperation, but should not be the only goal and yield of it.” Synergy of T.2.2 and T.2.3 gives an opportunity to develop such long-term cooperation based on priorities of heritage practice of a certain field.

T.2.2. is intended to take into consideration this aspect and look for a possibilities to synchronize at least some activities performed within JHEP2 and thus to reach a better synergies and sustainability. Issue of 20<sup>th</sup> century historic urban landscapes and problems of value open a possibility for a dialog at least with few activities performed under the T.2.3: (a) Changing (urban) landscapes: urban housing areas of post-World War II; (b) Cultural heritage concepts and theories: value and identity problems in the process of preservation of 20th century heritage. The last one, is taken as an exemplar case for the workshop “Cultural heritage concepts and theories: evaluation of the 20th century historic urban landscapes” in Vilnius as a merging result of 2.3 activity 18, and 2.2 second activity.

Improving visibility within the certain field of expertise is important part of “Heritage practice”, but not the only one. Wide topic of 20<sup>th</sup> century urban landscapes may tackle many other different aspects. Among them is the issue of the relation of top-down and bottom-up approaches in the process of dissemination of knowledge created by JPICH. The brochure which was presented at the Annual Joint Programming Conference on 22-23 November 2016 in Brussels reminds that among objectives of JPI’s is the standardization and harmonization of research and defining of common priorities “require a top-down, high-level sustained strategic intergovernmental dialogue.”<sup>8</sup> However, “top-down challenges require bottom-up solutions, using inclusive, traceable and transparent processes with the different stakeholders for creating the trust between members and also with the EC.”<sup>9</sup> Building up a stakeholders platform within a certain sector of heritage practice could be one the tools to introduce some aspects of bottom-up approach, which would further strengthen the alignment potential.

Among the three main strands of European strategy for international cultural relations “reinforcing cooperation on cultural heritage”<sup>10</sup> has been mentioned. Cooperation network on such specific areas such as 20th c. urban landscape could work as an interlinking instrument aiming to reach a group of stakeholders. It is important to mention that 20<sup>th</sup> century heritage community have a rather strong identity with such international communities as DOCOMOM, ICOMOS 20<sup>th</sup> century scientific committee or regional organizations such as Working Group on 20<sup>th</sup> Century Built Cultural Heritage by the Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea States. JPICH could strengthen and broaden the community of 20<sup>th</sup> century heritage with aspects which are important for JPICH – i.e. alignment process of the research. Therefore the aim is to create a knowledge sharing and discussion channel and stimulate long-term partnerships within a certain heritage community.

---

<sup>8</sup> JPIs launch brochure. 2016.12.02. Brussels.

<sup>9</sup> JPIs tackling societal challenges today and tomorrow. In: *JPI Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge strategy for Europe. Future Strategy Vision, main achievements and future goals*, approved by the JPICH GB on 8/6/2017, p. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Towards a European strategy for international cultural relations (June 2016, Brussels 8.6.2016 JOIN (2016) 29 final.

Last, but not the least is the relation of the topic of 20<sup>th</sup> c. historic urban landscapes with SRA. Developing a reflective society is among the four pillars of the SRA. Research areas on “Identity and perception” and “values” are strongly related with common problematic of the 20<sup>th</sup> century heritage field where the same questions are relevant: “What is chosen to represent ‘our heritage’? How is it chosen and how might this change over time? Who is capturing the cultural heritage that is being created today?”<sup>11</sup> Within a strategy of JPICH this process relates with third priority “creating knowledge”, which involves deepening our understanding of the context in which cultural heritage exists and is formed<sup>12</sup>.

Overall it is obvious that the alignment is a multistage process. JPI “Urban Europe” indicates five strategic aspects of alignment process: (1) aligned objectives; (2) common values; (3) aligned strategies; (4) common frameworks and infrastructure; (5) joint action and common practices.”<sup>13</sup> T.2.2 address the last issue which implements alignment process on the level of particular actions. This is an implementation instrument which opens a possibility for creating a transnational and trans-institutional network for sharing experience and aims to achieve two main goals:

*(a) to open a possibility to influence JPICH strategies and priorities to match the coming research and innovation needs from perspective of specific cultural heritage area;*

*(b) on the other hand, dissemination of the SRA approach within a certain heritage area can give a strong impulse to influence national politics on research.*

In such way T.2.2 should work as an instrument which can increase the visibility of JPI as well as support a better “bottom-up” and “top-down” communication.

