



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 (JPICH)**

Instrument: Coordination and Support Action

**Deliverable 2.9**

**END REPORT ON JOINT ACTIVITIES**

Due date of deliverable: December 2019

Actual submission date: December 2019

Lead beneficiary for this Deliverable: RCE



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. SELECTION OF ACTIVITIES AND COORDINATORS	3
3. PROPOSAL TO THE GOVERNING BOARD	5
4. JOINT ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED IN 2017-2019	7
ANNEX. THE 56 ACTIVITIES IN ANNEX A TO THE ACTION PROGRAMME (TOPICS)	19

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

One part of task 2.3 of JHEP2 concerns the follow up of the activities in the Action Programme 2016-2018, which was drawn up as Deliverable D3.1 of JHEP (submission date 30 September 2015). In Annex A to this Action Programme, 56 activities of high potential were defined, related to the four main themes of the Strategic Research Agenda (2013). According to the JHEP2 CSA, one of the aims of Task 2.3 was to prioritize the implementation of a selection of these activities. At least three different activities a year would be undertaken and each partner would be responsible for the implementation of at least one of them. The Governing Board was to decide which activities to undertake in 2017-2019 under JHEP2. In a first report in June 2017 we explained how we came to a prioritized selection of joint activities and which activities the Governing Board decided to implement (Deliverable 2.7, <http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/wp-content/uploads/Deliverable-2.7-Report-on-joint-activities.pdf>). In June 2018 we delivered a Midterm Report about the state of affairs in mid-2018 (Deliverable 2.8, <http://jpi-ch.eu/wp-content/uploads/Deliverable-2.8-Midterm-Report-on-joint-activities.pdf>). In this End Report (Deliverable 2.9) we reiterate the previous history and give an overview of all joint activities that were implemented in 2017-2019.

Another part of task 2.3 is the provision of a practical guidance on managing the joint activities for member states leading them. After consultation with the partners, this document was provided by the task leader in December 2016 (Deliverable 2.6) and published on the website (Milestone 4, <http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/wp-content/uploads/D2-6-Guidance-on-managing-joint-activities-2.pdf>).

## **2. SELECTION OF ACTIVITIES AND COORDINATORS**

### **Questionnaire and criteria**

In order to assess the feasibility of the defined activities, the task leader sent out a questionnaire to all JHEP and JHEP2 partners on 25 April 2016. The aim of this questionnaire was to investigate the support for the 56 actions with the initiating/submitting as well as additional partners. At the same time, it opened up the opportunity to see if activities could be combined and if new topics had come up since the list of 56 activities was drawn up. By May 31 2016 responses were received from eleven JHEP2 partners (CY, BE, FR, IT, LT, NL, NO, PL, PT, SE, UK) and three members of the JPICH Advisory Board (Council of Europe / HEREIN, ICCROM, Tecnalia). On the basis of these responses, the task leader made a proposal for a selection of activities to undertake and partners responsible for their implementation.

At an earlier stage it was decided to apply the following criteria for selecting and prioritizing the activities: urgency, measured by the support for the actions, with a minimum of three member states participating; participation of actors other than member states, with NGO's and IGO's as a plus, and; availability of funds if needed. An important criterion for the amount of activities to select was the agreement in the JHEP2 CSA that each partner (country, according to the description of the deliverable) would coordinate at least one of them. This made the total amount of activities to be implemented at least thirteen. This has served as a guide in the process of analyzing the results of the questionnaire and selecting activities.

### **Method of selecting activities and coordinators**

In order to assess the support for the activities, the task leader first took into account the expressed sense of urgency. Five activities were indicated as urgent by at least seven respondents, thirteen by at least six respondents and sixteen by at least five respondents. We selected these

sixteen activities, for which between three and eight countries showed interest to participate. In almost all cases one or more NGO's/IGO's indicated that they want to participate. One of the criteria for the selection of activities was the availability of funds if needed. However, the inquiries into this issue in the questionnaire yielded hardly any concrete results. Therefore this criterion was not taken into consideration, on the assumption that for all activities (some) funding has to be found.

One of the selected activities was to be developed within the ESFRI Infrastructures: E-RIHS, reason why we decided not to include it in the selection. Following the respondent's suggestions for possible combinations of activities, we made two combinations that seemed feasible and logical. This reduced the selection to thirteen activities.

Then we paired countries that had shown interest in coordinating activities with these activities. For countries that had not indicated their preference in this respect, we established their support for the activities, expressed in a willingness to participate or, if this was absent, a statement of urgency or relevance. On this basis we assigned responsibilities for activities to these countries. For countries that did not respond to the questionnaire, we suggested an activity that did not have a coordinator yet.

In the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to suggest possible activities that are not mentioned in the list of 56. Six respondents suggested in total thirteen activities. Since, of course, we were not aware of the support among the partners for these activities – and we agreed not to send out new questionnaires – we left these out of consideration while making the selection. Of course all partners were entirely free to examine the feasibility of these activities, whether or not in combination with activities that were proposed for implementation.

### **Proposal for activities and coordinators**

Our proposal for activities to be implemented and coordinators was as follows. The numbers correspond with the numbers of the original 56 activities in the Action Programme.

