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Executive summary

This third delivery of the HERIWELL project presents the final methodological framework that the HERIWELL Consortium proposes to adopt for assessing and hopefully measure the relation between cultural heritage (CH) and the different dimensions of societal well-being (SWB). Some preliminary examples of its application are provided.

The assessment strategy: a multimethod approach

The proposed methodological framework moves from the conceptual approach and the hypotheses on how cultural heritage impacts on societal well-being developed in the Theory of Change presented in the Inception Report and discussed with cultural heritage stakeholders in a deliberative event organised between December 2020 and January 2021 (see Annex 9 to the HERIWELL interim report for further details).

The proposed approach combines three main sets of methodologies:

1. **Global assessment** aiming to unveil and explain linkages between all forms of cultural heritage and societal well-being at pan-European regional level. The global assessment is based on quantitative and qualitative methodologies involving the use of available information and data (including big data) as well as fieldwork:

   - **Quantitative methodologies** include multivariate statistical and econometric analyses of the relation between Tangible Cultural Heritage (TCH) and societal well-being (SWB) in ESPON countries at national and regional level, on the basis of available comparable indicators, and testing the possibility to use big data (e.g. Tripadvisor and/or Wikipedia data).
   - **Fieldwork**, involving a cross-country population survey in eight European countries (Belgium, Czechia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Poland and Spain), to identify the individual perceptions on the relation between all forms of cultural heritage and societal well-being and the changes occurred in the use of cultural heritage in the Covid-19 pandemic.
   - **Qualitative and mixed methodologies** adopted to analyse the relation between CH in its various forms and SWB. Different approaches have been tested focussing on: i) the relation between Intangible CH and some dimensions of societal well-being, on the basis of a *content analysis* of the UNESCO lists of Intangible CH; ii) the contribution of CH on gender equality on the basis of a descriptive analysis of the evolution in the gender composition of the directors of State Cultural Museums/Collections between 2003 and 2021 in some capital cities; iii) the relation between contested or controversial heritage on SWB, based on the mapping and assessment of the HERIWELL country experts. These methodologies are meant as examples of the type of qualitative and mixed analyses that can be carried out on the basis of the collection of ad hoc data and evaluated information.

2. **Local assessment**, aiming to further detail the analysis by pointing out not only the linkages between the various forms of cultural heritage and societal well-being, but also how and why these linkages occur and who benefits most from them. The methodology is based on eight extrapolative case studies, involving quasi-quantitative methodologies based on desk and statistical analysis of available documents and data (including big data whenever possible) and fieldwork (interviews, workshops, focus groups, etc.).

3. **Assessment of EU investments in cultural heritage in the programming period 2014-2020**, aiming to analyse the relation between cultural heritage in all its dimensions and societal well-being in EU investments. The analysis of EU investments is being carried out through:

   - A quantitative analysis based on the mapping of EU CH-related investments (with focus on the European Structural Funds and Creative Europe) at national and (where possible) regional level and a *correlation analysis* between ESIF investments in cultural heritage and societal well-being;
   - A qualitative meta-analysis of the ex-post evaluations of the ECoC focusing on CH, based on *desk and fieldwork* (i.e. interviews, workshop) of those capitals including cultural heritage in their investment programme.

The proposed multimethod approach allows the Consortium to tackle three main challenges raised in the literature and the deliberative event:
i. **The development of a measurable and comparable operational definition of cultural heritage encompassing all its dimensions** – tangible, intangible, and digital heritage – and: i) commonly accepted by stakeholders; ii) measurable with available data; and iii) comparable across countries and over time.

While the quantitative pan-European analyses will focus on tangible heritage, the qualitative methodologies will rely on a broader definition of cultural heritage, either considering all forms of cultural heritage (as in the cross-country survey, the case studies, and the ECoC meta assessment), or specific subsets (as in the content analysis of intangible heritage included in UNESCO lists, in the analysis of contested heritage and in the analysis of gender equality in top positions in cultural heritage institutions).

Regarding the measurement of cultural heritage with available and comparable data, other challenges arise, such as the limited availability of comparable data on the size of national heritage in ESPON countries. To address these challenges, the proposed pan-European quantitative analyses will rely on both official sources of data (e.g. Eurostat) and big data.

**ii. Definition and description of the structure of the relationship between cultural heritage and societal well-being, which is strongly affected by the specificity of the actions taken and target audience**

The use of a multimethod approach sheds light on the various dimensions of societal well-being at different levels (macro – society, and micro – specific groups, individuals) that would be difficult to grasp otherwise. The aggregate quantitative pan-European analysis considers the contribution of tangible cultural heritage to well-being at societal level. The cross-country survey provides information on individual perceptions on the contribution of cultural heritage (in all its forms) to individual and societal well-being. The extrapolative case studies shed light on micro impacts (e.g. community engagement, sense of belonging) that the statistical analyses at the aggregate level cannot capture in detail, and on the mechanisms that favour this contribution. Extrapolative case studies can also provide information on impacts of cultural heritage that occur jointly (e.g. social inclusion measures adopted by museums can produce both social inclusion and health and happiness of participants), which are more difficult to unveil through other methods.

In addition, the multimethod design allows us to better understand the bidirectional relation between cultural heritage and societal well-being: i.e. on the one hand the fact that cultural heritage enhancement measures tend to target specific audiences and, on the other hand, the fact that the selected target must have the capacity to grasp that impulse.

**iii. Interconnected nature of the outcomes in the relation between cultural heritage and the societal well-being dimensions**

The adoption of a multimethod design allows us to triangulate data from different sources to uncover the impacts for all the SWB sub-dimensions, e.g. community engagement, civic cohesion and sense of belonging, inclusive growth, trust (societal cohesion); education and skills, knowledge and research, and quality and sustainability of the environment, commitment and life satisfaction (quality of life), material conditions.

**The quantitative pan-European analysis: methodology and preliminary results**

The pan-European model intends to verify the existence of a causal relationship between TCH and SWB and quantify it (i.e., attributing a sign and a numerical value) at the national and regional level (NUTS 2).

The relationship between well-being and culture is defined by a generic function: \( Y_{it} = f(X_{it}) \) where the index \( i \) refers to the single NUTS2 regions in ESPON countries and \( t \) refers to the years for which the selected indicators are available. In the cross-sectional regression analysis carried out so far, the most recent year for which data are available has been used. The dependent variable \( Y \), is a measure of life satisfaction (as a proxy of SWB), approximated by the indicator “Freedom on life choices” which is strongly correlated with the life satisfaction indicator and available for a larger number of NUTS2 regions.

A two steps regression analysis was carried out. The first step was meant to derive the main socio-economic drivers of SWB. Among the social and economic dimensions of SWB described by the considered 57 indicators, the main drivers of the freedom of choice indicator resulting from the statistical analyses conducted so far are: “Lifelong learning” which approximates the education, social and economic dimension, and the “Neither in Employment or in Education or Training (NEET)” which approximate the labour market especially referred to young people.
The second step was to investigate the interplay of SWB with TCH. In order to consider homogeneous and comparable TCH data at NUTS 2 level, the size of CH endowments is approximated by the ratio between the number of dwellings built before 1919 and the total number of dwellings, while the well-being indicators is estimated using those collected to compose the EU Social Progress Index (EU-SPI). As this index exclude economic aspects, the indicator on Cultural Employment was added as an indicator of the economic impacts of the TCH.

The investigation of the interplay of SWB with TCH carried out so far shows that SWB is positively related to the ratio of historical dwellings and, to an even greater extent, to Cultural Employment.

These results provide a first evidence on the interplay of the TCH dimension in the explanation of the SWB, but more investigation is required: a) providing and extensive analysis along the 57 indicators available at NUTS2 on EU-SPI; b) enhancing the TCH indicator by exploring the potentiality of big data, using the information collected by TripAdvisor. This source provides the popularity of regional sites which can be derived from the reviews of a large international audience. To test the explanatory capacity of this data, the proposal is to first apply the information collected by this source on a limited number of regions belonging to a maximum of three countries that can be representative of the universe of the ESPON countries: for example, Austria, Italy and Norway.

The qualitative pan-European analyses

The proposed qualitative pan-European analyses are examples of the different types of qualitative and "mixed method" research that can be carried out in order to assess the relation between SWB and forms of CH; their results can compensate for the scarcity of quantitative data and indicators. The results of these exploratory analyses merit further, more detailed investigations, including at national and regional levels, which are however out of the scope of the present HERIWELL study.

Content based analysis on the relations between intangible cultural heritage and societal well-being

Due to the scarcity of quantitative data on intangible cultural heritage at pan-European level, a content analysis of material provided in the intangible cultural heritage lists of UNESCO helps to shed light on the relations between intangible cultural heritage and societal well-being at pan-European level. The analysis has assessed the descriptions presented for 146 nominations available in 26 ESPON countries.

The main steps of the analysis included: i) a definition of intangible cultural heritage and societal well-being ii) a definition of a set of identifying descriptors: iii) text analysis of semi-standardised documents on factual intangible cultural heritage manifestations in ESPON countries (inscriptions in the UNESCO lists) according to the selected descriptors; iv) an analysis and interpretation of the territorial distribution of intangible cultural heritage manifestations and their relevance for key HERIWELL categories of societal well-being (see section 2.2 for further details).

Preliminary results show that intangible cultural heritage activities related to the ‘active engagement of the population, dedicated communities or minorities in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage figure at the top of UNESCO intangible cultural heritage typologies (50 % of the overall analysed ICH) almost on par with ‘different forms of supportive engagement provided by heritage communities’ (49 %). Conversely, traditional crafts do not figure on top of the ranking – which may be different in countries outside Europe.

The analysis also reveals that intangible cultural heritage is mostly locally or regionally based (73 % of the overall analysed ICH), which means that impacts will occur mostly at these levels, confirming the territorial level of societal well-being impacts of intangible cultural heritage.

Coherently with the territorial level of intangible cultural heritage, residents are the most relevant beneficiaries of intangible cultural heritage (75 %) and related societal well-being impacts, followed by heritage/culture professionals (52 %). Minorities or migrants seem to be a rather limited category benefitting from ICH (5 %).

When it comes to the societal well-being dimensions related to intangible cultural heritage, although many activities refer to different societal well-being dimensions, overall the dimensions of societal cohesion and quality of life are the most relevant: 55 % of the analysed intangible cultural heritage refers to societal cohesion (as defined in the HERIWELL theory of change), while 51 % to quality of life. Material conditions are less relevant in this relation (44 % of the analysed intangible cultural heritage), except that professional job opportunities seem to be on the increase in Europe.
The contribution of cultural heritage to gender equality in a sample of countries

Gender equality is one of the key dimensions of social well-being. Concerning CH, gender equality is one of its six priority included in the European Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022, and European, national and international organisations active in the different fields related to CH have called, since many years, for ensuring "gender balance at senior leadership levels" and particularly more equitable conditions in the leadership of museums. The focus on museums is due to the long-established fact that other CH institutions like archives and libraries are already considered as largely “feminised” in many EU countries, including in senior positions.