### **T.2.2. „Heritage practice“: activities**

Future Strategy Vision of JPICH suggests “due to small budgets, to use actions other than research projects within calls, for more alignment”. This can be networking and avenues for knowledge sharing”<sup>14</sup>. Three activities of T.2.2 are orientated in particular to the smaller scale instruments capable to rise up the potential of cooperation within a certain sector of cultural heritage. Implementation strategy of T.2.2 suggests that the main keywords describing the “heritage practice” aspect could be: knowledge sharing, networking and training. These keywords are frequent in various documents regarding the JPI’s and reflect the priorities foreseen in Future Strategy Vision and Strategic Research Agenda of JPICH.

As it was indicated in the deliverable 2.3 the plan of knowledge exchange will consists of three parts aiming: (a) to identify objectives; (b) to discuss the strategy; (c) to perform an action as an experimental tool for knowledge transfer/exchange with heritage practitioners.

---

<sup>11</sup> JPI Cultural Heritage and Global Change. Strategic research agenda, 2014, p. 17.

<sup>12</sup> JPI Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge strategy for Europe. Future Strategy Vision, main achievements and future goals, approved by the JPICH GB on 8/6/2017, p. 5.

<sup>13</sup> JPIs launch brochure. 2016.12.02. Brussels.

<sup>14</sup> JPI Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge strategy for Europe. Future Strategy Vision, main achievements and future goals, approved by the JPICH GB on 8/6/2017, p. 14.

## First action: identification phase

**Title, time and place:** Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage Workshop: Funded research projects Parade. Brussels, 20-21 February 2017.

**Type of activity:** the overall event was organized by JPICH in order to put into perspective and present results of projects granted through the two joint calls. The parade also included the presentation “The role of JPICH as a potential node for research best practice in Europe” where the strategy of T.2.2 was presented as the first action.

**Aim and results.** Aim of the presentation was to identify the role of JPI CH as a potential „node for a research based practice in Europe“. It was also important to set up a network of operating partners on further implementation of the T.2.2 and thus to involve in the process thematically close Heritage Plus projects and other interested parties. As it was mentioned, the whole event was focused on the presentation of the projects granted by First Pilot and Heritage Plus Calls. On base of these presentations three projects (“Smart value”, “PICH” and “H@V”) have been selected and invited to continue activities foreseen in T.2.2 “Heritage practice”.

**Target auditorium:** representatives of JPI CH, representatives of Heritage Plus (pilot call) and Heritage Plus Call 2015 projects and their social partners from the field of practice. representatives from the organizations of practitioners (ICCROM, ICOMOS etc.).

## Second action: discussion phase

**Title, time and place:** Two half days’ workshop “Cultural heritage concepts and theories: value problems in the process of preservation of the 20th century historic urban landscape”, September 28-29<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Lithuanian National Commission for UNESCO, Šv. Jono str. 11, Vilnius, Lithuania.

**Aim.** The primary aim of the event will be to discuss how to improve the relation of JPICH and heritage practice and how to increase visibility of the research results of the projects funded by JPICH among the professionals of cultural heritage practice. These general questions will be addressed through the lens of 20<sup>th</sup> century historic urban landscapes and value definition. Three selected Heritage plus projects (“Smart value”, “PICH” and “H@V”) will be presented as a case studies.

**Structure.** The workshop will cover two separate but interrelated topics of JHEP2: T.2.2 “Heritage practice” and T.2.3 “Cultural heritage concepts and theories”. It is important to note, that (T.2.3 activity 18) can be followed and supported by other activities of T.2.3 (for example Activity 17, “Changing (urban) landscapes” which is foreseen in November, 2017, Netherlands).

**Target auditorium:** The public of the event will include the national representatives of the JPI CH member states, JPI CH Scientific Committee, representatives of the Working Group on 20<sup>th</sup> Century Built Cultural Heritage by the Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea States and representatives of Lithuanian cultural heritage institutions.

**Organized by:** Lithuanian research council; Institute of Architecture and Construction of Kaunas University of Technology; Lithuanian National Commission for UNESCO.

