



Joint Programming Initiative on
Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge for Europe - JPI CH

**Governing Board Meeting
Rome, June 14th, 2018**

Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism
Via del Collegio Romano, 27

Sala Spadolini

Participants:

Belarus, National Academy of Science of Belarus, Natallia Yankevich; Belgium, Royal Institute for Cultural Heritage, Hilde De Clercq; Czech Republic, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic, Daniel Hanspach; France, Ministry of Culture, Pascal Lievaux; Alexandre Caussé;, Ministry for Higher Education, research and Innovation, Charles Giry Deloison; Agence Nationale de la Recherche, Xavier Engels; Italy, Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism, Antonia Recchia, Cristina Sabbioni, Patrizia Bianconi, Alberto Anfossi, Alessandra Cuscianna; Italy Ministry of Education, University and Research, Aldo Covello; Lithuania, Kaunas University and Technology, Vaidas Petrusis; Netherlands, The Netherlands organizations for Scientific research - Humanities, Jeanet Bruil; Cultural Heritage Agency, Esther Jansma, Kees Somer; Norway, The Research Council of Norway, Eli Ragna Taerum, Mari Susanne Solerod; Ministry of Climate and Environment, Tonte Hegard; Romania, Ministry of Research, Monica Alexandru; Slovakia, Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic, Simona Strapakova; Spain, State Research Agency, Ministry of Science, Innovation and Competitiveness, Juan Climent Basco and Estrella Fernandes, Sweden, Swedish National Heritage Board, Christina Fredengren, United Kingdom, The Arts and Humanities Research Council, Katherine Warren.

Agenda

Opening of the meeting

- Adoption of the provisional Agenda and communication
- Approval of the minutes of the JPI Governing Board Meeting held on the 30 November 2017

Session 1 -GPC WG and GPC meeting 5th of June -Potential R&I Partnership in Horizon Europe

-JPI Cultural Heritage's proposal for the joint statement from the 10 JPIs

Session 2- JPICH Strategy and Governance:

- Strategic Vision for the evolution of the JPI CH
- Proposal of Task Forces setting up
- Practical arrangements for the future management structure
- Preparation of the election of the Chair

Session 3 - The JPI CH future strategy

- Workshop on Alignment, Madrid 25th April: output and outcome
- Workshop LTS Task Force, Rome, 13th June: output and outcome

Session 4 - Collaboration within the 10 JPIs/Organizations

- 10 Years Joint Programming: Achievement and the Way Forward, Vienna 19-20 September
- Future Action with other JPIs
- JPI CH /ICCROM - Cooperation for Strengthening Synergies of Heritage Actors and Setting Strategic Priorities for a More Impactful Sector

Session 5 - Communication and dissemination activities

- International Conference
- Participatory Governance of Built Heritage Amersfoort, 3-4 October
- Migration and Heritage, November 2018
- Fair of European Innovators on Cultural Heritage, Brussels, November 2018

Future JPICH Meetings

Concluding remarks

Minutes:

On June 14th, the Governing Board Meeting for the Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new Challenge for Europe (JPICH) was held in Rome (Italy), at the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism, Via del Collegio Romano, 27.

Opening and welcome address:

Antonia Recchia (Chair) welcomes all the participants.

A round table presentation follows.

Jeanet Bruil (NWO) asks for a slight modification, for the sake of coherency, with the point "Workshop LTS Task Force, Rome, 13th June: output and outcome", originally placed on the 3rd session, by the Coordinator on the 13e to be anticipated in the 2d session "JPICH Strategy and Governance" with reference to the points "Practical arrangement for the future management structure", and "Preparation of the election of the chair".

The Agenda is adopted with that modification.

The minutes of 30th November 2017 is approved

SESSION 1

- GPC WG and GPC meeting 5th of June -Potential R&I Partnership in Horizon Europe

Cristina Sabbioni (JPICH Coordination Unit) summarizes the results of the last GPC meeting, which was held on 5th June in Brussels.

She reminds that the Coordinators of all 10 JPIs are periodically invited to participate in the GPC meetings, to report about JPIs level of implementation, to discuss on monitoring, to present their future strategies, etc.

Last GPC meeting was focused on the future of Joint Programming and it was based on two documents produced by the *GPC Working Group (WG) on Partnerships*:

Final report of the ERAC Ad-hoc Working Group on Partnerships on "Process" (ERAC 1204/18)

Final report of the ERAC Ad-hoc Working Group on Partnerships on "Criteria" (ERAC 1205/18)

Both documents will be circulated within GB members after the official approval by ERAC.