In the absence of comprehensive European museums statistics covering this issue and given available resources, the proposed exploratory analysis focusses on National resp. State-financed museums / collections in selected European capitals, starting with 115 institutions in six country capitals that have a significant number of them (i.e. Berlin, London, Madrid, Stockholm, Vienna and Warsaw). It is planned to compare he situation in up to 4 more cities in the next Report. This analysis focuses on “cultural” museums or collections in the narrow sense, in order to fully take into account typical qualification profiles for the staff of scientific museums. As well, the sources enabled only a comparison of the gender balance among directors of such museums.

The analysis compares the gender balance of 2003 with that of 2021. The main source for the initial date is the International Directory of Arts, covering institutions from all ESPON countries and providing information on the type of museum or collection as well as on the lead staff. For the end date, respective information for the same institutions has been researched from official websites in April and May 2021.

Preliminary results show an uneven development regarding the prestigious director’s positions in State-financed CH museums and collections for the six considered capitals. In 4 out of the 6 cities analysed women account still for less than 50% of the selected 115 museums’ directors (Stockholm and Vienna being the exception with more than 50%), despite some progress in a gender-balanced staffing policy of many museums evaluated so far and despite an overwhelming share of female student and graduates in related university subjects.

The relation between contested heritage and SWB

What is considered cultural heritage can change over time due to changing values and political or societal choices. In Europe, contested heritage represents a relatively high share of CH with potential negative effects on SWB. For a mapping of recent debates and incidents, it is crucial to collect examples that stand for the most important CH-related conflicts, historical burdens or forms of neglect as well as for their impacts.

Given time and resources constraints, the mapping of contested heritage will be based on the assessments of HERIWELL country experts who are asked to contribute to an initial list of contested heritage in their country, focusing on cases that have recently gained special public attention (cf. template in ANNEX 1.2). Based on this assessment, the 4th delivery will include an initial mapping with identified territorial locations. In order to make sure that all ESPON countries will be represented in the map, we may involve additional experts from European organisation with a CH background. Preliminary results will be available in the next report.

Field-work: survey on a representative sample of the adult population in eight ESPON countries

To analyse the relation between cultural heritage in all its manifestations (tangible, intangible and digital) and personal views of individual and societal well-being, with focus on the Covid-19 context, the Consortium has undertaken a survey on a sample representative of the population of eight ESPON countries: Belgium, Czechia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Poland and Spain.

The HERIWELL survey aims to shed light on: the typologies of cultural heritage users (e.g. consumers, active users, not users); the barriers faced in accessing to cultural heritage; the impacts of Covid-19 on individuals’ view of cultural heritage and their expected cultural heritage consumption once the pandemic is overcome; people’s perceptions on heritage-related quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions aspects.

To grasp the complexity of the relationship between CH and SWB, the HERIWELL survey adopts the broad definition of both CH and SWB (section 1).
The survey questionnaire was submitted between the 28th of May and the 8th of June 2021, a total of 8,818 people took part in the HERIWELL survey, of whom: 1,000 people in BE; 1,002 people in CZ; 2,141 in DE; 1,113 people in ES; 507 people in IE; 1,039 people in IT; 1,010 people in NO; 1,006 people in PL. The results were nationally weighted in each case and are representative of the country-specific population aged 18 and over. Details on the sample composition and initial elaborations on the survey responses are included in the Annex Survey to Population (section 1.1).

The analysis of the survey data will be provided in the next Report, on the basis of univariate 1 and bivariate 2 statistics in order to understand the relations between CH and SWB at the individual level and its variation based on the respondents' social and demographic characteristics and geographical provenience, as well as on their level of participation in CH. In analysing people's perception of the relation between CH and SWB during the Covid-19 period, the analysis will also take into consideration various context factors, e.g. Covid measures in the CH field, digitalisation level of the country and level of digital skills of the population.

This report provides some initial results (section 2.3) for questions 3 on the effects of the Covid pandemic on respondents' CH-related behaviour, and question 5 on the benefits and problems associated to CH, while preliminary elaborations of the data collected for all questions and all countries are included in Annex Survey to Population (sections 1.2 - 1.10).

The results on the effects of the pandemic show that a majority of the respondents in most of the countries - the exception is Norway - registered negative impacts of the pandemic with regard to their heritage-related perceptions or behaviour. "Lockdowns" and other restrictions figure on top of these negative effects (for 35% of all respondents), particularly in those countries that suffered extensively under COVID-19 (Czech Republic, Spain and Italy). Concerns about potential repercussions for the cultural sector at large are the second most mentioned answer, in that respect (26% of the total).

However, some of the respondents also registered a shove of motivation to engage more in heritage-related activities: about 1/5 - and even 30% in Ireland and Italy - want to see more of the national all regional cultural resources, once the pandemic is gone, for 13% this desire extends to heritage sites in other European countries. Volunteering and other practical forms of engagement are planned by over 10% of the respondents in Ireland, Italy, Spain and Poland.

Attitudes towards European cultural heritage show that there seems to be an alignment between the perception of cultural heritage as a source of material wellbeing and of personal / social wellbeing. Respondents from countries that consider the potential of CH to contribute to the economy and to contemporary creation as very strong, such as those living in Italy, Spain, Poland or in the Czech Republic, are also those that perceive a more important contribution to individual and social development. Respondents from Germany and Norway show instead lower shares in the range of 60 to 75%. Among the reasons for that could be that the concept of an all-encompassing "cultural heritage" is less firmly rooted at least in Germany (which does not exclude a strong interest in some of its institutionalised forms, particularly in museums and their collections).

There are other dimensions and perceptions that deserve further exploration in the next report, such as the divergent opinions about the perils of over-tourism or other negative influences derived from cultural heritage that could even downgrade the quality of life of residents (i.e. the question with the largest variation in the answers). Answers of respondents from countries with strong similarities in most positive attitudes (Spain and Italy, for instance) suddenly differ a lot when it comes to such more negative statements.

Case studies for the assessment of cultural heritage and societal well-being at the local level

Eight case studies are going to be conducted in the same countries participating in the survey to be able to integrate macro and micro level information and explain the contribution of cultural heritage to societal well-being.

---

1 It refers to the analysis of one variable at a time. It will include frequency tables, diagrams, etc. (Bryman, 2012).

2 It refers to the analysis of two variables at a time to see whether there is any relation between the two variables. It will include contingency tables, diagrams, etc. (Bryman, 2012).
The case studies are meant to: collect more fine-grained information on the impacts of cultural heritage at the local level; test empirical methods of impact assessment; provide policy-relevant insights on how specific results have been achieved (mechanism); and provide evidence on the linkages between cultural heritage and societal well-being for policymakers and stakeholders in the cultural heritage field in order to gain insights for successful policies and development efforts at the local and regional levels.

An extrapolative design approach is proposed (Barzelay, 2007), particularly useful when effects depend on case-specific situational or contextual factors, as it is the case of cultural heritage whose societal well-being impacts are strongly dependent on the ‘target’ (both in terms of social groups and sites). However, the extrapolative design allows to narrow down the design problem in order to devise locally feasible elements that would intentionally activate the desired causal process, and that could thus be transferred to other contexts. The extrapolative design will focus on context features, policy features, project and policy outcomes, and the mechanisms that trigger specific policy outcomes in the societal well-being domain.

As unit of analysis we consider exemplary practices, selected among those proposed by the HERIWELL country experts, to explore the reasons why their results (in terms of societal well-being) occurred. The proposed case studies on exemplary practices have been selected according to the following criteria: location in one of the case study countries; coverage of various types of cultural heritage and societal well-being; variety among the policies promoted; availability of qualitative and quantitative data on SWB impacts.

The pilot case study undertaken to test the methodology is the Archaeological Museum of Naples (MANN). The pilot case study focuses on the effects of the digitalisation strategy adopted by MANN. The MANN tackles different forms of cultural heritage: tangible and digital (through the development of the Father and Son videogame), and through its initiatives it also aims to contribute to different forms of societal well-being: quality of life (in particular knowledge and research about the past), societal cohesion (in particular, enhanced community engagement and integration of minorities and enhanced community awareness, civic cohesion and sense of belonging).

The analysis of the MANN case study was based on data provided by the museum; visits data on Wikipedia page of the Museum through mobile and desktop users to assess the dynamics in the period of Covid-19 restrictions; and on an experimental text analysis of the reviews to the ‘Father and son’ videogame written in Italian and English between 2016 and April 2021. Moreover, interviews with relevant stakeholders have been carried out to verify and discuss the findings of the analysis.

Preliminary results show that, although the digitisation strategy of the MANN is quite recent, there has been an increase in the MANN’s online followers, users and online popularity, that pair with a relevant increase (pre-Covid) of the number of visitors, and ticket revenues. The analysis of social network and digital data shows that the digital tools used so far involved more women (that prevail online, differently from what happens in visits in person), middle-aged people, and people living in Naples, city’s surroundings and Southern Italy. Moreover, there is an important role as a connection with the Italian communities abroad. These findings account for the contribution of digitisation to enhance equal opportunities and inclusion. Further reflection and activities should be to use the digitisation strategy in a truly international perspective, on the one hand, and to engage young people, on the other hand, for which different, more targeted approaches are required.

Some mechanisms seem to favour the contribution of the different streams of the MANN’s digitisation strategy to the identified SWB results. The main ones refer to: the appreciation of the MANN’s heritage; the pride to belong to the same ‘cradle of history’, the entertainment and amusement of the new communication tool (the game); and most of all, the emotions that cultural heritage can produce, when communicated with special attention to this aspect. These outcomes and mechanisms also depend on the conservation, care and development of the Museum’s heritage, achieved through many other different policies. These include the restoration expansion and communication of the collections, which amplified the visitors and ticket revenues; and the ‘enhanced community engagement’ that is expected to derive from the intense strategy.
of cooperation with local actors and from the initiatives to present the Museum and its gardens as a resource open to the city and to its inhabitants. The latter cooperation should also benefit the economic chain of the museum, thanks to the various marketing initiatives that have been promoted.

The contribution of EU investments in cultural heritage to societal well-being in the 2014.-2020 programming period

The analysis of the effects of European investments in CH on societal well-being focuses on three main programmes: European Structural and Investment Funds, Creative Europe, and the European Capitals of Culture programme.

As in the case of global and local-level analyses, a mixed methodology approach is adopted, involving quantitative and qualitative approaches.

Societal well-being and Cultural Heritage in ESIF investments

The analysis of the relation between European Structural and Investment Funds allocations on cultural heritage and societal well-being has been based on the following three main steps:

- Collection of data and mapping of ESIF investments in cultural heritage at national and, whenever possible, regional level. The analysis considered data and indicators available in EU data-sources (e.g., Open Cohesion data for ERDF allocations, and the keep.eu on-line portal for the European territorial cooperation programme Interreg Europe), as well as on national data-sources analysed by the HERIWELL country experts for the European Social Fund and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). Financial allocations in tangible cultural heritage and the numbers of projects focussed on CH (using keywords) are considered.

- The selection of SWB indicators available at regional level as proxies of the three societal well-being dimensions identified in the HERIWELL Conceptual Framework.

- A correlation analysis between the ESIF investments in CH and SWB indicators. Indicators for ESIF investments include: (i) the % incidence of CH allocations over ESIF planned allocations (by Fund), and (ii) ERDF CH allocations per inhabitant. Derailed insights on the role of ESIF funds in supporting specific strategies/policies that contribute to societal well-being will derive from some of the case studies.