### **September 28th. Focus on “Heritage practice”**

**The first part of the workshop** will be focused on T.2.2 “Heritage practice” with discussion on relation of JPICH and heritage practice. The main **objective** is to discuss if JPICH can give an impulse for further dissemination of the Heritage plus results and principles encoded in Strategic research agenda? How to improve the communication between research projects financed by JPICH, different stakeholders from field of heritage practice and JPICH Platform itself? Can we find the way to reach the potential user of these results in heritage practice, and how? What kind of solutions would encourage applying these results in heritage practice?

Therefore T.2.2 focuses on aim to strengthen the process of knowledge transfer/exchange with heritage practitioners. Part of the aim is ensured by such events as *Heritage parade*. However the T.2.2 suggests that communication of the results targeting to a certain field of cultural heritage (i.e. urban landscapes of 20<sup>th</sup> century) could be another important tool. Action dedicated to urban landscapes of 20<sup>th</sup> century do not aim to review the whole strategy on relation of heritage practice and JPICH, but aims to be an example how different members of JPICH could use stakeholders platforms as a tool to foster the application of the results within a certain sector of cultural heritage.

The main **outcome of the workshop** will be the **strategic suggestions** on dissemination of the research results of the projects funded by JPICH among the professionals of cultural heritage practice. Suggestions will be presented in form of deliverable of the project JHEP2. Also the future action – the summer school for practitioners/students based on case study of Kaunas, Lithuania in 2018, will be discussed.

### **September 29th. Focus on historic urban landscapes of 20<sup>th</sup> century**

**The second part of the workshop will** be dedicated to “Cultural heritage and concepts” (T.2.3 activity 18) and will address specific issue of heritage practice – urban landscapes of 20<sup>th</sup> century. The main **objective** is to discuss if JPICH could act as connecting platform to develop networks of different stakeholders active in a certain field of cultural heritage protection (i.e. historic urban landscapes of 20<sup>th</sup> century)? Could and should such networks influence the activities of JPICH (i.e. suggesting new topics for the forthcoming Heritage plus calls)? Do such strategic documents prepared by JPICH as Strategic Research Agenda (<http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/wp-content/uploads/SRA-2014-06.pdf>) could be an inspiration for the alignment on research strategies concerning issues in a specific heritage field?

As a case study workshop will analyze **the role of architectural theory in the process of value definition** for 20<sup>th</sup> century historical landscapes. Therefore this part of the workshop by integrating theoretical knowledge and good practice aims to elaborate methodology which tackles complicated issues on valuation of 20<sup>th</sup> century legacy.



The main **outcome of the workshop** will be mobility of experts and the exchange of knowledge by sharing the good practices with heritage professionals.

### Third action: implementation phase

**Time and place:** June 18-22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018, Kaunas, Lithuania. Organized by Lithuanian Research Council and Institute of Architecture and Construction of Kaunas University of Technology.

**Type of activity:** summer school as a pilot instrument for knowledge exchange. Summer school for heritage practitioners/student will be a tool for dissemination results of funded research projects.

**Aim:** training module for the heritage practitioners as a tool for dissemination results of Heritage plus calls based on the case study of Kaunas historic urban landscape (European heritage label site). Teaching materials (methodology on evaluation of 20<sup>th</sup> century urban landscapes) for the summer school/courses will be published. Materials for the summer school can be based not only on experience of selected projects but also will include the results from T.2.3 activities. Action aims to be an event of European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH). The concept of the action corresponds to Vision document aiming “to encourage the development of resources for training, to build skills and capacity for research on the protection of cultural heritage.”<sup>15</sup>

**Target auditorium:** The final scope and target auditorium for the third activity is still under the discussion. Possible results of this event will be discussed during workshop in Vilnius September 28-29<sup>th</sup>, 2017. However it is clear that the implementation phase of heritage practice have to have a certain practical background. As a case study

### Conclusions

Actions of T.2.2 will focus on exchange of knowledge and mobility of experts through presenting results of the JPICH funded projects to target auditorium in form of workshop and summer school. Keywords of the T.2.2 “Heritage practices” are: knowledge sharing, networking and training. Overall it is expected that actions performed will increase visibility of JPICH among cultural heritage professionals.

---

<sup>15</sup> *JPI Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge strategy for Europe. Future Strategy Vision, main achievements and future goals*, approved by the JPICH GB on 8/6/2017, p. 11.