1. **Social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage.** *Portugal*
2. **The changing meaning and value of cultural heritage across Europe for 'old' and 'new' citizens as well as 'outside' visitors.** *Belgium*
6. **Research on the role of cultural heritage in the reconstruction of (national) identity in post-conflict situations.** *Poland*
16. **Development of preservation and accessibility of archeological monuments.** *Romania*
17. **Changing (urban) landscapes & 48. Changing landscapes: landscape with its cultural heritage and natural environment.** *Netherlands*
18. **Cultural heritage concepts and theories.** *Lithuania*
19. **Enjoyment of cultural heritage by means of new and old media.** *Cyprus*
23. **Re-use and continued use of buildings, historic urban centres and landscapes.** *United Kingdom*
24. **Community as actor in heritage management & 47. Sustainable development of local communities.** *France*
29. **Migration and identity.** *Sweden*
41. **Methodology development for assessing the cultural and socio-economic value(s) of digital cultural heritage.** *Spain*
42. **Sharing knowledge of conservation measures for historical buildings in areas that are sensitive for earthquakes and landslides.** *Italy*
46. **Creating environmental, cultural, social and economic assets on cultural heritage.** *Norway*

### **Responses of the partners**

On 2 August 2016 we sent this proposal to the partners. We asked them to inform us ultimately 9 September 2016 if they agreed with it, or if they had established an exchange of activity-coordinator amongst one another. Furthermore we requested to start developing a concrete and concise plan for the activity they were going to coordinate, in consultation with the partners that

had shown interest in participating or labeled the activity relevant. In this plan, the theme and nature of the activity was to be described, since the selection of activities at hand in fact contained topics with only a general indication of the methods of joint action that were proposed in the time. We indicated that the deadline for submitting these plans was 14 October 2016.

In their responses, all partners confirmed to coordinate the activity we had selected, with two exceptions. Instead of 46: 'Creating environmental, cultural, social and economic assets on cultural heritage', Norway wanted to coordinate activity 49: 'The past has power: conservation of historic wooden structures'. This contained the 18<sup>th</sup> International Course on Wood Conservation Technology to be held in Norway in 2018. And Romania indicated that it could not coordinate activity 16 'Development of preservation and accessibility of archeological monuments', due to capacity constraints as well as lack of expertise in this field. Romania intended to coordinate an activity concerning the role of the new Heritage Portal for participatory approaches to cultural heritage. This activity does not appear on the original list of 56 activities, but is closely related to JHEP2 Task 2.6 which Romania (ANCSI) is leading: the transformation of the Heritage Portal into a Knowledge Hub. In addition, France informed us to be willing to coordinate activity 24 only, since it is not a signatory of the FARO convention and a combination with activity 47 would be problematic.

Some partners pointed out that some of the topics of the activities were somehow related to each other and could be combined. Although we sympathized with this suggestion, we decided to stick to the amount of thirteen activities since this was agreed in the JHEP2 CSA. We asked the coordinators of these activities to develop their plans in consultation with each other, in order to avoid overlap and find synergies.

### 3. PROPOSAL TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

On 22 September 2016 we informed the partners about these outcomes and asked them to send in a plan for their activity ultimately 14 October 2016. On 28 October 2016 we sent the received plans back to the partners, with a request to further clarify and elaborate them as much as possible and to get in touch with the coordinators of related activities and activities they were interested in. We asked them to send in their revised plans ultimately 14 November 2016.

After judging feasibility and timing of the thirteen plans that we received, we presented the following prioritized selection of joint activities to the JPICH Governing Board of 30 November 2016.

PLANNING	ACTIVITY (TOPIC)
January – December 2017	<b>Methodology development for assessing the cultural and socio-economic value(s) of digital cultural heritage:</b> Creation of a virtual working group of experts; inventory and analysis of documents; workshop to finish reports and make policy recommendations; publication of the results <b>(SPAIN)</b>
January 2017 – June 2018	<b>Sharing knowledge of conservation measures for historical buildings in areas that are sensitive for earthquakes and landslides:</b> Questionnaire on national guidelines; mobility of experts; survey on National Action Plans <b>(ITALY)</b>
January 2017 – December 2018	<b>Re-use and continued use of buildings, historic urban centres and landscapes:</b> Three events on this topic in historic cities in the UK, Cyprus and the Netherlands <b>(UK)</b>

March and October 2017	<b>Enjoyment of cultural heritage by means of new and old media:</b> Two workshops/expert meetings on tangible and intangible CH and the way it is presented by new and old media <b>(CYPRUS)</b>
June 2017	<b>Social, cultural, political and economic value of Cultural Heritage:</b> International conference on this topic <b>(PORTUGAL)</b>
June – November 2017	<b>Community as actor in heritage management:</b> 2 Days conference on 'participatory approaches' <b>(FRANCE)</b>
September 2017	<b>Cultural heritage concepts and theories:</b> International workshop/conference on "value and identity problems in the process of preservation of 20 <sup>th</sup> century heritage" <b>(LITHUANIA)</b>
November 2017	<b>Changing (urban) landscapes:</b> Expert meeting on urban housing areas of post-World War II <b>(NETHERLANDS)</b>
January – December 2018	<b>Research on the role of cultural heritage in the building of (national) identity in post-conflict situations:</b> International conference/seminar/workshop, based on an example of Warsaw's reconstruction <b>(POLAND)</b>
January – December 2018	<b>Migration and Identity:</b> International workshop or conference on migration, heritage and identity; publication to share the results <b>(SWEDEN)</b>
May – June 2018	<b>The past has power: Conservation of historic wooden structures:</b> International course on Wood Conservation Technology <b>(NORWAY)</b>
February 2019	<b>The changing meaning and value of cultural heritage across Europe for 'old' and 'new' citizens as well as 'outside' visitors:</b> International workshop on this topic <b>(BELGIUM)</b>
May 2019	<b>The knowledge hub heritage portal as a catalyst to the development of a circular economy around cultural heritage:</b> International workshop or conference as satellite event to a key socio-economic conference under the Romanian Council Presidency <b>(Romania)</b>

We asked the Governing Board to decide on three elements of this proposal: selection, planning and finances.