Preliminary results show that, according to Open-Cohesion data ERDF funding allocated to the CH investment fields reached around 2.7% of total ERDF allocations in the 2014-2020 programming period, while ESF allocations resulting from national data sources consulted so far are much lower (around 0.2% of ESF planned allocations). Total ETC-Interreg Europe allocations on CH are indicatively equivalent to about 9% of total eligible budget. Available ERDF regional data on allocations in CH-related investments fields show that regions with the highest incidence in CH allocations over total ERDF allocations are in Portugal, Italy, Greece, Malta, France and Belgium. Portuguese regions also show the highest level of allocations per inhabitant, followed by Malta and the Ionian Islands in Greece.

The recognition on national data using keywords, shows that, while for ESF and ERDF information is available in most of the EU MSs, less information is available regarding the EAFRD. The assessment also shows that many ERDF and ESF projects dealing with CH are often classified by Managing Authorities also under other codes, besides the CH-related codes 94 and 95. The preliminary correlation analysis shows low correlations between ERDF allocations on cultural heritage (codes 94 and 95) and societal well-being indicators, although the correlation results are compatible with a positive relation between cultural heritage and societal well-being.

Creative Europe investments in CH

Preliminary results of the content analysis through key words conducted on the Creative Europe website reveals that overall 138 projects were related to CH in the programming period 2014-2020, of which 37% focused on TCH, 32.4% on ICH and the remaining on mixed typologies of CH. The amount of funded projects across the years went from a minimum of 17 projects in 2014 to a maximum of 37 projects in 2018. The distribution of projects and funding among coordinators’ countries provides a first overview on where the Creative Europe financing might have impacted more. Italy and France are the countries which coordinated the highest number of the projects associated to CH (respectively 21 and 20 projects). The following are
Spain (13 projects), The Netherlands (12 projects) and Belgium (12 projects). Unfortunately, available data do not allow to disaggregate on project partners, neither to establish the effective amount of received funding. Considering the numbers of projects and their duration, the country in which the projects coordinators were expected to receive the highest amount of financing is France, with more than 6 million of euros in the 2014-2020 period.

**Qualitative meta-assessment of the evaluations of the European Capitals of Culture**

In order to provide insights on the relation between cultural heritage and societal well-being at the local level the Consortium is conducting a qualitative meta-analysis of ECoC involving cultural heritage in their investment programme, based on the analysis of ex post evaluations reports and interviews and workshop with representatives of ECoC. Identified outcomes will be classified along the impact categories defined in the HERIWELL theory of change and, to the extent possible, explanations will be provided on triggering factors of these impacts. One potential limit may be represented by the fact that data on long-term outcomes could be scarce, as the official ex post evaluation process is conducted briefly after the end of the nomination period. Nevertheless, from a methodological point of view this information, together with that derived from the case study analysis, will feed the final HERIWELL theory of change to show how outputs and intermediary outcomes connect to long-term ones.

**Preliminary results** relate to three of the eight cities that proposed in their ECoC application a specific focus on issues linked to CH promotion, preservation or valorisation. The three cities (Umea, Mons and Riga) report a change associated to most of the sub-dimensions of SWB in their ex-post evaluation reports. Out of the 14 sub-dimensions of SWB identified in the Theory of Change, though not indicated in all the three cities relate to: growth in happiness and life satisfaction, environment quality and sustainability, trust, and growth in property prices and housing conditions. The analysis will be further detailed in the next reports, as indicated in section 4.3.

**Initial policy indications**

Based on the analysis conducted so far, the report concludes with some initial policy indications with focus on the following aspects: definitions of CH and CH data availability and comparability; CH strategies at European, national and regional level to address the impact of cultural heritage in development policies at various territorial levels.

**Definitions of CH**

To overcome the heterogeneity of CH definitions and improve the comparability among national CH lists, there are two main issues to be addressed.

The first is to provide clear indications and guidelines with common criteria on what can be considered CH and on how to improve data collection at national level.

The second issue is to define a common weight system able to harmonize the different types of objects that compose CH across countries. Several methods and techniques have been proposed to this end. For example, the UK DCMS proposes to value, and not just count, the heritage assets using the methodologies developed in the Social Cost Benefit Analysis, while Eurostat, in experimental statistics, proposes not only to count the number of sites registered in each country in the World Heritage List, but to value them according to their popularity or cultural consumption using Wikipedia page views as a weight.

Regarding Intangible Cultural Heritage, the question of an appropriate definition is still open among the scientific community and operators as well as representatives of communities or cultural minorities. Also clear definitions of the roles of „heritage communities“ are so far not provided in both the UNESCO ICH Convention and the CoE FARO Convention. This could suggest staging a European exchange of experiences or special conference that could provide clearer guidelines, including as regards a potential division of labour with State authorities.

Concerning controversial CH, given the limited information available, in order to provide a more in-depth picture of popular views of contested CH or even feelings of “bad-being” we propose to use the HERIWELL
findings for the development of a comprehensive survey, either in the context of a EuroBarometer dealing with CH or in a special survey staged by professional bodies such as EUROPA NOSTRA.

Harmonized approaches are also needed to identify heritage at risk, as the UNESCO or national delegates of Europa Nostra’s Red Lists appear to be understaffed to cover all the potential cases.

**Comparable indicators on CH**

As previously mentioned, the difficulty of having homogeneous and comparable data for CH endowments arises because of the criteria adopted to define CH in each country that are different from place to place, making cross-country and cross-region comparison impossible and estimations of the causal relationship between CH and SWB biased. There is a need for comparable indicators of the stock and use of cultural heritage at EU, national and regional/local level. Though inventories and registers are typically the most usual tool for public intervention, their administrative logic is still outdated and do not facilitate user friendly information about the objects included and their characteristics. This is even more difficult with intangible heritage, although good practices are present at the regional level.

The HERIWELL analysis of TCH data sources and indicators shows that two strategies can be followed to produce the necessary data at EU, national and regional/local level. The first is to build a long term strategy based on publicly produced/managed open data systems. The second is to integrate the use of publicly produced data with big data, through the establishment of long term partnerships with commercial providers of big data. Big data may indeed be used for analyses of the popularity of sites or territories at the NUTS2 and NUTS3 level, using the different sources to answer different problems. However, the use of big data implies both ethical and practical managerial questions, as it relies on information collected and made available by private commercial actors. To this end, it is important that their use in the heritage field, as in other fields, is based on well-defined “smart” and sustainable public strategies.

**Data on public and private CH funding are also very limited and often it is not possible to disentangle CH from culture data.** Public funding data require more specific elaborations than the customary report in terms of COFOC categories with too broad results. Detailed reports on expenditure in terms of ESA2010 categories (better classification in terms of creation of new assets – gross capital formation – or compensation of employees) are needed.

Even though some data on private funding may be derived by the Eurobarometer survey for the European Year of Cultural Heritage, they are rather limited. In order to understand the overall intensity of investments in heritage it is important to define systems for data collection on cultural heritage at private level as well.

Regarding available data on EU Funding programmes, the HERIWELL mapping shows that EU funds have a potential impact on all the three categories of SWB related to CH: quality of life (e.g. education), societal cohesion (e.g. societal diversity and inclusion) and material conditions (e.g. territorial attractiveness and tourism).

Available data on the ESI funds provide some information on investments in CH. Open Cohesion data show that ERDF allocates a significant amount of resources to investments related to CH, however there is no data on ESF and EARDF CH-related allocations and on the projects implemented and their results. A mapping of national data-sources on ESIF investments and projects carried out by the HERIWELL national experts shows many drawbacks (see section 4.1). There is therefore a need for:

- Extending the categorization system to projects and the other funds besides the ERDF;
- Providing data on number of projects and allocations at NUTS2 level whenever possible, in particular for what concerns national programs;
- Providing indicators on outcomes and results;
- Organising regional ESIF data according to a common structure, in order to ensure comparability across European countries. One suggestion is to follow the European categorisation of regions according to the NUTS system.

Concerning Creative Europe and ECoC European capital of culture, the actual link between CH and well-being is often implicit, making the identification of CH impacts on well-being difficult. In addition, the EU funding lacks clear indications of the interventions dealing with CH and even more of the ones tackling both CH and SWB, thus making it difficult to assess their linkages. Furthermore, particularly in the case of Creative Europe, the available data are not disaggregated by projects’ partners making it difficult to assess the distribution at national and sub-national level. In the case of the ECoC programme, evaluation reports are often based on a narrative structure, with information on quantitative indicators often lacking. Thus, a specific
classification of cultural heritage investments, following for instance the example of the ERDF categorisation system, and their territorialisation would be useful to understand the intensity of investments in CH. In addition, results should be presented along a specific and common set of indicators, paying particular attention to outcomes related to societal well-being.

More data and information is also needed on employment in CH, as well as monitoring data on outputs and outcomes of EU, national and local programmes related to CH.

Initial indications on CH strategies

As underlined in the Theory of Change conceptual model presented in the Inception report, the effects of CH on social and individual well-being do not depend only on the presence of CH endowments, but largely on the implementation of CH strategies valorising CH endowments and their potential effects on social well-being. The HERIWELL analyses show that investments in CH and their sustainability over time largely depend on the value that society at large attributes to cultural heritage resources. Specific strategies can be used to increase the value recognition of heritage as well as its potential effects on societal well-being. Strategies aimed at increasing the accessibility of cultural heritage to all categories of people, including for those at risk of social exclusion (e.g. people with disabilities, minorities, migrants, people with low levels of education, people living in problem areas). Strategies to improve citizens' engagement in cultural heritage, strengthening active participation in processes of cultural heritage protection and valorisation could become a strategic priority. Furthermore, and in order to produce the expected outcomes, such strategies have to be continued over time.

Finally, Cultural heritage programmes and policies, like all public policies, to be effective need to be based on a long-term strategic approach in terms of identifying the goals of the interventions and key stakeholders, earmarked funding, as well as implementation, monitoring and evaluation systems and tools including progress, output, outcomes and impact indicators.

Outreach actions

In the report period the HERIWELL Consortium organised a specific dissemination event, i.e. HERIWELL Social Storm, on the 11th of March 2021 and participated in four conferences/workshops organised by other stakeholders.

The Social Storm consisted in involving the HERIWELL team and Network and ESPON EGTC in disseminating the main messages of the project through specific posts on social media (Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn). Through the event, the Consortium reached 30,053 people. Even though it is not possible to detect how many of the people reached by the event joined the HERIWELL network, it is worth noting that 38% of the HERIWELL network members joined it during March 2021 and that 39% of the new subscriptions registered during the month of March occurred on the dissemination day.

In the next period the HERIWELL team members plan to participate in 3 international events (seminars, conferences, workshops).
Introduction

This second interim report presents the final HERIWELL proposed methodological approach to assess and measure the relation between CH and SWB, as well as some interim/preliminary (in some cases) examples of its application.