The WG was set up by ERAC following the Council conclusion adopted on 1st December 2017, which underlined the necessity to start a process of revision of the instruments and the networking related to the funding of the partnerships at European level (including Eranet, Art 185, Art 186, JPIs, JTIs, etc.)

Cristina Sabbioni recalls the presentation Emanuela De Menna did at the Steering Committee meeting, held on 13th June afternoon, on the next Framework Programme "Horizon Europe" which is structured on the base of the following pillars: fundamental science, global challenges and open innovation; stressing that the new partnerships shall be functional to any of the sectors involved in the FP9 pillars.

The most important recommendations suggested by the GPC WG in reference to rationalize the EU R&I partnerships landscape are:

- strictly limited cases where other policies instruments do not achieve similar results;
- monitor and report the budget allocations to partnership;
- coherence and a coordination with other related FP9 and national initiatives.

At the level of the funding approaches ensure a simplify system with clear intervention logics: co-funding, co-programming, and institutionalized partnership.

Themes will be identified and selected in a way that maximizes complementarities and synergies with actions under Pillar 2 "Global Challenges and Industrial Competitiveness".

The FP "Horizon Europe" is summarized with particular focus on the new generation of European Partnership.

The second issue on which the GPC meeting was focused was the results of the GPC WG on JPIs Long Term Strategy (LTS). GPC WG LTS identified good practices in the JPIs LTS both as structural aspects (i.e. EU relevance, fulfil minimum requirements) and joint activities.

Taking into account the report which the GPC provided following the JPIs LTS received, resulted that the biggest problem of the JPIs is linked to their sustainability (Very big dependence to EC support, short-term budget horizons that make long term challenges difficult to tackle).

Finally, the GPC mentioned that it will not ask for an update of the JPIs Long Term Strategy, but ask the JPIs to monitor the level of implementation of their LTS on the following criteria: relevance, internationalization, industrial agendas/initiatives, inclusiveness, critical mass and robustness.

- JPI Cultural Heritage's proposal for the joint statement from the 10 JPIs

Charles Giry Deloison NR(Ministry for Higher Education, Research and Innovation) reminds the presents that during the last GB meeting in November 2017 all the JPICH partners agreed to write a document addressed to the other 9 JPIs in order to affirm the importance of Cultural Heritage which was recognized as one of the priority areas of the European Union.

The aim of this document is to demonstrate that the role of Cultural Heritage in answering "great" societal challenges cannot be underestimated. Cultural Heritage research has to be considered as an

independent and specific field of research. The document circulated among the Partners in February/March. The proposed current text of takes into account those comments.

Cristina Sabbioni (JPICH Coordination Unit) asks to reconsider to whom the document needs to be addressed.

Charles Giry Deloison (MESRI) states that at the beginning the document was addressed to all the JPIs.

Katherine Warren (AHRC) supports this position and suggests to consider the document as a response to the other JPIs against the possibility to merge activities and projects. JPICH can't be merged with any other JPIs because is the only JPI to have as main matter the research in the Cultural Heritage field.

Katherine Warren (AHRC) supports this position and notes that the document was prepared as a response to the European Commission's suggestion in our previous meeting that the JPICH should merge with JPI Urban Europe. Suggests to consider the document as a response to the other JPIs against the possibility to merge activities and projects. At the November 2017 meeting, we agreed that JPICH can't should not be merged with any other JPIs because it is the only JPI to have as main matter the research in the Cultural Heritage field.as its main focus.

It was agreed that the document should be sent to the European Commission.

Cristina Sabbioni (JPICH Coordination Unit) invites the JPICH Partners also to consider the future partnerships mentioned in Horizon Europe and the possibility to be part of the process which will produce the new partnerships.

During the discussion the title of the document is changed to "JPICH Statement" and minor changes are proposed: the final version will be circulated by ANR. The document will be addressed to the European Commission.

SESSION 2 - JPICH Strategy and Governance

-- Strategic vision for the evolution of the JPI on Cultural Heritage

Cristina Sabbioni (JPICH Coordination Unit) presents the document that circulated among partners "Strategic vision for the evolution of the JPI Cultural Heritage", as a contribution of the JPICH Coordinator with respect to the debate on the future of the JPI on Cultural Heritage.