#### *Selection*

The selection of activities to be implemented in 2017-2019 was based on the criteria we decided on (urgency, participation of actors other than member states, availability of funds) and the answers to the questionnaire.

#### *Planning*

With this planning based on the information of the partners, we proposed to stretch the agreement in the JHEP2 CSA that at least three different activities a year would be undertaken, since most activities concentrated in 2018 (the European Year of Cultural Heritage), and only one activity was planned in 2019.

### *Finances*

In the prioritization of activities, the financial planning was not taken into account. This turned out not to be a distinctive criterion, since the financial plans had much in common. In all cases the coordinator and/or institutions in the organizing country would bear the expenses (organization, hosting) of the event and expected the participants to pay their own accommodation costs. This made all selected activities feasible. Nevertheless, some additional budget was needed so that all organizing parties could pay travel and accommodation costs of international speakers to be invited. We proposed that for this purpose € 3000 for each of the 13 activities would be earmarked in the JPI Business Plan 2017-2019.

During the meeting of 30 November 2016, the Governing Board approved of the three elements of the proposal. Concerning the planning it was considered that the staggering of activities was in the spirit of the agreement in the CSA and that in practice some of the activities would be implemented later than expected.

## **4. JOINT ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED IN 2017-2019**

In our first report (Deliverable 2.7, June 2017) we included a schematic summary of the plans for the thirteen joint activities. They were arranged in alphabetical order of countries, containing information about the coordinator, topic, activity and planning. In addition, it was indicated which research priorities and elements of the enabling framework of the Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) would be addressed by the joint activity. After this report was delivered, the coordinators of the activities elaborated their plans and some of the activities were carried out. For the Midterm report (Deliverable 2.8, June 2018), we requested the coordinators to give an update of their activities. For the activities that were implemented in 2017, we asked them to complete a Template for Regular Reporting on JPICH joint activities made by FCT and MCC in the context of JHEP2 Work Package 3: Monitoring and evaluation (KPI). For the activities that were to be implemented in 2018 and 2019, we asked them to update the information which was given in the first report.

For this End Report we asked all coordinators of joint activities to complete the abovementioned Template for Regular Reporting on JPICH joint activities. This resulted in ten reports. For various reasons three activities could not take place. Belgium (KIRK-IRPA) planned an international conference on 'Citizen participation and the changing meaning and value of CH across Europe', to be held on 29 November 2019 in Brussels. Unfortunately, in spite of extensive (promotional) efforts, this meeting had to be canceled due to an insufficient number of registrations. Italy intended to organize several activities focused on 'Sharing knowledge of conservation measures for historical building in areas that are sensitive for earthquakes and landslides', but due to political developments and personnel changes within MIBACT and CNR this could thus far not be realized. An intended workshop on 'The Heritage Portal as a knowledge hub in a cultural heritage circular economy', to be organized by Romania in 2019, could not take place either. This was due to a government change and following structural alterations in the government apparatus as well as staff reductions. We will examine to what extent these activities can still take place in the context of the current goals of JPICH, which all three relevant partners are keen to pursue.

All in all in the context of JHEP2 ten joint activities were implemented in the years 2017, 2018 and 2019. Each activity was coordinated by the country in which it took place. The activities included international conferences, seminars, workshops and courses on a variety of issues, including tangible, intangible and digital heritage. Some focused on high intensity interaction between a smaller number of participants, while others aimed at reaching a wider audience. All four SRA research priorities were addressed: developing a reflective society; connecting people with heritage; creating knowledge; safeguarding our cultural heritage resource. The amount of active participants ranged from six to a hundred, whereas the activities and results were disseminated amongst an uncountable number and range of stakeholders.

In the years 2017, 2018 and 2019 the following joint activities were implemented.

<b>2017</b>	
20 March	<b>Cyprus:</b> workshop on 'Remote Sensing for Cultural Heritage Beyond Europe'
1-2 June	<b>Portugal:</b> conference on the 'Social, cultural, political and economic value of Cultural Heritage'
28-29 September	<b>Lithuania:</b> workshop on 'Value and identity problems in the process of preservation of 20 <sup>th</sup> century heritage'
September-October	<b>Spain:</b> creation of working group for 'Methodology development for assessing the cultural and socio-economic value of digital cultural heritage'
27 October	<b>Cyprus:</b> workshop on 'Intangible Cultural Heritage and its presentation through old and new technologies'
17 November	<b>Cyprus:</b> seminar on 'Enjoyment of Cultural Heritage by Means of New and Old Media'
November – April 2018	<b>Spain:</b> development of work for 'Methodology development for assessing the cultural and socio-economic value of digital cultural heritage'
<b>2018</b>	
9 April – 11 May	<b>Norway:</b> online long-distance learning module 'International course on Wood Conservation Technology'
4-29 June	<b>Norway:</b> training 'International course on Wood Conservation Technology'
20 June	<b>Spain:</b> workshop 'Methodology development for assessing the cultural and socio-economic value of digital cultural heritage'
10-12 September	<b>Poland:</b> conference on 'The role of cultural heritage in the building of (national) identity in post conflict situations'
26 November	<b>United Kingdom:</b> workshop on 'Re-use and continued use of buildings, historic urban centres and landscapes'
<b>2019</b>	
4 April	<b>France:</b> conference on 'What role for communities in heritage management? From identification to transmission'
15-16 May	<b>Sweden:</b> conference on 'Migration and Identity'
9 October	<b>Netherlands:</b> Expert Meeting on 'Heritage Management in Dynamic Environments'

Below are the same activities, alphabetically by country and with additional information.