Moving from the conceptual approach and the hypotheses on how cultural heritage impacts on societal well-being (i.e. theory of change) developed in the previous reports, the report starts in Chapter 1 with the presentation of the overall proposed multi-method approach. This chapter includes an overview of the proposed methodologies of analysis and associated operational definitions of CH and SWB as well as the rationale behind the multi-methodological design.

Methodologies and their application are detailed in Chapters 2 (global, pan European methodologies) and 3 (local methodologies), with some interim/preliminary (in some cases) examples of application reported in the two Annexes to the report.

Chapter 4 presents the proposed methodologies for the analysis of the contribution of EU programmes supporting cultural heritage to societal well-being, with focus on the role of ESIF funds, the Creative Europe and the Capital of Culture programmes.

Chapter 5 includes the preliminary policy indications that stem from the analyses undertaken so far within the project. As works so far has focused in particular on the conceptual and methodological approach, most of the initial policy recommendations are focusing in particular on these aspects. However, some initial indications regarding strategies for enhancing the CH contribution to societal well-being are also provided, based mainly on the Mann pilot case study.

Chapter 6 illustrates the HERIWELL outreach actions undertaken in the report period and those proposed for the next project phases.

Two separate sets of Annexes complete the report, with details on the preliminary applications of the propose methodologies. Annex HERIWELL Survey to population include details on the survey methodological approach (e.g. characteristics of the samples) and its preliminary results. Further details on the survey results will be provided in the next reports. Annex Methodologies and results includes details on the other global, local and EU funds methodologies and their results as well as on the outreach activities. Thus, Annex 1 provides information on the global methodology and results, Annex 2 includes details on case studies (e.g. proposed case studies, case study template, interim results of the Mann case study), Annexes 3 and 4 provide details on the analysis of ESIF in cultural heritage and societal well-being. Annex 5 includes details on the European Capitals of Culture. Annex 6 provides an overview of the main results obtained by the outreach strategy in the report period.

3 https://www.espon.eu/HERIWELL
1 The overall methodological approach

This chapter introduces the overall proposed methodological approach, presented in-depth in the following chapters.

As illustrated in figure below, the methodological approach relies on a multi-methodological design that foresees three levels:

- **Global level**, including a mix of quantitative (i.e. cluster, correlations, regression, descriptive statistics) and qualitative (i.e. desk and content analysis) methodologies to unfold the relation between cultural heritage and societal well-being at pan-European level.

- **Local level**, based on an extrapolative case study approach to analyse in-depth the multifaceted and multi-dimensional relation between CH and SWB through a mixed qual-quantitative approach based on desk and statistical analysis of locally available material and data (including big data whenever possible) and interviews to local stakeholders. In some cases, the use of big data will also allow to show the impact of COVID-19 on the analysed CH resource and target groups’ behaviour.

- **EU funds**, a mixed quantitative (i.e. descriptive statistical analysis, correlation analysis) and qualitative approach (i.e. content analysis, semi-structured interviews, workshops) approach will be used to analyse cultural heritage investments in ESIF (i.e. ERDF, including ETC programmes, ESF, EAFRD) and EU programmes (Creative Europe and European Capitals of Culture) and their linkages with SWB.
Figure 1.1 The HERIWELL programme in a nutshell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative pan-European and big data analysis (cluster, correlation, regression, etc.)</td>
<td>Estimate the relation between tangible cultural heritage and societal well-being (i.e. quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions), based on available comparable Eurostat data and big data (e.g. Tripadvisor data at NUTS2 level in three ESPON countries).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative analyses (content and desk analysis)</td>
<td>Investigate the relation between intangible cultural heritage projects (according to the UNESCO list) and societal well-being (i.e. quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions). Investigate linkages between cultural heritage and gender equality in state museums in a sample of ESPON countries (capital cities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of contested/neglected heritage: a mixed approach</td>
<td>Analysis of contested/neglected heritage in ESPON countries through the submission of a questionnaire to country experts and HERIWELL stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERIWELL cross-country survey to population in eight ESPON MS</td>
<td>Grasp individual perceptions on the relation between tangible, intangible and digital cultural heritage and societal well-being (i.e. quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions) in BE, CZ, ES, DE, IE, IT, NO and PL. Capture the impacts of a “forced” virtual use of cultural heritage during the Covid-19 pandemic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies analysis</td>
<td>Investigate in-depth the impacts and mechanisms linking tangible, intangible and digital cultural heritage and societal well-being (with focus on quality of life and societal cohesion) at local level in eight ESPON countries (BE, CZ, DE, ES, IE, IT, NO and PL). Investigate why the observed results occurred to derive policy-relevant insights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big data analysis in some of the case studies</td>
<td>Complement some of the case study analysis with examples of how big data (e.g. Wikipedia, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram) can be used for the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of EU investments in CH</td>
<td>Analyse the correlation between ESIF investments in tangible, intangible and digital cultural heritage and societal well-being (i.e. quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation analysis of the relation between EU investments in CH and societal well-being</td>
<td>Analyse the investments in cultural heritage of Creative Europe and, to the extent possible, their relation with societal well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical analysis of Creative Europe investments in cultural heritage</td>
<td>Shed light on ECoC’s objectives and results in the field of CH in European Capitals of Culture and their links with the societal well-being (i.e. quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HERIWELL elaboration

The adoption of a multi-methodological design allows the HERIWELL Consortium to deal with the main challenges identified in the HERIWELL Interim report:

1. **Definition of CH**
What constitutes cultural heritage is still an open issue among stakeholders in the field, as unveiled by the HERIWELL deliberative event, held between December 2020 and January 2021 (see Annex 9 to the HERIWELL Interim report for further details). Following stakeholders’ recommendation of taking an encompassing view to cultural heritage that underlines its dynamic, community related and value based feature, the definition proposed by the HERIWELL Consortium in the previous reports adopts a broad view to CH, building on the Faro Convention, and the work of the EU JPI initiative and UNESCO.

**Box 1.1 HERIWELL CH definition**

CH is to be considered as the ‘cultural capital’, inherited from the past, which people consider as a reflection and expression of their evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions and from which, through the investment of human ingenuity and effort, originate the rich and varied cultures of modern Europe. Cultural heritage includes all elements resulting from the interaction over time between people and places. Cultural heritage is community based and hence heritage communities play a relevant role in its framing. Conservation of this cultural capital is essential, both for its intrinsic value and its potential as an investment from which future development – cultural, social and economic – may be generated. Article 1 explains the three assertions of the convention, namely: a) the existence of rights relating to cultural heritage, derived as an unavoidable consequence of the internationally accepted right to participate in cultural life; b) the fact that a right to cultural heritage creates inescapable responsibilities towards that heritage; c) the fact that the ultimate purpose behind the conservation of CH and its sustainable use is the development of a more democratic human society and the improvement of quality of life for everyone.

CH encompasses physical items from the past (tangible cultural heritage – TCH), as well as traditions (intangible cultural heritage – ICH) considered to be of value for societies or specific communities. TCH includes movable objects (e.g. paintings); immovable objects (e.g. architectural works and groups of buildings); cultural landscapes (with strong identity and environmental connotations); sites (e.g. archaeological areas); underwater cultural heritage; industrial heritage. ICH includes traditional skills of craftsmanship, oral traditions, rituals, games and festivities and traditional performing arts (e.g. folk dance) as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated to them, which communities, groups and even individuals recognise as part of their heritage. Unlike TCH, it gains value and can be protected only if practices – of real people – are still alive, so the participation of communities, professional groups etc. (‘bearers’ of ICH) is a necessity. Indeed, ICH is constantly recreated through the interaction between people and places. If only records of former but now deceased practices exist, e.g. in books or films, the latter could possibly be protected as TCH. More recent categorisations include digital heritage (‘born’ digital or digitised). Moreover, recent debates focus on controversial heritage, i.e. CH characterised by CH-related conflicts, historical burdens or forms of neglect, showing the dynamic and value based nature of heritage.

Source: HERIWELL Consortium, Inception report (2020)

However, the adoption of a broad view poses difficulties in the quantitative measurement of CH impacts, imposing the individuation of an operational definition which allows it to be measured and compared across countries and over time.

In the search for a balance between the need for operationalising CH and for underlying its broad meaning, the HERIWELL research team proposes to adopt a methodology-driven definition (i.e. a definition based on the type and purpose of the methodology adopted):

- The CH broad definition (including TCH, ICH and digital heritage), included in the previous box, is used in the following methodologies: HERIWELL cross-country survey to population, case studies, and the analysis of EU investments. While the content analysis of ICH also considers the broad definition of CH, it limits the analysis of ICH to that included in the three UNESCO lists: Urgent Safeguarding List; Representative List; Register of Good Safeguarding Practices.

- For the pan-European aggregated analysis at NUTS2 level, in order to consider homogeneous and comparable TCH data at NUTS 2 level, the size of TCH endowments is approximated by the ratio

---

between the number of dwellings built before 1919 and the total number of dwellings. Furthermore, in order to overcome the problems posed by the comparability of national lists of protected heritage, the Consortium proposes to use TripAdvisor reviews in an experimental way as a proxy of TCH, allowing an estimation of both its flow component (measured by the popularity of heritage) and its stock component.

- A specific definition has been adopted for the analysis of the linkages between cultural heritage and gender equality museums: CH is restricted to National (State-run) museums / collections.

ii. Definition of SWB and the description of the structure of the relationship between CH and SWB and the mechanisms characterising this relation

As in the case of CH definition, the SWB definition also takes a broad view, following the literature - on the issue. The HERIWELL Consortium identifies three macro-dimensions of SWB (i.e. quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions) that include several sub-dimensions, as described in the HERIWELL ToC below.

**Figure 1.2 A theory of change for achieving societal well-being through CH: definition of SWB and identification of its linkages to CH**

![Diagram of theory of change for achieving societal well-being through CH](https://www.espon.eu/HERIWELL)


This definition of SWB is used in all the proposed methodologies. The pan-European quantitative analysis and the ESIF correlation analysis use proxies based on available indicators, as described in the Box below.
**Box 1.2 Operational definition of SWB in the pan-European quantitative analysis and ESIF analysis**

For the pan-European quantitative analysis and the ESIF analysis 57 comparable indicators available at NUTS2 were identified as proxies for the three macro-dimensions and most of the sub-dimensions of the general SWB definition illustrated in the HERIWELL ToC:

- **Quality of life** refers to:
  - Education and skills (including digital skills), with the following indicators: tertiary education attainment, tertiary enrolment, upper-secondary enrolment rate (age 14-18), early school-leavers, lower-secondary completion only, adult participation in learning (life-long learning);
  - Health, with the following indicators: life expectancy; subjective health status; premature mortality (<65); infant mortality; Unmet medical needs; standardised cancer death rate; standardised heart disease death rate;
  - Living/eudemonic conditions: crime rate; safety at night; money stolen; assaults; leisure activities;
  - Access to ICT, with the following proxies: internet at home, broadband at home, online interaction with public authorities; internet access;
  - Knowledge and research, with R&D expenditure as proxy.
  - Environmental conditions: air pollution (NO2, Ozone, pm2.5, pm10); traffic deaths.

