ESPON HERIWELL: Policy Implications

Vienna 6 June 2023

Manuela Samek Lodovici – IRS Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale

Overall policy implications

For cultural heritage to produce well-being outcomes, **key aspects to be considered in designing heritage valorisation strategies should consider:**

- Preservation and valorisation of all forms of cultural heritage with attention to their potential well being effects
- Supporting CH access and active engagement of all citizens in the design, implementation and monitoring of valorization strategies
- Ensuring multi-level and multi-actor governance systems and mainstreaming of CH strategies into wider policy frameworks, given their potential transversal impact on well being dimensions referring to different policy fields
- Ensuring continuous and adequate human and financial resources
- Improving data collection and monitoring & evaluation of CH strategies and initiatives

1. Preservation and valorisation strategies favouring positive effects on societal well being

- Ensure the **continuity and sustainability of heritage preservation and valorisation** strategies over time through:
  - ➢ mobilizing political consensus towards the valorisation of CH into wider policy frameworks
  - ➢ mainstreaming the heritage dimension in all socio-economic and development policies (e.g. territorial planning, education and training, regional development, social inclusion and welfare, environmental and mobility policies)
  - ➢ increasing inclusion and diversity in the heritage sector (policy making and management)
  - ➢ paying attention to the potential well being effects in the design of heritage strategies and to the social mechanisms that enahnce the social well being effects of heritage;
  - ➢ designing, implementing, and coordinating participatory valorisation strategies, building on open and inclusive narratives, engaging the whole community.

- Valorisation strategies are particularly relevant for the inter-generational transmission of **Intangible heritage**:
  - ➢ creation or re-creation of collective memories of traditions and practices (e.g. through contemporary creations, digitisation, intergenerational dialogues, celebrations);
  - ➢ education and training (e.g. through the creation of academies of traditional practices, the provision of informal learning opportunities, the embedment of traditional practices in the school curricula);
  - ➢ valorisation of traditions and practices within TCH settings (e.g. museums, libraries, archives);
  - ➢ their accreditation or certification (e.g. inscription in special registers, trademarks, labels).

2. Improving accessibility and engagement in cultural heritage/1

➢ **Targeting heritage opportunities and accessibility to groups usually marginalized** (e.g. people at risk of social exclusion, people with disabilities, minorities, migrants, people from rural/remote/neglected areas, etc.).

➢ **Decentralising heritage activities** in areas close to living and working places or in **non-traditional settings** (e.g. retirement houses, hospitals, schools, abandoned industrial sites, etc.), revitalizing heritage sites and places in peripheral and neglected areas, creating new cultural spaces and attractors, etc.

➢ **Harness the potential of digital tools to increase accessibility and participation in CH,** e.g. to increase young people's interest and participation in cultural heritage; to allow migrants to engage in their own heritage; etc.

➢ **Improving the aesthetics of heritage buildings and their surroundings**, **and supporting reception and services facilities** enhancing participation, also by making heritage alive, turning heritage spaces into meeting / leisure places.

➢ **Strengthening the dissemination of information on heritage** and opportunities to engage with it, combining multiple channels, and creating information offices in decentralised areas.

➢ **Paying attention to issues relevant for access to heritage**, such as:

  - The transport system;
  - The quality of spaces where heritage is located;
  - The adequacy of the digital infrastructure and digital skills of staff and citizens (in particular for digital heritage).

Improving accessibility and engagement in cultural heritage/2

➢ **Contributing to citizens' empowerment and active engagement in heritage, enhancing their sense of belonging and implementing "participative" aspects** such as:

- active participation of all population groups, including under-represented ones, in all the phases of the policy agenda (co-creation, co-production/implementation, co-evaluation);
- ensuring equality between all engaged participants and the inclusion in the policymaking process of the decisions taken during participatory processes;
- improving awareness of the value of heritage with certification processes carried out by reputable actors (e.g. inscription in national/international protection lists; use of national awards to cultural heritage actors/projects; etc.).
- including cultural heritage in education/training policies since an early age.