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>CYPRUS</b> Research Promotion Foundation (RPF), Cyprus University of Technology (CUT)
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Enjoyment of cultural heritage by means of new and old media</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>A workshop on 'Remote Sensing for Cultural Heritage Beyond Europe' in Paphos, Cyprus, on 20 March 2017. This event was part of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Remote Sensing and Geoinformation of Environment, that took place in Cyprus between on 20-23 March 2017. The activity was open to the public and not just to the conference participants</p> <p>Specific topics that were addressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Digital cultural heritage</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renewal and restoration of historic areas</li> <li>• Climate change</li> </ul>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Developing a reflective society; Connecting people with heritage
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Capability and capacity; Knowledge sharing
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 1065.
<b>Participation</b>	Fourteen persons took part in the workshop directly, representing Cyprus, the UK, Italy, Germany, Egypt and Spain and including at least two young students or professionals in training. More than seventy persons were reached by the activity.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	The main dissemination tool is <a href="http://www.cyprusremotesensing.com/rscy2017/Workshop">http://www.cyprusremotesensing.com/rscy2017/Workshop</a> .

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>CYPRUS</b> Research Promotion Foundation (RPF), Open University of Cyprus (OUC)
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Enjoyment of cultural heritage by means of new and old media</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>A workshop on 'Intangible Cultural Heritage and its presentation through old and new technologies' in Nicosia, Cyprus, on 27 October 2017.</p> <p>Specific topics that were addressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Digital cultural heritage</li> <li>• Improvement in accessibility of materials and data</li> </ul>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Creating knowledge; Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Capability and capacity; Knowledge sharing
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 400.
<b>Participation</b>	Six persons took part in the workshop directly, representing Cyprus, Greece and the Arab Emirates and including one young student or professional in training. Fifteen persons were present, but the workshop was also broadcasted live through the web platform of the Open University Cyprus
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	The main dissemination tool was the website of the Open University Cyprus.

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>CYPRUS</b> Research Promotion Foundation (RPF), University of Cyprus (UCY)
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Enjoyment of cultural heritage by means of new and old media</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>A seminar on this topic at the Archeological Research Unit of the University of Cyprus in Nicosia on 17 November 2017, in the context of Innovative educational programmes and activities in museums, educational institutions and other cultural heritage organizations. The focus was on how children are educated about cultural heritage by means of new and old media and whether this process could include enjoyment.</p> <p>Specific topics that were addressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Digital cultural heritage</li> <li>• Improvement in accessibility of materials and data</li> </ul>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Developing a reflective society; Connecting people with heritage; Creating knowledge; Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Capability and capacity; Knowledge sharing
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 4500.
<b>Participation</b>	Twenty persons took part in the workshop directly, representing Cyprus and Greece. More than seventy persons were present and the presentations were live streamed on YouTube.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	Printed promotional material , website, online mass media presentation

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>FRANCE</b> Ministry of Culture and Communication (MCC), National Research Agency (ANR), Foundation for Cultural Heritage (FSP)
<b>Topic</b>	<b>What role for communities in heritage management? From identification to transmission</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>The seminar took place Thursday 4th April 2019 in the "Médiathèque de l'Architecture et du Patrimoine" (MAPA), next to Paris, in Charenton-le-Pont. The seminar gathered a range of different disciplines and research areas under the main umbrella of 'communities' heritage' and ways for communities to engage with and manage cultural heritage: ethnology, political sciences, digital heritage, archaeology, Social Sciences and Humanities, history, literature, heritage landscapes, anthropology, minorities' heritage, participatory sciences.</p> <p>Specific topics that were addressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Digital cultural heritage</li> <li>• Improvement in accessibility of materials and data</li> </ul>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Developing a reflective society; Connecting people with heritage; Creating Knowledge; Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage Resource

<b>Enabling framework</b>	Management strategies; Knowledge sharing
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 8.645,37.
<b>Participation</b>	Hundred people took directly part in this seminar, representing France, Belarus, Italy, the Netherlands and Luxemburg. Two PhD students gave presentations. The number of persons reached by the joint activity is approximately 3500 (through websites and online newsletters.)
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	The activity was disseminated through a website, an online newsletter and two targeted mailing campaigns. <a href="http://www.culture.gouv.fr/Thematiques/Connaissance-des-patrimoines/Partenariats-scientifiques/Le-cadre-europeen-et-international/Journee-d-etude-Quel-role-pour-les-communautes-dans-la-gestion-du-patrimoine-De-l-identification-a-la-transmission-videos2">http://www.culture.gouv.fr/Thematiques/Connaissance-des-patrimoines/Partenariats-scientifiques/Le-cadre-europeen-et-international/Journee-d-etude-Quel-role-pour-les-communautes-dans-la-gestion-du-patrimoine-De-l-identification-a-la-transmission-videos2</a> .