- **Societal cohesion** refers to:
  - Community engagement, volunteering, charitable giving, and civic cohesion indicators: active citizenship, freedom over life choices, making friends, volunteering; female participation in regional assemblies; tolerance towards immigrants; tolerance toward minorities; tolerance towards homosexuals;
  - Equal opportunities and empowerment, with the following proxies: people at risk of poverty or social exclusion, deprivation rate (severely materially deprived people); NEET rate (15–29); gender employment gap.
  - Trust indicators: trust in national government; trust in the legal system; trust in the police; Institutions quality index; Institutions’ corruption index; institution impartiality index.

- **Material conditions** refers to:
  - Growth in jobs and earnings indicators: employment rate; per capita nominal GDP; employment in creative and cultural sector; job opportunities index; involuntary part-time /temporary employment; insufficient food;
  - Housing conditions: lack of toilet in dwellings; uncollected sewage; costs of housing; housing quality; overcrowding; lack of adequate heating.

Further details are included in 1.1.

The relation between SWB and CH is strongly affected by the specificity of the actions taken and target audience, and cannot be measured by resorting to a single and undifferentiated method of analysis, because the relation is influenced by various intervening variables impacting on different dimensions of SWB. As shown in the HERIWELL ToC above, its generation and transfer depends on the type of target (individual versus community), varies across individuals and communities, and refers to different, but interconnected dimensions of SWB, which are difficult to disentangle and for which data is not always available. Furthermore, this relation is bi-directional. On the one hand, a CH enhancement measure is activated by pointing at one (or more) specific targets and, on the other hand, the target selected must have the capacity to grasp that impulse (e.g. the impacts of policies promoted by museums to increase community identity are different if the target is adults or if its pupils). This means that impacts do not depend on the quantity or quality of CH, but instead on the objectives and how some of its components are used (by policies/programmes/projects). In addition, some impacts could occur jointly.

Therefore, many of the impacts that we have identified through the ToC (especially those relating to societal inclusion and quality of life) are so micro that it is impossible to detect them at aggregate level, even when
applied the most sensitive of econometric models to the available data. In analytical terms, the richness and complexity of relationships can be better examined, described and evaluated in case studies at the local level, where it is possible to describe the mechanisms that have generated the analysed impacts (positive and replicable, or negative and non-replicable) between the type of CH, enhancement actions activated, and impacts expected and actually achieved.

iii. The interconnected nature of the outcomes of the relation between CH and the SWB dimensions represented in the ToC

From a purely theoretical point of view, the potential impacts of CH on SWB are different according to the three SWB dimensions identified in the HERIWELL ToC. While the ToC tries to order them on the basis of previous measurements carried out through different methodologies, debates with stakeholders in the cultural heritage field have shown the tangled nature of societal well-being dimensions, which makes their separate assessment quite difficult. For instance, according to stakeholders involved in the HERIWELL deliberative event, while education and digital skills can represent an outcome of CH (if specific initiatives are activated to support them), at the same time they can also represent a factor that contributes to increased participation in CH (the more educated people are, the higher is their participation in CH). Stakeholders’ suggestion to analyse jointly the various dimensions of well-being due to their interconnected nature, is also reflected in their answers to the question regarding the SWB areas on which the project should focus: mainly societal cohesion (13.8 %) and quality of life (13.6 %), while material conditions were considered less relevant for the HERIWELL project (5.7 %). Furthermore, when it comes to sub-dimensions of SWB three main areas of interest for further analysis emerge from CH stakeholders involved in the HERIWELL Deliberative event:

- Community awareness, civic cohesion and sense of belonging and education and skills, including digital skills and digitisation;
- Community engagement, volunteering and charitable giving, knowledge and research, and quality and sustainability of the environment;
- Happiness and life satisfaction, place identity and symbolic representation and territorial attractiveness and branding.

For further details see on suggested dimensions and sub-dimensions see chapter 1 of the HERIWELL Interim report and Annex 9 to the HERIWELL Interim report.

---

5 Current research on well-being as ‘quality of life’ has been derived from two general perspectives: the hedonic approach, which focuses on happiness and defines well-being in terms of pleasure attainment and pain avoidance; and the eudaimonic approach, which focuses on meaning and self-realisation, and defines well-being in terms of the degree to which a person is fully functioning. (Richard M. Ryan and Edward L. Deci (2001), On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-being, Annual Review of Psychology). These aspects of well-being can, by their nature, be analysed only on the basis of ‘micro’ analysis by directly analysing (measuring) the reactions of the subjects involved in the experiment. It is no coincidence that the studies carried out are generally made up of ‘laboratory analyses’ carried out by clinical psychologists. (‘Moment-to-moment measures of experiences’, study of the reaction of groups of individuals to the choice of an alternative, etc.) (see, Daniel Kahneman, Ed Diener, and Norbert Schwarz (Editors), (1999), Well-Being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.)
2 The contribution of cultural heritage to societal well-being: a pan-European analysis

2.1 The contribution of Tangible CH to societal well-being: a quantitative pan-European analysis at NUTS2 level

2.1.1 Methodology

The pan-European model intends to verify the existence of a causal relationship between TCH (Tangible Cultural Heritage) and SWB (Societal Well Being) and quantify it at the supranational level (i.e., attributing a sign and a numerical value). The sign and extent of the relationship between TCH and SWB estimated at pan-European level may be considered as the “average relationship” for the totality of the NUTS2 territories at a given time (cross-section analysis). Therefore, it does not exclude that, in individual territories, the “form” of the relationship can be significantly different, both in sign and value, from that estimated for the whole.

The territorial level. The analysis is conducted at the regional level (NUTS 2), and constitutes a continuation of the analyses previously conducted at national level and presented in the HERIWELL Interim Report.

The indicators. Econometric models require that all the indicators considered are: a) expressed on a numerical scale: both those referring to subjective perceptions (i.e., trust in the national government) and those referring to quantitative dimensions (e.g., the dwellings built before 1919); and b) defined and collated in the same way in all the regions in order to be homogeneous and comparable across the considered territories.

The TCH and SWB indicators have therefore been selected to respect these two constraints. The list of the TCH and SWB indicators at NUTS2 level considered in the explorative econometric analysis is presented in chapter 1 and in Annex 1.1, together with a discussion of the other available indicators with their pros and cons.

The methodology approach. From a general point of view, to provide a quantitative measure of the impact of TCH on the social well-being at the NUTS2 level, the relationship between well-being and culture might be defined by a generic function:

\[ Y_{it} = f(X_{it}) \]

where the index \( i \) refers to the NUTS2 regions of the ESPON countries, while \( t \) refers to the years for which the selected indicators are available.

This generic representation requires the identification of the dependent variable, \( Y \), and the independent ones (\( X \)).

The dependent variable \( Y \) could be defined as a measure of life satisfaction, such as the indicator provided by EU-SILC survey or by Gallup World Poll or, in our terminology, a synthetic indicator of SWB. This choice is in line with the literature on well-being (see for example Bjørnskov et al., 2008).

The OECD Regional database provides the Gallup’s Poll indicator at NUTS2 level, although only for 140 regions. In order to cover more NUTS2 ESPON regions we explored the correlation between the OECD indicator and the indicators available from European Social Progress Index (EU-SPI). The indicator on ‘Freedom on life choices’ registers the highest correlation with the life satisfaction indicator, and therefore this indicator is used to define \( Y_{it} \). The indicator covers 240 EU27 regions.

In order to select the \( X \) variables to be included in the regression, those able to best capture social well-being among the list of SWB listed in Tables 1.1 of Annex 1.1, a two-step analysis was carried out:

1. Identify the drivers that most of all explain the social and economic dimensions of SWB;
2. Explore TCH’s contribution to societal well-being.
As reported in the previous Interim report, this two steps model is based on two regressions: the first identifies the social and economic components that impacts on SWB indicator, and the second studies the impact of the CH dimension on the SWB indicator.

The equations and the quantitative results obtained so far are detailed in Annex 1.1.

### Interim results

In the first step, a number of regression analyses have been carried out to identify the main social and economic drivers on the SWB dependent variable. The results so far show that SWB, approximated by "Freedom on life choices", is explained by two main variables: "Lifelong learning (life_long)", which approximates the education, social and economic dimensions; and "Neither in Employment or in Education or Training (NEET) rate" which approximates labour market conditions, particularly referred to young people:

\[
SWB_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ast (life\_long)_i + \beta_2 \ast (NEET)_i + \varepsilon_i
\]  

The second step was to investigate the interplay of SWB with TCH. In order to consider homogeneous and comparable TCH data at NUTS 2 level, the size of CH endowments is approximated by the ratio between the number of dwellings built before 1919 and the total number of dwellings (build), while the well-being indicators is estimated using those collected to compose the EU Social Progress Index (EU-SPI). As this index exclude economic aspects, the indicator on Cultural Employment (cul19) was added as an indicator of the economic impacts of the TCH.

The complete estimated equation is therefore:

\[
SWB_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ast (life\_long)_i + \beta_2 \ast (NEET)_i + \beta_3 \ast (build)_i + \beta_4 \ast (cul19)_i + \varepsilon_i
\]  

To explore the contribution of the CH and cultural employment dimensions we performed, firstly two separate equations for each one of the indicators and then a comprehensive one obtaining the following results: SWB is positively related to TCH (build) and, to an even greater extent, to Cultural Employment (cul19).

These results provide a first evidence on the interplay of the CH dimension in the explanation of the SWB. The analysis will be extended for the next reports, by:

i) extending the set of the variables considered for the CH dimension, using data on participation (e.g. museums visitors) and exploring the potentiality of big data (see Box 2.1 below); and

ii) further checking the correlation and the main drivers for the social and economic dimension with an extensive analysis of the 57 indicators available at NUTS2 on EU-Social Progress Index.

iii) analyzing all the correlations between the OECD and the EU-SPI well-being data in such a way as to be able to analyze almost all the ESPON regions.
Box 2.1 A first exploration of the possible use of TripAdvisor data for the estimation of TCH at NUTS2 level

Several studies have pointed out the possibility to use big data to estimate cultural demand (the popularity) of different components of CH at territorial level. We conducted an initial exploration on the information that could be inferred from TripAdvisor data to estimate the size and popularity of CH at the regional level. TripAdvisor, since 2004 a web application for the tourism domain, offers a review on traveler’s experiences including those on museum, church and landscape attraction.

In our analysis the focus has been on the historical sites for which the tourists reviewed their experience and, in particular, on points of historical, cultural and/or artistic interest, such as architectural buildings, religious sites, monuments and statues, churches and cathedrals.

For each of the NUTS2 regions TripAdvisor ranks the historic sites according to a popularity index which is computed using an algorithm that accounts for user reviews and other published sources such as guidebooks and newspaper articles.

In our exploratory analysis, we extrapolated for two regions (Ile de France, Lazio Region) the list of historic sites which received at least one review and the popularity (number of reviews) of each site. The number of sites that have received at least one review, could then be used as an indicator of TCH stock and popularity in each region, as TripAdvisor users are numerous and representative of a global audience.

In the continuation of the research, and in order to increase the capability of the econometric model to grasp the impact of CH on well-being, we propose to explore the potentialities of this information source, as a first approximation on a limited number of regions in a maximum of three countries that can be representative of the universe of the ESPON countries: e.g. Austria, Italy, and Norway.