In view of a new generation of European partnerships, Horizon Europe will streamline the number of partnerships that the EU will co-programme or co-fund with partners as Member States, academia, industries, and philanthropic foundations.

To reinforce the role of the JPICH in the next European research scenario, including intangible, tangible, natural and digital cultural heritage and humanities, a Task Force coordinated by the Coordinator will prepare an extended document by the end of 2018.

The dialogue with other existing networks in the different areas of research on Cultural Heritage will be strongly promoted, but above all a new structure of Governance will be organized and supported.

- Synthesis of he workshop on future strategy (held 13 June morning) (anticipated from SESSION 3)

Mari Susanne Solerod (RCN) thanks all the colleagues who participated in the morning workshop remarking that the main scope of that meeting was the need to provide the JPICH with a new and stronger Governance based on a clearer structure, a larger involvement of the partners in the management and a big efficiency and transparency in relation to the activities. The workshop was supported by Italian and French documents, proposing some evolution to be discussed by all partners and Mari Solerod reports the workshop outcomes in relation to the role and the responsibilities of the Chair, the composition of the Governing and the Executive Board, the

importance to involve more concretely the Scientific Committee and the Advisory Board in all the JPICH activities. She also stresses the benefit of creating working groups focused on the achievement of specific results.

Monica Alexandru (MCI) asks if it is mandatory for each country to have 2 representatives in the Governing Board. She remarks that this could be a problem for some countries.

Mari Solerod (RCN) replies that this option is not mandatory, remarking however that in the actual structure already, each country only have right to one vote.

Esther Jansma (RCE) suggests to replace the members of the Scientific Committee and the Advisory Board after two years, in case they are not active, instead of after 5 years as proposed by France.

Patrizia Bianconi (JPICH Coordination Unit) asks more clarifications about the possibility of the Chair to vote.

Most partners agree that the Chair should not vote, being not a country representative but having a “super parts” role.

Eli Ragna Taerum (RCN) raises the issues of the mandate duration of the Chair.

Another important issue raised refers to the financial aspect of the new Governance and necessity to introduce a fee. All the partners agree about the opportunity to regulate soon this aspect, which was one of the weaknesses in the past.

- Practical arrangements for the future management structure

It is decided to set up a Task Force to revise the ToR. The Task Force will be composed by: Cristina Sabbioni coordinator, Charles Giry-DeLoison (MESRI), Christina Fredengren (SNHB), Esther Jansma (RCE) and Eli Ragna Taerum (RCN).

Charles Giry DeLoison (MESRI) presents the structure of Governance which follows the main outcome of the workshop and which integrated the different models proposed previously in the French and Italian documents.

Mari Solerod (RCN) proposes a quick round table so that all the partners may express their opinion about the new structure of Governance.

Patrizia Bianconi (JPICH Coordination Unit) in reference to the Steering Committee composition expresses the opinion to have present the Chair, the Co-Chairs and the Task Force coordinators. In reference to the number of the Coordinators for Task Force she proposes only one Coordinator also because the number of the total participants doesn't permit to have Task Force composed by many participants.

Aldo Covello (MIUR) remarks that the Steering Committee should be a “slim” and practical body not composed by many people. The presence of two Coordinators for pillars could cause a sort of duplicate of the Governing Board. He also agrees with the idea, suggested by Spain, to have a head of Secretariat who punctually manage the daily activities.

Estrella Fernandez (MINECO) supports the position of Patrizia Bianconi and Aldo Covello about the limitation of to 1 Coordinator per pillar. Also Spain would prefer a single Co-Chair, but could accept a maximum of two people for that role. In reference to the Advisory and the Scientific Board and their responsibilities she needs to consult with her director before to take a position. She disagrees with the proposal to merge the Alignment with the Strategy pillar. She anticipates also that for Spain is a problem to pay a fee to another country due to the weight of the procedure.

Monica Alexandru (MCI) stresses the importance that Scientific Board and the Advisory Board must be two different bodies, as a major guarantee of the quality of the work. The Scientific Board should have more contacts with the Steering Committee, while the Advisory Board should be more linked to the decisional responsibilities of the Governing Board.

Eli Ragna Taerum (RCN) fully supports this structure, but considers it is important to look at the Terms of Reference (ToR) before to proceed with the revisions. She supports the idea of two Coordinators, one being a deputy coordinator.