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>LITHUANIA</b> Lithuanian Research Council (LRC), Institute of Architecture and Construction of Kaunas University of Technology (KTU)
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Cultural heritage concepts and theories: evaluation of the 20<sup>th</sup> century historic urban landscape</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>A two-day international workshop in Vilnius on 'value and identity problems in the process of preservation of 20<sup>th</sup> century heritage', 28-29 September 2017.</p> <p>This workshop discussed how to improve the communication between research projects financed by JPICH, different stakeholders from the field of heritage practice and the JPICH itself. It investigated if JPICH can give an impulse for further dissemination of the joint research call results; how to improve the outreach using the resources of JPICH? These general questions were addressed through the lens of 20<sup>th</sup> century historic urban landscapes and value definition. Three selected Pilot Call and Heritage Plus Call projects ('H@V', 'Smart value' and 'PICH') were discussed as case studies</p> <p>The event covered two separate but interrelated topics of JHEP2: 'Integrating new knowledge into practice' (Task 2.2) and 'Cultural heritage concepts and theories' (Task 2.3). The first part of the workshop, on 'Heritage practice and strategic priorities of JPICH funded scientific researches', was a think-tank type event that discussed ways to improve the visibility and the impact of the research projects funded by JPICH. The second part of the workshop, on 'JPICH funded scientific researches and question of value of 20<sup>th</sup> century historic urban landscapes', was an information sharing seminar. The results of three projects funded by JP CH ('H@V', 'Smart value' and 'PICH') were presented. The workshop discussed how these results could have impact on heritage practice.</p> <p>A specific topic that was addressed is:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement in accessibility of materials and data</li> </ul>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Developing a reflective society; Connecting people with heritage; Creating knowledge; Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Knowledge sharing
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 10.500.
<b>Participation</b>	<p>The workshop was organised in collaboration with the Lithuanian National Commission for UNESCO and ICCROM. On the first day 21 people took directly part in it, on the second day 24. They represented Lithuania, Italy, Poland, the UK, the Netherlands and Norway and included six young students or professionals still in training. Participants of the event covered a wide range of specialist from academia and heritage practice including JPICH members.</p> <p>Approximately 200 people from Lithuania were directly engaged; 110 people registered as "attended" or "interested" on Facebook and Lithuanian research and practice institutions were contacted. Approximately 7000 people were indirectly engaged; the Facebook platform 'Architektūros ir urbanistikos tyrimų centras' where the event was disseminated has 6483 followers. Also other websites were used to disseminate information.</p>
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	<p>The final outcome of the event is the "Joint Statement by ICCROM and JPICH on Enhancing Heritage Research Participation and Impact". The workshop has been presented in the form of a printed leaflet. In addition, the main instrument was social media:</p> <p><a href="https://www.facebook.com/events/122717268471145/">https://www.facebook.com/events/122717268471145/</a>  <a href="http://old.lmt.lt/lt/naujienos/archive/vilniuje-vyks-jpi-mk53.html">http://old.lmt.lt/lt/naujienos/archive/vilniuje-vyks-jpi-mk53.html</a>  <a href="https://www.vu.lt/projektai/rugsejo-28-29-d-vyks-jpi-kulturos-paveldas-moksliniam-tyrimams-skirtas-tarptautinis-seminaras-moksliniai-tyrimai-ir-paveldosaugos-praktika/">https://www.vu.lt/projektai/rugsejo-28-29-d-vyks-jpi-kulturos-paveldas-moksliniam-tyrimams-skirtas-tarptautinis-seminaras-moksliniai-tyrimai-ir-paveldosaugos-praktika/</a>  <a href="http://www.autc.lt/lt/naujiena/28">http://www.autc.lt/lt/naujiena/28</a>  <a href="http://2017.ktu.edu/lt/architekturos-ir-statybos-institutas/naujiena/kvietimas-dalyvauti-tarptautiniame-seminare-moksliniai-tyrimai-ir-paveldosaugos-praktika">http://2017.ktu.edu/lt/architekturos-ir-statybos-institutas/naujiena/kvietimas-dalyvauti-tarptautiniame-seminare-moksliniai-tyrimai-ir-paveldosaugos-praktika</a>  <a href="http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/2017/09/workshop-on-the-role-of-jpich-funded-resarch-projects-on-heritage-practice-28th-29th-september-2017-vilnius-lt/">http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/2017/09/workshop-on-the-role-of-jpich-funded-resarch-projects-on-heritage-practice-28th-29th-september-2017-vilnius-lt/</a>  <a href="https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/881a59_f8f26faded714d4cb0fd5e9aca1aeb20.pdf">https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/881a59_f8f26faded714d4cb0fd5e9aca1aeb20.pdf</a> (page 6)  <a href="http://first.aster.it/aster/viewNews?ID=39515">http://first.aster.it/aster/viewNews?ID=39515</a></p>

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>NETHERLANDS</b> Wageningen University and Research (WUR), Cultural Heritage Agency (RCE)
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Heritage Management in Dynamic Environments</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>A one-day expert meeting on October 9<sup>th</sup> 2019, Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands (RCE), Amersfoort, the Netherlands. It was a meeting of landscape professionals dealing with heritage, (landscape) archaeology, urban history, history, museums, and ecology.</p> <p>Topics that were addressed are: Digital cultural heritage, improvement in accessibility of materials and data, multidisciplinary frameworks for integrated revitalisation of artefacts, buildings and landscapes, climate change.</p>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Connecting people with heritage; Creating knowledge; Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Capability and capacity; Management strategies; Knowledge sharing; Policies, laws and regulations
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 10.000.
<b>Participation</b>	Seventeen experts participated in the meeting. They came from Sweden, Hungary, United Kingdom, Ireland, the Netherlands, Italy, Poland and Germany.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	The meeting resulted in a planning for collaboration (papers and funding applications). Dissemination via a mailing list.