2.2 The contribution of Intangible and mixed CH to societal well-being: a qualitative content analysis

2.2.1 Methodology

The HERIWELL multi methodological design foresees a specific analysis of the intangible cultural heritage at pan-European level to understand its contribution to societal well-being. As criteria for defining intangible cultural heritage vary throughout the ESPON countries and due to the scarcity of homogenous data at pan-European level, the HERIWELL consortium has decided to limit the analysis to intangible heritage registered on the UNESCO lists.

The investigation has been conducted through a content analysis of the 146 UNESCO intangible heritage nominations available in 26 ESPON countries. The UNESCO heritage provides harmonized criteria for the definition and classification of intangible cultural heritage (structured nomination forms, descriptions and inventories, pictures, official certifications, etc.), which makes comparative ICH investigations, based on empirical evidence of relevance for the HERIWELL concept, feasible. This allows the Consortium to provide information on the types of ICH activities registered in the UNESCO lists, the territorial distribution of ICH manifestations in ESPON countries, the relevance of ICH inscriptions for key HERIWELL categories of SWB and stakeholders or communities as bearers or promoters of ICH.

The figure below presents an overview of the main steps of the analysis.
Figure 2.1 Main steps of the content analysis of the relation between ICH and SWB dimensions

The analysis adopts the general definitions of CH and SWB provided in the inception report. The analysis uses the HERIWELL ToC dimensions (quality of life, societal cohesion, material conditions) and the main target groups (residents, tourists, minorities/migrants, heritage professionals). The text analysis is carried out using the identifying descriptors defined previously, it is carried out on the semi-standardised documents on factual ICH manifestations. The territorial levels considered in the analysis include the following: local, regional, trans-regional, national, trans-national, outside Europe. The analysis includes the examination of the relation between ICH and SWB dimensions (quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions). It refers to potential outcomes of ICH on SWB.

Source: HERIWELL elaboration

More details on the methodological approach are provided in the HERIWELL Interim Report “Methodology and preliminary results”, in chapter 2.2. “Content analyses: a pan-European analysis of ICH and mixed CH” and in Annex 3 to the Interim report “Intangible cultural heritage (ICH) – an operational approach and preliminary results”.

The HERIWELL approach to assessing the relevance of ICH for SWB could possibly inspire other researchers to conduct their own investigations of societal impacts of living cultural traditions. Future efforts to compare Europe-wide as well as national and regional ICH practices would again require common evaluation categories in accordance with the criteria for a recognition of ICH in the selected territorial units. The development of more harmonised recognition criteria is a task that will require more collaborative efforts involving responsible authorities, CH experts and engaged practitioners from civil society.

2.2.2 Final results of the content analysis

The following paragraph presents a synthesis of the main findings of the analysis, while the detailed results are included in chapter 2.2. “Content analyses: a pan-European analysis of ICH and mixed CH” and in Annex 3 to the Interim report “Intangible cultural heritage (ICH) – an operational approach and preliminary results”.

The analysis shows that the top four types of ICH registered on the UNESCO lists refer to ‘active engagement of the population, dedicated communities or minorities in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage’ (50% of the overall ICH), ‘different forms of supportive engagement provided by heritage communities’ (49%), ‘traditional arts (music, theatre, dance etc.) and oral expressions’ (48%) and to ‘crafts skills and their transmission / early industrial practices’ (45%). ‘Nature-related traditions / environmental care’, ‘food and beverage traditions and/or related agricultural practices’ and other forms of ICH (e.g. events of high importance for cultural tourism; Involvement of, or inspiration to, contemporary artists) are less relevant.

From a territorial distribution point of view, ICH is mostly present at local or regional level (73% of the overall analysed ICH), which implies that effects on societal well-being will be more visible at these levels than at upper ones. Only 22% of the UNESCO ICH is based at national or trans-national level.

The analysis of the relation between ICH and SWB shows that that this relation is multifaceted. ICH has potential effects on all the three macro-dimensions investigated by the HERIWELL Consortium (quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions). On the one hand this suggests that societal effects could play the largest role in ICH-related activities and on the other hand that effects of ICH on the three dimensions are not isolate, but rather interconnected. Slightly over of the analysed ICH is linked to societal cohesion (55%) and to quality of life (51), while 44% of it refers to material conditions. The role of material conditions appears to be less relevant in the case of ICH, even though a linkage has been detected (i.e. 44% of ICH on the UNESCO lists regards material conditions). The relevance of material conditions, even though lower than the other two dimensions, derives especially from opportunities for full or semi-professionals and businesses in the context of ICH manifestations.
The analysis has also considered the target groups benefitting from ICH. Residents are by large the main target group which benefits from ICH (75% of the overall target groups), followed by cultural heritage professionals (52%) and other groups, such as, for instance, shepherds or horse breeders, other professionals e.g., in gastronomy, specialised shops and trade, and religious believers and clergy (46%).

In the next reports, and in particular in the final one, the HERIWELL Consortium will integrate these findings with examples from other programmes that deal with ICH in an hybrid way, i.e. through its combination with other forms of CH (e.g. tangible, digital), such as the Council of Europe (CoE) programme Cultural routes. While a specific analysis of the CoE Cultural Routes programme was foreseen originally, the preliminary analysis conducted showed that Cultural Routes correspond only to a very limited extent to the HERIWELL SWB categories and that empirical evidence - except as regards cultural tourism - is rather scarce. There are however some examples that could provide interesting lessons for the HERIWELL project, which will be considered in the final report.

2.3 The relation between CH and individual perceptions of well-being: the HERIWELL survey

2.3.1 Methodology

The HERIWELL survey stems from the intention to take into account the Covid-19 issue, as an emerging issue that affects citizens' behaviour towards cultural heritage and culture in general. The HERIWELL survey thus aims to investigate people's perceptions on the impact of CH on SWB both in general and in the context of Covid-19. In detail, the main objectives of the HERIWELL survey are:

- Stratify respondents into ‘consumers’ or ‘active’ CH users and those not interested.
- Identify barriers that prevent or discourage the use of CH.
- Show the impacts of Covid-19 on people's view of CH and their future practice once the pandemic is gone.
- Identify the impacts of Covid-19 on people’s use of digitised heritage-related content on the internet and in social media.
- Identify different views regarding heritage-related quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions aspects.

The survey will be carried out in the following countries: Belgium, Czechia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Poland and Spain. The 8 countries were selected based on: the geographical coverage of all ESPON areas; the coverage of both EU and non-EU countries that are part of the ESPON programmes and the coverage of a large part of the ESPON countries’ population – different levels of GDP and cultural heritage resources. In addition, the selection has aimed to include some of the countries that were considered in the HERITAGE project.

The questionnaire is based exclusively on closed-ended questions (see Annex 4 to the HERIWELL Interim report). This choice was driven especially by the fact that the survey is submitted online. From the experience of the Consortium, when submitted online, closed-ended questions have a higher potential rate of responses compared to open-ended questions.

To grasp the complexity of the relationship between CH and SWB, the HERIWELL survey adopts the broad definition of both CH and SWB, detailed in the previous chapter. Thus, the survey allows the consortium to collect people’s perceptions on TCH, ICH and DCH as well as on all dimensions of SWB. Furthermore, in one of the questions, the use of the Likert scale allows us to uncover degrees of opinions of the survey sample with regards to the linkages between cultural heritage and well-being.

The survey questionnaire was submitted between the 28th of May and the 8th of June 2021 by a specialised survey company, i.e. YouGov Deutschland GmbH together with its partner institutes in the other 7 involved

---

6 The geographical scope of the heritage study includes Austria, Brussels, Flanders, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Sweden
7 It allows individuals to express how much they agree or disagree with a statement.
countries. The survey was based on online interviews with participants of the YouGov’s panels in the participating countries. The members of the panels agreed to participate in the online interviews. The panellists were invited via email with a link to a survey. Sampling was done randomly from the population of the YouGov panels according to the specifications of the HERIWELL project.

The resulting sample was weighted in addition to the quota in order to be able to guarantee a target distribution that is representative of the population. In the quota definition and weighting, current data from official statistics of the participating countries are the benchmark (starting from the characteristics age, gender and region). All the results are based on a random sample and thus fulfil the requirements for the calculation of statistical parameters and tests.

Between the 28th of May and the 8th of June 2021, a total of 8,818 people took part in the HERIWELL survey, of whom: 1,000 people in BE; 1,002 people in CZ; 2,141 in DE; 1,113 people in ES; 507 people in IE; 1,039 people in IT; 1,010 people in NO; 1,006 people in PL. The results were nationally weighted in each case and are representative of the country-specific population aged 18 and over.

In terms of gender, the sample is almost equally divided between men and women: 48%-49% of men in all the 8 countries versus 50%-52% of women.

When it comes to the age, in all the countries, but for Ireland and Norway, the percentage of people aged 55+ is higher than that of people from other age categories.

More details on the sample composition are included in Annex Survey to Population (section 1.1).

The analysis of the data is carried out through univariate8 and bivariate9 statistics in order to understand the relations between CH and SWB at the individual level. This allows the Consortium to unveil differences in respondents’ perceptions according to their social and demographic characteristics and geographical provenience, as well as on their level of participation in CH (e.g. ‘consumers’, ‘active’ CH users and non-users). In analysing people’s perception of the relation between CH and SWB during the Covid-19 period, the analysis also takes into consideration various context factors, e.g. Covid measures in the CH field, digitalisation level of the country and level of digital skills of the population.

Some initial results are provided in the following chapter. Further analyses will be carried out in the next reports.

2.3.2 Preliminary results

Validated data of the HERIWELL population survey in 8 countries arrived only a few days before the delivery of this 3rd interim report, therefore a detailed analysis of the results will be provided for the 4th Delivery with univariate and bivariate statistical analysis based on respondents characteristics and involvement in CH – derived mainly from questions 1 and 2 (intensity of CH use/involvement and non-use reasons) – and as much as possible also on some regional categories.

In the following paragraph are some initial comments on survey results relating to questions 3 on the effects of the Covid pandemic on respondents’ CH-related behaviour, and question 5 on the benefits and problems associated to CH, while preliminary elaborations of the data collected for all questions and all countries are included in Annex HERIWELL Survey to population (sections 1.2-1.10).

Question 3 refers to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on CH-related views and practices. In fact, the pandemic and the restrictions it caused across Europe had been among the key motivations of the HERIWELL team to stage the survey, since originally envisaged workshops especially in the countries selected for case studies proved to be impossible.

The table below provides an overview of the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the CH-related behaviour of respondents in the 8 countries considered by the survey.

---

8 It refers to the analysis of one variable at a time. It will include frequency tables, diagrams, etc. (Bryman, 2012).

9 It refers to the analysis of two variables at a time to see whether there is any relation between the two variables. It will include contingency tables, diagrams, etc. (Bryman, 2012).
The results show, that a majority of the respondents in most of the countries - the exception is Norway - registered negative impacts of the pandemic with regard to their heritage-related perceptions or behaviour. "Lockdowns" and other restrictions figure on top of these negative effects (for 35% of all respondents), particularly in those countries that suffered most under COVID-19 (Czech Republic, Spain and Italy). Concerns about potential repercussions for the cultural sector at large are the second most mentioned answer, in that respect (26% of the total). Restricted possibilities for social interaction and human communication were felt negatively by 16%. Daily concerns of survival in pandemic times actually lowered the interest in heritage activities for over 10% of those interviewed.