➢ **Addressing problems arising from dissonant or contested CH**

▪ Cultural heritage can represent a space to recompose conflicts and generate social cohesion, with issues that can be settled on the basis of:

  ➢ the inclusion of all heritage stakeholders
  ➢ preparatory research and educational efforts
  ➢ building a participatory, open and inclusive CH narrative engaging all the community and considering the multifaceted nature of heritage: whose heritage is narrated and how heritage is narrated
  ➢ the willingness/capacity of policy makers to promote a mediation and partial restitution process.

3. Ensure multilevel, multi-sectoral and multi-actor governance of cultural heritage

➢ **Ensure strong coordination between public and private CH stakeholders** across different territorial levels and policy fields, creating coordination mechanisms, tools and places where the different levels/sectors of government and stakeholders can interact with each other.

➢ Support the **empowerment of public administrations** to enhance their capacity to promote meaningful participatory policies.

➢ Ensure the **engagement of economic actors** (e.g. companies, banks, foundations) for financial support and sustainability.

➢ **Promote open and inclusive participatory tools and practices in local communities** and in public institutions to ensure all stakeholders' (including NGOs) and citizens' engagement and support to investments in heritage. To this end it is important to adopt flexible regulatory procedures to enhance people's capacity of influencing heritage design and delivery.

4. Ensure adequate financial resources ...

➢ **Continuity and equality in access to public funding** to ensure adequate resources, especially the case of small grassroots organisations that often do not have the capacities to access private market funding or large public funding opportunities. Specific funding tools could be crated, like micro-grants (as in the Wroclaw ECeC case)

➢ EU investment in CH is particularly significant and **financing heritage can be further strengthened in all ESIF instruments**, including the ESF. HERIWELL analyses show the relevance of EU investments in CH and their positive contribution to SWB. The ESF currently contributes limitedly to cultural heritage, while it could support capacity building and the development of heritage-related skills and services.

➢ **A stronger consideration of the heritage dimension could be mainstreamed in other EU funding schemes**, e.g. those on digitization (Digital EU programme), gender equality, integration of migrants, fighting social exclusion and health.

…and adequate human resources

➢ **Ensure adequate human resources and skills/capacity** of heritage stakeholders, starting from public administrations, to support innovative, quality, and effective cultural heritage strategies.

- Stakeholders' capacity in the cultural heritage and societal well-being fields can be improved through **training, mutual and peer learning, exchanges of experience and good practices,** and creation of **knowledge platforms**.

- Capacity-building activities need to pay attention also to **strengthening the digital skills** of cultural heritage and societal well-being actors, and their **capacity to collect data on cultural heritage and implement monitoring and evaluation activities**.

5. Ensure systemic data collection and monitoring and evaluation systems

The **lack of a commonly agreed framework on the definition of CH implies that data collected differ from one country to another**. Furthermore, at EU level many of the data collected consider CH as part of the broader category of culture, making it difficult to disentangle heritage from other forms of culture. It is therefore necessary to:

➢ Develop **a common agreed framework** for the definition of both cultural heritage and societal well-being to allow their measurement and comparability across time and countries;

➢ Develop **a common classification and measurement system** to harmonize and weight the different forms of heritage across countries and to capture all dimensions of societal well-being, as well as the impacts of heritage on well-being;

➢ **Improve data collection** on cultural heritage and its contribution to societal well-being at national and regional/local level, including data collection system on EU investments/funding in cultural heritage;

➢ **Test new data (big data) and methodologies**. The analysis of big data can be useful for identifying the involvement of audiences in relation to heritage. *TripAdvisor* and *Wikipedia* can provide data to assess impacts;

➢ **Improve empirical analyses** and the evaluation of qualitative information to integrate quantitative data;

➢ **Build the capacity of cultural heritage actors** at all levels to set up data collection systems and gather data;

➢ **Implement continuous monitoring and evaluation** of cultural heritage strategies/initiatives and their contribution to well being.

9

Thank you for your attention

Manuela Samek Lodovici – msamek@irsonline.it