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>NORWAY</b> Directorate for Cultural Heritage Management (Riksantikvaren), Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), ICCROM
<b>Topic</b>	<b>The past has power: Conservation of historic wooden structures</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>An international course on Wood Conservation Technology (ICWCT), held online and in Oslo.</p> <p><u>Part 1: Online 9 April – 11 May 2018</u>: five weeks theoretical online long-distance learning, including weekly assignments. The platform used – Blackboard – is owned and administered by Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU). An estimated 6 hours of study per week was considered a feasible amount for participants in full-time employment.</p> <p><u>Part 2: Oslo, Norway 4 - 29 June 2018</u>: four weeks practical full-time training in Norway. This was conducted through lectures, workshop exercises, field studies and museum visits.</p> <p>The course was concluded by an examination organised by NTNU. The exam is compulsory, and gives 18 ECTS (European Commission grading system) if passed.</p> <p>Topics addressed were: improvement in accessibility of materials and data;</p>

	multidisciplinary frameworks for integrated revitalisation of artefacts, buildings and landscapes; renewal and restoration of historic areas; climate change.
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Creating knowledge; Safeguarding our cultural heritage resource
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Capability and capacity; Knowledge sharing
<b>Planning</b>	The ICWCT 2018 will be divided in two parts: an online distance learning module April 9 – 11 May and a workshop in Oslo 4 – 29 June 2018.
<b>Participation</b>	<p>Twenty participants in the online long-distance learning and eighteen participants in the full-time training in Oslo. The participants came from Brazil, Canada, Egypt, El Salvador, Hong Kong, India, Italy, Lithuania, Nepal, Norway, Philippines, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, USA, Zimbabwe.</p> <p>Two main groups of participants dominated the course: architects and conservators. Special care was shown in the selection procedure to make a balanced group. One participant was a qualified stone mason and two other participants were trained craftsmen (in addition to their academic qualifications).</p> <p>The ICWCT target group is mid-career professionals, i.e. minimum of 3-4 years of relevant work experience in the field of wood conservation. 2-3 of this year's participants are working on their PhD's.</p>
<b>Stakeholders</b>	<p>Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.</p> <p>Approximately 100 persons were involved in the 26 days course in Norway in excursions, workshops and visits.</p>
<b>Dissemination</b>	<p>Website, web page: (Riksantikvaren: <a href="https://www.riksantikvaren.no/">https://www.riksantikvaren.no/</a> and ICCROM's <a href="https://www.iccrom.org/courses/18th-international-course-wood-conservation-technology-icwct-2018">https://www.iccrom.org/courses/18th-international-course-wood-conservation-technology-icwct-2018</a>; Offline mass media presentation (articles in local newspapers in Norway from the excursions and other visits to museums etc; articles in newspapers in the participants countries; online mass media presentation.</p> <p>The report of the ICWCT 2018 was published on Riksantikvaren's website in January 2019 <a href="https://www.riksantikvaren.no">https://www.riksantikvaren.no</a>.</p>

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>POLAND</b> Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, National Institute for Museums and Public Collections (NIMOZ), Emanuel Ringelblum Jewish Historical Institute, Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum Oświęcim, Stutthof Museum. German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp 1939-1945 in Sztutowo.
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Research on the role of cultural heritage in the building of (national) identity in post-conflict situations</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 10, 2018, Warsaw - International conference on the role of</li> </ul>

	<p>cultural heritage in the building of (national) identity in post conflict situations (sharing knowledge, best practices, panel discussions). The conference was held at the Emanuel Ringelblum Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw and divided into three parts: a) "Authenticity - the essence of places of remembrance", b) "The need for research reflection – the study in places of remembrance", c) "Identity and education - society after the conflict";</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 11, 2018 - study visit –The Palmiry Museum – Place of Memory, a branch of the Museum of Warsaw (23 km north-west of Warsaw) or The Museum of Fight and Martyrdom in Treblinka (85 km north-east of Warsaw);</li> <li>September 12, 2018, Warsaw - study visit - The Museum of Pawiak Prison in Warsaw, Katyń Museum (Warsaw), The Museum of Warsaw.</li> </ul> <p>Specific topics that were addressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multidisciplinary frameworks for integrated revitalisation of artefacts, buildings and landscapes.</li> <li>Renewal and restoration of historic areas.</li> </ul>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Developing a reflective society; Connecting people with heritage; Creating knowledge; Safeguarding our cultural heritage resource.
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Knowledge sharing
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: approximately € 5.100. This does not include travel and accommodation costs of speakers delegated by JHEP2 partners.
<b>Participation</b>	25 Persons took directly part in this conference, representing Poland, Germany, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Slovakia, the United Kingdom and the United States. Approximately 70 persons were reached by the joint activity.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	Dissemination through printed promotional material and a web page.