However, some of the respondents also registered a shove of motivation to engage more in heritage-related activities: about 1/5 - and even 30% in Ireland and Italy - want to see more of the national all regional cultural resources, once the pandemic is gone, for 13% this desire extends to heritage sites in other European countries. Volunteering and other practical forms of engagement are planned by over 10% of the respondents in Ireland, Italy, Spain and Poland.
Table 2.1 How did the Corona pandemic and related restrictive measures impact on your behaviour or views regarding cultural heritage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible answers (multiple choice)</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Czech Republic</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It made me feel sad that, due to the restrictions, many cultural heritage activities were impaired or impossible.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worried about the effects on the cultural sector, because I think a diverse arts and heritage sector should be sustained.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It increased my desire to see the cultural resources of the country and region where I live.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It made me feel lonely: I could not meet up with friends and other people with whom I usually go to visit exhibitions or do activities related to cultural heritage.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It lowered my interest: Due to the pandemic, survival and other daily or economic concerns became much more important than participating in any cultural heritage activity.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It increased my desire to make new heritage discoveries in other European countries.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It strengthened my desire to engage more: During the restrictions, I considered engaging more in cultural heritage activities, e.g. by donating money, joining a group practising traditional arts or crafts, or by volunteering in a museum.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The three most common answers in each country are underlined in yellow

Source: HERIWELL survey to population implemented by YouGov Germany
Question 5 of the survey proposed a number of statements regarding benefits or problems that are frequently associated with cultural heritage in Europe. Respondents could indicate whether they fully or partly agree or disagree with these statements (cf. figure 2 on the next page).

A preliminary analysis of the country differences concerning attitudes towards European cultural heritage enables some interesting insights: There seems to be an alignment between the perception of cultural heritage as a source of material wellbeing and of personal / social wellbeing. Respondents from countries that consider the potential of CH to contribute to the economy and to contemporary creation as very strong, such as those living in Italy, Spain, Poland or in the Czech Republic, are also those that perceive a more important contribution to individual and social development. The frequency of positive answers to questions related to those dimensions ranges between 80 and 90%, while respondents from Germany and Norway are situated with less enthusiastic – but still positive – answers in the range of 60 to 75% at the other end of the distribution. Among the reasons for that could be that the concept of an all-encompassing “cultural heritage” is less firmly rooted at least in Germany (which does not exclude a strong interest in some of its institutionalised forms, particularly in museums and their collections).

There are other dimensions and perceptions that deserve further exploration in the next report, such as the divergent opinions about the perils of over-tourism or other negative influences derived from cultural heritage that could even downgrade the quality of life of residents (i.e. the question with the largest variation in the answers). Answers of respondents from countries with strong similarities in most positive attitudes (Spain and Italy, for instance) suddenly differ a lot when it comes to such more negative statements.
Figure 2.2 Do you agree or disagree with the following opinions that are often associated with Europe’s cultural heritage? (Totally agree + Tend to agree)

1. Living close to places rich in cultural heritage can improve people’s quality of life (e.g. it connects with the past or raises the aesthetic quality of the environment).

2. Living close to places rich in cultural heritage can downgrade people’s quality of life (e.g. because of masses of tourists or higher costs of living and housing).

3. Learning more about, and sharing, cultural heritage in all its diversity can bring people together and help to respect minorities or migrants with their own traditions.

4. Some cultural traditions can create conflicts or hinder the integration of migrants.

5. Cultural heritage-related activities have an important role for the local economy and for creating jobs (e.g. heritage and tourism professions).

6. Areas visited by large numbers of tourists can endanger cultural heritage itself.

7. Cultural heritage is a resource for the personal development of people (e.g. as regards self-reflection, education, creativity, emotions or exchanges with others).

8. Cultural heritage is a resource for the development of society or local communities (e.g. bringing a sense of belonging, trust, common values or citizenship).

9. People should be proud of their historical monuments or sites, works of art or traditions (e.g. crafts, festivals, traditional music or dance).

10. Cultural heritage objects, patterns or practices are a resource for contemporary cultural creation (e.g. in the arts, design or architecture).

11. The meaning of cultural heritage can change over time. For example, a monument that used to be cherished can later be contested and may have to be reconsidered or even be removed.

Source: HERIWELL survey to population implemented by YouGov Germany
2.4 Cultural heritage and gender equality in a sample of countries

2.4.1 Methodology

As shown inter alia in Chapter 4 of the HERIWELL Conceptual Framework Report, the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are frequently considered as one of the potential benchmark systems for SWB. However, most of the SDG indicators do not connect directly with CH which suggests specific analytical methods to determine such links. This in mind, the HERIWELL team decided to focus on one of the goals with a positive connotation to SWB, in general, and to social inclusion as one of the three main SWB impact groups of this study, in particular: achieving gender equality (SDG #5).

The advantage of focusing on that goal is that also the European Union, in its Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022, has identified actions towards achieving more gender equality as one of its six priority areas of work. Similar to the European Commission, Council and Parliament, national and international organisations active in the different fields related to CH have called, since many years, for ensuring "gender balance at senior leadership levels" and particularly more equitable conditions in the leadership of museums. The focus on museums is due to the long-established fact that other CH institutions like archives and libraries are already considered as largely "feminised" in many EU countries, including in senior positions. Even in the field of archaeology similar trends seem to exist, according to a study carried out in several European countries.

In contrast with an empirical study conducted for the EU three decades ago, which revealed that on average only less than one third of directorship positions in art museums were occupied by women (exception: Finland), a brand-new report of an Open Method of Coordination Working Group came to the conclusion that today “…more women [are] in leadership positions. For example, women fill leading positions in over 50% of the highly frequented Swedish and Dutch museums and 63% in Italian museums. In Poland, though, only 13% of leadership positions in the most popular museums are held by women. However, the directorship of museums and galleries with higher funding tends to be dominated by men; for instance, only 23% of directors in such organisations in the UK are women.”

Such differences suggested the following research question: Can a Europe-wide SWB-trend towards an adequate gender balance in the leadership of important museums be empirically verified? In the absence of comprehensive European museums statistics covering this issue it had to be answered with an evaluation of selected institutions that could be conducted with the available resources.

From a methodological viewpoint, the definition of an “adequate gender balance” is of course crucial: For example, could a 50%-50% parity be considered an ideal solution? Or should we rather take the much higher rate of female students and graduates in university subjects who qualify for lead functions in museums and other heritage institutions – since over two decades on average 60-80% in most

---

10 https://ec.europa.eu/culture/policies/selected-themes/gender-equality
11 https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52018XG1221%2801%29
13 cf. e.g. UNESCO (2014), Gender Equality – Heritage and Creativity, p. 135
15 cf. e.g. Ministère de la culture/DEPS (2021): Observatoire de l’égalité entre femmes et hommes dans la culture et la communication 2021, Paris
16 Lazar, I. et.al. (2014). The Archaeologist of the Future is Likely to be a Woman: Age and Gender Patterns in European Archaeology. Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress
18 OMC Working Group Report “Towards Gender Equality in the Cultural and Creative Sectors”, June 2021, p.103
19 cf. the EGMUS Standard Questionnaire under https://www.egmus.eu/en/questionnaire/
of the EU countries\textsuperscript{20}? Qualified professionals in museums are considered ‘scientists’ in their field of work and are recruited accordingly. There may be different options depending on the type of museum and the aspired position, but as a rule, graduates in art history, cultural studies, archaeology or other subjects of the humanities will have good chances of success in applications. Obviously, a realistic benchmark for an optimal ratio of male or female leadership positions in museums must go beyond formal parity, i.e. situated above the 50% threshold.

To operationalise this further and in order to be on a par with existing (re)sources for the study, three additional criteria for the selection of museums or collections were developed:

a) Investigations had to focus on public institutions, since the staffing of private museums or galleries does not necessarily obey to public standards of gender equality or “mainstreaming”.

b) In order to consider truly “important” institutions in the sense of the research question, only trends in National resp. State-financed museums / collections in selected European capitals are analysed\textsuperscript{21}, starting with capitals that have a significant number of them. In order to exclude random results, at least 12 of such institutions should be available for comparison in each of the considered cities. It is envisaged that in the next Interim Report the situation in up to 4 more cities can be compared.

c) To fully take the above mentioned qualification profile for scientific museums staff into account, only directors of “cultural” museums or collections in the narrow sense are considered, including e.g. cultural history, fine art, music, film, design or crafts, ethnography, archaeology etc., i.e. technical, “political” or natural history museums are excluded from this evaluation.

As the main source for an evaluation of trends, a benchmark publication has been selected: The International Directory of Arts, 2004 edition. Its volume 1 covers institutions from all ESPON countries and provides information about the type of museum or collection as well as on the lead staff (institutions without staff information were not considered in the evaluation). Actually, the data of this source represent the situation in 2003 (editorial deadline August 2003), which in comparison with information collected for the same institutions from official websites in April and May 2021 covers a period of ca. 18 years – i.e. long enough for a trend analysis.

2.4.2 Preliminary results


These examples (to be continued in the next delivery) show an uneven development of the most prestigious (and usually well-paid) director's posts in national CH museums and collections. The share of women in that role may now be roughly on a par with other senior positions in the national administrations of EU Member States\textsuperscript{22} and clearly higher than their share among senior executives in private companies, where women reached only 18% in 2019\textsuperscript{23}. However, despite obvious progress in a gender-balanced staffing policy of State museums in European capitals, only 2 of the 6 cities reach the previously envisaged rate of above 50% female directors. In the case of Stockholm this comes almost as a surprise, since in that capital they were already above parity in 2003. In the “Compendium” information system\textsuperscript{24}, expert Tobias Harding explains the background of gender-related Swedish policies:

“The government foresees the public sector as a role model for the private sector and as ‘best practitioner’ of available effective mainstreaming instruments and measures.”

\textsuperscript{20} Source: Eurostat (educ_grad5)

\textsuperscript{21} In the case of Germany, also 88 public “provincial” museums / collections were analysed. However, their results did not differ significantly from those of the State institutions in Berlin.

\textsuperscript{22} IPOL Dept. of the European Parliament (2021): The Gender Gap in the EU’s Public Employment and Leadership. Brussels. p. 16

\textsuperscript{23} Eurostat News release no. 40/2020

\textsuperscript{24} Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, 2021 – www.culturalpolicies.net
Already during the preparation of its technical offer and later in its first conceptual report, the HERIWELL team had reflected on the question whether interpretations and actions connected with cultural heritage are mainly mirroring changing societal values and practices or whether they could also be seen as drivers of such changes. The above results demonstrate that the latter option can principally be a real one – if there is a true political will or societal pressure to make it possible.

Since European statistics do not yet provide gendered data for the leadership of museums, it is recommended that the EGMUS Standard Questionnaire should be enlarged to enable a future gender monitoring in that respect. As an alternative, the European Institute for Gender Equality could be asked to provide such data at least for the largest museums in the EU (similar to the gendered data of management positions of broadcasting organisations that are already published by EIGE).
The UK State-financed CH institutions can differ from those in other countries (includes e.g. “arm’s length” bodies). However, like in the other capitals, the museums compared are the same.