Vaidas Petruelis (Kaunas University) agrees about the new structure. He asks more information about the management of the Heritage Portal and expresses his opinion stressing that the Heritage Portal and the pillars on communication should be managed day by day by the Coordinator.

Christina Fredengren (SNHB) agrees with the new structure, but Sweden would prefer the solution with two Coordinators who could operate also alternatively. The Steering Committee should have a more important and operative role and its meetings should be open to all the members, countries and also to the observers. In her opinion it needs to change the method of work of the Steering Committee.

Katherine Warren (AHRC) supports the principle that the Scientific Board and the Advisory Board have to be considered separately and that the most important aspect on which to focus the attention is not the composition of the Boards but their roles and involvement within the JPI. She specifies that the Advisory Board should play a key role in the communication and promotion of the activities for involving new stakeholders. She also underlines that the communication must be considered as pillar at strategic level and not reduced as an instrument of implementation. In reference to the revision of the ToR she adds that the real change has to concern not only the composition of the different boards, but also the role to cover and their specific responsibilities. The Governing Board for example should be a decision making body.

Hilde De Clercq (KIKIRPA) explains that it is important to make a clear distinction between the Chair of the JPICH and the Coordinator of the CSA. There is also the need to specify precisely what will be the role of the Coordinators within the Steering Committee and how they will be selected. The current Executive Board is composed by more technical professional profiles, while the GB is composed mainly by the Ministry, but in reality today there is not a big difference between these two boards, in fact the members are quite the same. This is not opportune.

Simona Strapacova (MINEDU) suggests that the Coordinator and the Chair may have a different nationalities.

Pascal Lievaux (MCC) asks when this election and this new changes will produce effects.

Natallia Yankevich (NASB) has nothing to add.

Daniel Hanspach (MSMT) agrees in reference to the presence of two Coordinators and two Co-Chairs. The duration of the Chair should be three years with a second possibility of being elected. The Chair should have right to vote.

- Preparation of the election of the Chair

The GB agrees to elect the new Chair at the next Governing Board meeting on November following the current ToR, because it is impossible to change the ToR before the Chair's mandate expires.

Patrizia Bianconi (JPICH Coordination Unit) summarizes, reading the current Term of Reference, all the steps related to the election of the new Chair.

The candidates have to submit to the JPICH Coordinator their candidacy one month before of the election date, that is to say before 19th October, because the next GB meeting will be held in Rome on 19th and 20th November.

Hilde De Clercq (KIKIRPA) notices that in 2019 Italy will be still Coordinator of the CSA in support to the JPICH (JHEP2). Should a new Chair will be elected in November 2018 and Italy will not be reconfirmed, it will be very important to clarify the responsibilities of the new Chair and the present Coordinator to avoid an overlapping in the management of the activities.

Cristina Sabbioni (JPICH Coordination Unit) states that the Chair who will be elected in November will follow all the JPICH activities, while the CSA is a contract signed between the Commission and MIBACT in the role of Project Coordinator and legal entity.

Aldo Covello (MIUR), supports this position remarking that JPICH and CSA are two different bodies which follow different rules and procedures.

Esther Jansma (RCE) requested some clarification on who could possibly be a candidate. The coordination office referred to the ToR, spotting that despite some lack of clarity in the writing, the ToR only referred to representatives from the current Board members could be candidate. The Board agreed on it. *Aldo Covello* (MIUR) added then, that this meant that one country wanting to promote a candidate first had to nominate him/her as a representative to the Board.

SESSION 3 - The JPICH Future strategy

- Workshop on Alignment, Madrid 25th April: output and outcome

Juan Climent Basco (MINECO) summarizes the results of the workshop on the Alignment which was held in Madrid on 25th April.

He reminds that six JPICH Countries took part in the event: France, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Sweden. In addition some representatives of JPI Water, E-RIHS, ERALEARN and the European Commission represented by Emanuela De Menna were present.

All the participants showed their presentations sharing some examples and practical cases of Alignment in order to give their inputs.

Norway and Spain presented in that occasion the deliverables D.1.1 (Updated mapping on national research programmes) and D.1.2 (Report on the best practices of Alignment) while the representatives of E-RIHS stressed their intention to explore future possibilities of cooperation with the JPICH.

Juan Climent Basco underlined the important work done by Era Learn to promote Alignment through the creation of a Task Force addressed to revise 29 tools (joint actions) of alignment in different phases of the R&D programming cycle as for example: planning, strategy, funding, implementation, evaluation and monitoring and capacity building of researchers, policy makers, practitioners.