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>PORTUGAL</b> Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT), Laboratório Nacional de Engenharia Civil (LNEC)
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Social, cultural, political and economic value of Cultural Heritage</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>An international conference on this topic in Beja (Portugal), 1-2 June 2017. The event consisted of a scientific conference, followed by a social programme for interaction amongst the participants. The focus was on four themes: social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage. The event promoted several aspects, as networking, exchange of knowledge, mobility of experts and collecting best practices.</p> <p>Specific topics that were addressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Digital cultural heritage</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement in accessibility of materials and data</li> <li>• Multidisciplinary frameworks for integrated revitalisation of artefacts, buildings and landscapes</li> <li>• Renewal and restoration of historic areas</li> <li>• Climate change</li> </ul>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Developing a reflective society; Connecting people with heritage; Creating knowledge; Safeguarding our cultural heritage resource
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Capability and capacity; Management strategies; Knowledge sharing
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 10.500.
<b>Participation</b>	Eighteen people took directly part in this conference, representing Portugal, Poland and the UK. The audience reached by the activity numbers sixty.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	A book of abstracts of the international conference was published. Tools used for dissemination are the websites of FCT, LNEC and the Municipality of Beja.

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>SPAIN</b> Fundación Santa María la Real del Patrimonio Histórico
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Methodology development for assessing the cultural and socio-economic value(s) of digital cultural heritage</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>Virtual working groups of experts, organizations and stakeholders were active from November 2017 until April 2018 to define and delimit the concept of Digital Cultural Heritage, develop a methodology for assessing the economic values of Digital Cultural Heritage and develop recommendations to public and private authorities to facilitate the use of digital content as commercial/economic purposes. The participants work in the following areas: Cultural and Creative Industries, Digital Heritage Research, Technology, Industrial Engineering, Economy, Environment, Architecture, Digital design, Art &amp; history and Digital Humanities.</p> <p>An international workshop in Valladolid on 20 June 2018, included in a seminar 'digitization of libraries and archives', organised within an Interreg Europe project: CD-ETA (Collaborative Digitization of Natural and Cultural Heritage). The working group met to finish their reports and to materialize their results through reports and policy recommendations.</p>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Creating knowledge
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Knowledge sharing
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 4000.
<b>Participation</b>	63 Experts from 12 countries participated in the working groups: Australia, Croatia, Greece, Israel, Russia, Romania, Portugal, Italy, Cyprus, Netherlands,



	UK and Spain.  Ten People took directly part in the workshop, representing Spain, Italy, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania and Slovenia.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	The conclusions of the working groups and workshop were presented at the CD-ETA seminar and disseminated by email.

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>SWEDEN</b> Swedish National Heritage Board (SNHB)
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Identity and Migration. New Methods and Historical Contexts</b>
<b>Activity</b>	An international conference on this topic in Stockholm (Sweden), 15-16 May 2019.  The conference addresses migration as an urgent global concern, and it linked migration to cultural heritage through forefront developments in fields such as contemporary archaeology, material culture studies, anthropology, ethnology, archaeogenetics, artistic research and art practice. This transdisciplinary approach revealed and complicated a variety of relationships between heritage and migration, from new methods within local heritage practices to historical and intensified global contexts. It interlinked theoretical analysis and practice based knowledge, and engendered a dynamic and challenging atmosphere that sparked creative and innovative conversations about how cultural heritage professionals can enhance their expertise and how new collaborative research projects can be formed.
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Developing a reflective society; Connecting people with heritage; Creating knowledge
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Capability and capacity; Knowledge sharing
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 1.1230 plus costs to hire one person to plan the conference.
<b>Participation</b>	80 Persons took directly part in this conference, representing Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Norway, Germany, France, Slovakia and Spain. Migrant backgrounds included Finland, Ireland, Iran, India, Pakistan, Senegal, Sudan, China and the Carribean.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	The conference resulted in a written report with abstracts. The conference was promoted on the Swedish National Heritage Board's newsletter and website and on the JPICH website. A flyer was distributed to universities, museums etc. in Sweden. <a href="https://www.raa.se/in-english/events-seminars-and-cultural-experiences/heritage-and-migration-new-methods-and-historical-contexts/">https://www.raa.se/in-english/events-seminars-and-cultural-experiences/heritage-and-migration-new-methods-and-historical-contexts/</a>

	<a href="http://jpi-ch.eu/2019/09/jpi-chsnhb-international-conference-heritage-and-migration-new-methods-and-historical-contexts-15th-16th-may-2019/">http://jpi-ch.eu/2019/09/jpi-chsnhb-international-conference-heritage-and-migration-new-methods-and-historical-contexts-15th-16th-may-2019/</a>
--	---

<b>Coordinator</b>	<b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Re-use and continued use of buildings, historic urban centres and landscapes</b>
<b>Activity</b>	<p>International workshop on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2018 in Leicester, UK. The workshop showcased current research in the sub themes of Conservation and Planning, Diversity and Communities, Immersice, multi-sensory engagement and virtual reality and Contested Heritage. The workshop was also designed to act as a platform to generate discussion about the long-term strategy of the JPI-CH. The Vice Chair of the JPI Urban Europe gave the keynote presentation, professor Carena Lewis presented on behalf of her JPICH award partners for the CARE MSoC project.</p> <p>Specific topics that were addressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Digital cultural heritage.</li> <li>• Improvement in accessibility of materials and data.</li> <li>• Multidisciplinary frameworks for integrated revitalisation of artefacts, buildings and landscapes.</li> <li>• Renewal and restoration of historic areas.</li> <li>• Heritage Management</li> <li>• Town Planning,</li> <li>• Heritage Conservation.</li> </ul>
<b>SRA research priorities</b>	Developing a reflective society; Connecting people with heritage; Creating knowledge.
<b>Enabling framework</b>	Management strategies; Knowledge sharing; Research infrastructures
<b>Finances</b>	Total budget of this activity: € 7000.
<b>Participation</b>	67 Persons took directly part in this conference, representing the United Kingdom, Norway and Ireland. Five doctoral students participated.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders reached by this activity are: policy makers and influencers; cultural heritage research community; parallel projects and organisations; industry, SME's and civil society.
<b>Dissemination</b>	The Eventbrite page was viewed by 885 people and the AHRC Heritage webpage saw a spike in traffic following the announcement of the event. Dissemination tools were email, twitter and a webpage. A report of the workshop was published in January 2019 and is available on the AHRC website: <a href="https://ahrc.ukri.org/newsevents/events/calendar/ahrc-jpich-workshop-on-re-use-and-continued-use-of-historic-buildings-urban-centres-and-landscapes/">https://ahrc.ukri.org/newsevents/events/calendar/ahrc-jpich-workshop-on-re-use-and-continued-use-of-historic-buildings-urban-centres-and-landscapes/</a>

## ANNEX: THE 56 ACTIVITIES IN ANNEX A TO THE ACTION PROGRAMME (TOPICS)

<b>1</b>	Social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage
<b>2</b>	The changing meaning and value of cultural heritage across Europe for 'old' and 'new' citizens as well as 'outside' visitors
<b>3</b>	DARIAH VL. Digital editions of literary texts, efforts to preserve poetic legacies (born digital or to be digitized) and literary databases
<b>4</b>	Medieval Greek manuscripts
<b>5</b>	Documenting knowledge on the historical production process and especially pre-digital production process in the 20 <sup>th</sup> century as practiced by many National Mapping Agencies (NMA)
<b>6</b>	Research on the role of cultural heritage in the reconstruction of (national) identity in post-conflict situations
<b>7</b>	Development of a digital repository for the preservation of architectural heritage. Cooperation on dealing with questions of acquisition and selection, sustainability, preservation and dissemination
<b>8</b>	Indexing system/content-based image retrieval/image processing. Typological studies of traditional timber framed structures
<b>9</b>	Development and optimization of innovative methodologies for the assessment of works of art
<b>10</b>	Cultural heritage artifacts (glass, ceramics and paintings) study by means of optical and chemical measurement techniques
<b>11</b>	Non-invasive soil inventory techniques for archeological prospection
<b>12</b>	Investigation of degradation mechanisms of cultural objects to establish preventive conservation and restoration strategies
<b>13</b>	Innovative ways of blending site preservation (archeological sites), heritage education and peoples involvement
<b>14</b>	Development and assessment of materials and techniques for sustainable conservation and restoration of works of art
<b>15</b>	Innovative and sustainable measures/methods/materials to realize refurbishment of heritage buildings
<b>16</b>	Development of preservation and accessibility of archeological monuments
<b>17</b>	Changing (urban) landscapes
<b>18</b>	Cultural heritage concepts and theories
<b>19</b>	Enjoyment of cultural heritage by means of new and old media
<b>20</b>	Artistic and cultural education in cultural heritage institutions
<b>21</b>	Stucco-work in heritage buildings in Europe
<b>22</b>	Dissimination of cultural knowledge
<b>23</b>	Re-use and continued use of buildings, historic urban centres and landscapes
<b>24</b>	Community as actor in heritage management
<b>25</b>	Training for preventive preservation
<b>26</b>	Education for cultural heritage
<b>27</b>	Cultural heritage interpretation
<b>28</b>	Contested histories and commemoration
<b>29</b>	Migration and identity
<b>30</b>	3-D imaging and printing research and use of new 3-D technologies for the conservation, documentation and interpretation of cultural heritage
<b>31</b>	Sharing knowledge about electrochemical techniques for the investigation and conservation of (corroded) historical and archeological metallic objects
<b>32</b>	Damage atlas for different historic materials
<b>33</b>	Natural stone in historic buildings in Europe

- 34** Development of a coherent system of standards and guidelines to improve the quality of conservation and repair work
- 35** Conservation of historic gilt leather wall hangings
- 36** Archeology of the Anthropocene
- 37** Understanding identity: a comparative research into desired and perceived functions/significances of museums/galleries in Europe and mainland China
- 38** Stucco-work in heritage buildings in Europe
- 39** Banking on financial heritage. Developing a European network to integrate tangible and intangible financial heritage: buildings, objects, narratives
- 40** Affective heritage. Creating a European platform for research and representation of affective heritage
- 41** Methodology development for assessing the cultural and socio-economic value(s) of digital cultural heritage
- 42** Sharing knowledge of conservation measures for historical buildings in areas that are sensitive for earthquakes and landslides
- 43** Reconstructions in paintings conservation research
- 44** Accessibility of archeological sites for the public in relation to the preservation of archeological remains
- 45** Watermarks and the paper trail of cultural history
- 46** Creating environmental, cultural, social and economic assets on cultural heritage
- 47** Sustainable development of local communities
- 48** Changing landscapes: landscape with its cultural heritage and natural environment
- 49** The past has power: conservation of historic wooden structures
- 50** Developing phytotechnology with using biofuel crops for sustainable land management of cultural heritage sites and mitigation of climate change
- 51** Damage mitigation and modeling decay
- 52** Translation, knowledge and ownership
- 53** Archiving advertising films
- 54** Landscape and identities
- 55** Archeology of conflict
- 56** Recovering the cultural heritage of collaboration