The outcome of the workshop on Alignment finalized the next steps:

- Establishing a Task Force on alignment to be approved in the current Governing Board ;
- Developing an alignment strategy;
- Presenting the alignment strategy in occasion of the EC RTD event planned on 15th-16th November 2018 within the 2018 EYCH.

(The second point of the SESSION 3 has been anticipated in the SESSION 2)

SESSION 4 -Collaboration within the JPIs/Organizations

- JPICH – ICCROM Statement

Vaidas Petrulis (Kaunas University- Lithuania) reminds that the Statement between ICCROM and the JPICH was elaborated in Vilnius at the Workshop on the role of JPICH Funded Research Projects on Heritage Practice last 28th and 29th September 2017.

The JPICH Partners discussed the document during the last GB meeting in November 2017, suggesting to improve the balance between role and responsibilities of the two bodies.

The revised version of the Statement circulated among the Partners for integration.

Esther Jansma (RCE) asks what will be the practical implications of this agreement.

Cristina Sabbioni (JPICH Coordination Unit) specifies that the document is addressed to formalize the common activities which ICCROM and the JPICH will develop together. This document is only

a first step also in view also of possible European partnerships. This cooperation aims at sharing important information and the involvement in topics projects and subjects of common interest. All the Participants approve the final version of the Statement which will be signed between the JPICH Coordinator and the ICCROM Legal Representative.

- Collaboration within 10 JPIs

Patrizia Bianconi (JPICH Coordination Unit) summarizes the Conference on “10 Years Joint Programming: Achievement and the Way Forward” which will be organized next 20th September in Wien within the EU Austrian presidency by the JPI Urban Europe.

The Conference aims is to gather the main stakeholders of the JPIs, to share their experiences in developing and implementing challenge-driven R&I programmes and exchange on possible contributions towards Sustainable Development Goals. Especially with regard to FP9 and the introduction of missions, the JPI model can serve as a reference.

The Conference Management team invites all the JPIs to actively participate in these workshops and events and to provide an official list of delegates who will have the task to promote and disseminate the activities of the group in these occasions.

The representatives for the JPICH will be: the Coordinator (Italy), Pascal Lievaux (France), Jeanet Bruil (the Netherlands) and Tonte Hegard (Norway) Hilde De Clercq will confirm her possible availability.

SESSION 5 - Communication and dissemination activities

Kees Somer (RCE) and *Christina Fredengren* (SNHB-Sweden) briefly reminded two important appointments managed by them: the Conference on Governance of Cultural Heritage on 3rd and 4th October in the Netherlands which is the third JPICH event organized within the 2018 EYCH, funded by the EC JHEP2 Project. Two days Conference with the title of “Migration and Heritage” which probably will be organized at Stockholm University on 1st March 2019 (to be confirmed).

Cristina Sabbioni (JPICH Coordination Unit) summarizes the “Fair of European Innovators on Cultural Heritage” organized by DG R&I within the 2018 EYCH in Brussels, next 14th-15th November. The two-day meeting will be structured in plenary sessions, 5 parallel sessions and a demo area (20 stands will be available). The JPICH will have its own stand with material to disseminate and results to show. In addition JPICH Heritage Plus Projects have already applied for the demo area: Chime, Heritamus, Clima, Prothego, Heat and Heuright.

She also invites all the JPICH partners interested in this event to register as soon as possible because the number of participants will be limited to about 500 people.

Concluding remarks

Cristina Sabbioni (JPICH Coordination Unit) concludes the meeting with the updating of the representatives lists. She requests that all JPICH -countries send their up-dated lists by the 15th of July. This will enable to improve the communication among us regarding the different activities the JPICH is implementing.

Four mailing lists will be created: i) GB representatives, ii) EB representatives, iii) EC CSA in support to the JPICH (JHEP2) Partners, iv) EC ERANET Heritage Plus project Partners.

Cristina Sabbioni (JPICH Coordination Unit) thanks all the JPICH colleagues for their fruitful participation in two intensive days of meetings and for the very challenging work planning in the next months.

Meeting closes at 1.40 pm.

Annexes:

- Annex 1 Governance structure following the Governance structure following the discussion on the 13 -14 June
- Annex 2 Task Forces and Participants following the Workshop held on the 13 June – Morning