Source: HERIWELL ERICarts’ elaborations on the International Directory of Arts 2004 (Deadline August 2003) and online research April and May 2021 on the same museums or collections (absolute figures for comparable institutions)
2.5 Contested heritage and societal well-being

2.5.1 Methodology for an initial assessment

Responding to proposals made in online seminars and in discussions with the ESPON PST as well as to recent incidents such as anti-colonialist debates and actions, the HERIWELL research team decided to explore issues of contested or neglected CH in European regions further. Clearly, highlighting well-being impacts of cultural heritage in the HERIWELL study requires to also consider issues of potential “bad-being” effects, including cases, where key European values are at stake.

When considering contested or neglected CH in European regions, a number of well-known cases and issues could be named including, but not limited to: toppled or damaged statues of colonialist heroes in Belgium and the UK; Franco’s “Valle de los Caídos” memorial built by prisoners in Spain; unclear provenance of objects in European museums; conflicts around Soviet monuments in the Baltic states; cultural traditions excluding women or migrants, or ethnic minorities; restoration works blocked by economic or political interests in Eastern Europe; looted sites in occupied Cyprus; restitution issues regarding artworks seized by Nazis in Austria, Germany and the Netherlands; debates on “Fascist architecture” in Italy etc. etc.

For a realistic mapping of the most important recent debates and incidents, it is crucial to systematically collect examples that stand for the most important CH-related conflicts, historical burdens or forms of neglect as well as for their impacts.

Given time and resources constraints, we have involved the HERIWELL country experts with a questionnaire asking them to provide an initial list of contested heritage in their country. Where experts point to general issues in their countries, they are asked to specify them with a local or regional case that has recently gained special public attention (cf. Annex 1.2). Results are expected to arrive before the summer break and will allow us to provide an initial mapping with identified locations in ESPON countries. In order to make sure that all ESPON countries will be represented in the map, we will involve additional experts from European organisations with a CH background.

The proposed exercise aims at a systematic mapping of contested heritage grouping the different cases into the following categories (to be identified in the map):

- historical burdens (e.g. restitution claims or debates);
- political or military conflicts;
- financing; budget problems;
- neglect, caused e.g. by insufficient CH protection rules;
- discrimination of social groups; lack of respect for minorities’ CH;
- lack of conservation specialists or facilities
- Other (which?):

The aim of this exercise is to show that Cultural heritage is not per se sacrosanct, its background increasingly under scrutiny, its values sometimes contested, its protection dependent on political or societal choices.

2.5.2 Preliminary results

The analysis is ongoing and the preliminary results will be included in the next reports.
3 Cultural heritage and societal well-being at the local level: case studies

3.1 Analysing the mechanism linking CH to well-being: the HERIWELL case studies

3.1.1 Methodology

To understand the multifaceted nature of the linkages between cultural heritage and societal well-being dimensions and sub-dimensions, the HERIWELL consortium proposes to conduct 8 case studies at local level. To collect additional information on how heritage impacts on societal well-being in the context of Covid-19, ideally case study information should be integrated with the information derived from the HERIWELL survey on population (Annex 4). Thus, case studies and the survey should be conducted in the same countries: Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Poland and Spain.

Case studies aim to produce knowledge for policymakers interested in fostering societal well-being through cultural heritage. In particular, they pursue the following goals:

- collect more fine-grained information on the impacts of cultural heritage at the local level;
- test empirical methods of impact assessment;
- provide policy-relevant insights on how specific results have been achieved, and how to learn from them.

The unit of analysis of case studies will be exemplary practices (different types of initiatives, comprising programmes, policies and projects), centred on a cultural heritage resource in one of the selected European countries, deemed to contribute to different types of societal well-being. The focus on exemplary practices will allow the HERIWELL Consortium to identify strategies and political strategies that contributed to societal well-being results, to explore the reasons why those results occurred.

Two are the main questions that will guide the drafting of case studies:

- What kind of change in the SWB dimensions can be detected related to the CH considered in the case study? How can it be measured?
- Why has the impact been generated?

To provide an answer to these questions and to capture the multifaceted nature of the linkages between CH and SWB, case studies will rely on the broad definition of CH (tangible, intangible and digital) and SWB detailed in chapter 1.

Following the two guiding questions, case studies will include two main parts:

- The initial part that refers to the identification of the impacts of relevant cultural heritage-related interventions to the different dimensions of societal well-being. The analysis and quantification of impacts will be undertaken through a variety of methodologies combining qualitative (e.g. desk analysis of the case official and unofficial documents, interviews, focus groups, workshops, content analysis), quantitative (e.g. surveys) and big data (e.g. sentiment analysis of Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Wikipedia) methods and tools. Methodologies will be selected based on the specificities of each case and type of policy strategy analysed within the specific case.
- The second part refers to the identification, based on a policy analysis approach, of the elements of the case history that are conducive to the results and impacts achieved. The qualitative analysis of the policies will be realised through the heuristic of extrapolation. Extrapolation25 is

---

25 For more details on the extrapolation approach, see chapter 3.1.1. of the HERIWELL interim report
used (among other circumstances) when actors believe that replicating models will not generate the same effects in their undertaking because of differences in situational or contextual factors. Under an extrapolation-based design, actors would narrow down the design problem to devise locally feasible elements that would intentionally activate a causal process such as the one evident in the functioning of the design exemplar. This method derives from the realist approach to evaluation proposed by Pawson\(^{26}\), even though it focuses more on the role of policy features as a way to purposively produce change.

The elements of an extrapolative case study as we understand them (Melloni, Pesce, Vasilescu 2016\(^{27}\)) are:

- context features such as institutions, rules and historical events, explaining the motivations of the CH-related intervention and its worth for the societal well-being;
- policy features – characteristics of the CH-related intervention and the implementation process, and SWB dimension addressed;
- mechanisms triggering specific policy outcomes in the SWB domain. Mechanisms are causal explanations of why the context features combined with process features shape the behaviours of some policy actors and trigger some kind of change. In this context, mechanisms are used for their learning potential, thanks to their relative general application. A list of mechanisms has been included in Annex 5.1 “Social mechanisms: an example” to the Interim Report.
- project and policy outcomes – with particular reference to changes in the actors’ behaviours congruent with the policy goal. This implies a preliminary identification of the success (or failure) elements of the analysed policy intervention.

These elements are at the basis of the case study template included in Annex 2.3.

From an operational point of view, the drafting of case studies includes the following steps:

**Figure 3.1 Steps in drafting case studies**

![Diagram showing steps in drafting case studies]

Source: HERIWELL Consortium’s elaboration

Annex 2.1 provides more details on the steps for the delivery of case studies.

---


3.1.2 The HERIWELL proposed cases

The 8 exemplary practices proposed for an in-depth analysis were selected among the practices mapped by the HERIWELL country experts (see Annex 10.4 to the HERIWELL Interim Report), from the analysis of databases of good practices (such as the Creative Europe projects database, the UNESCO list of case studies on local development\(^{28}\) and others), and from the findings of the outreach activities with HERIWELL supporting partners.

The main criteria for the selection of case studies are:

- experiences located in one of the eight countries selected for the HERIWELL survey to population, i.e. Czechia, Belgium, Germany, Norway, Ireland, Italy, Poland and Spain;
- experiences focusing on a tangible, intangible, digital and mixed cultural heritage resource, offering a strong connection with one of the identified dimensions of SWB (quality of life; societal cohesion and material conditions);
- experiences that already offer a relevant evidence to be analysed (in this sense, initial or promising practices will not be selected) and on which some data are already available;
- variety among the types of policies promoted (e.g. digitisation, accessibility and bottom-up participation) and of the targeted population (e.g. local community, tourists and minorities).

The table below provides an overview of the proposed case studies. More details are included in Annex 2.2.

**Table 3.1 Overview of proposed case studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Case study title</th>
<th>Type of policy</th>
<th>Type of CH</th>
<th>SWB dimension and sub-dimension</th>
<th>SWB sub-dimension</th>
<th>Target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>ECoC Mons</td>
<td>Heritage refurbishment; Cultural participation Digitisation</td>
<td>Mixed heritage</td>
<td>Societal cohesion</td>
<td>Cultural diversity, Place identity and symbolic representation</td>
<td>Residents, Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Material conditions</td>
<td>Jobs and earnings, Territorial attractiveness and branding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Handicraft in the Czech Republic and the blueprint as an example of good practice</td>
<td>Cultural participation</td>
<td>ICH</td>
<td>Quality of life:</td>
<td>Education and skills, including digitisation and digital skills, Happiness and life satisfaction, Quality and sustainability of environment</td>
<td>Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Societal cohesion</td>
<td>Integration and empowerment of minorities, migrants and other disadvantaged groups; other issues related to social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Material conditions</td>
<td>Jobs and earnings, Territorial attractiveness and branding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>ECoC City of Weimar</td>
<td>Cultural Participation Heritage Refurbishment</td>
<td>TCH</td>
<td>Societal cohesion</td>
<td>Equal opportunities, Human rights, freedom of expression, Integration and empowerment of</td>
<td>Residents, Tourists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Case study title</th>
<th>Type of policy</th>
<th>Type of CH</th>
<th>SWB dimension and sub-dimension</th>
<th>SWB sub-dimension</th>
<th>Target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Arquitecturas de la Memoria</td>
<td>Cultural Accessibility Participatory Governance</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>Education and skills, including digitisation and digital skills Knowledge and research</td>
<td>Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Community Led Village Design Statements</td>
<td>Participatory Urban Regeneration</td>
<td>TCH</td>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>Quality and sustainability of environment</td>
<td>Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sami</td>
<td>Repatriation, Restitution</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Societal cohesion</td>
<td>Cultural diversity Human rights, freedom of expression Integration and empowerment of minorities, migrants and other disadvantaged groups; other issues related to social inclusion Trust (in communities, institutions …)</td>
<td>Sami Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Museum of Podgorze - Krakow</td>
<td>Cultural Participation Cultural Accessibility</td>
<td>TCH</td>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>Education and skills, including digitisation and digital skills Happiness and life satisfaction Quality and sustainability of environment</td>
<td>Residents Tourists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the Italian case study is ongoing and preliminary results are included in the next chapter*

Source: HERIWELL team of country experts
3.1.3 The HERIWELL pilot case study: interim results

The MANN museum in Naples (IT) has been selected as a pilot case study according to the following criteria:

- It is located in Italy (i.e. a country covered by the HERIWELL survey of population) and is the beneficiary of a large amount of ESIF investments (EUR 39,859,275.71).
- It tackles various types of CH (mainly tangible and digital).
- It prompted a plurennial strategy to develop and strengthen the relationship with the local community, often vulnerable from a social and economic point of view, as well as to enhance the inclusion of minorities through specific projects. The museum has also a policy promoting the full accessibility to its collections for both residents, with unlimited access to the museum, and the wider community through enhanced digital accessibility. More in general, the goal is to make the museum a resource for the critical thinking of people, thanks to an increase in the physical, economic and cognitive accessibility.

The analysis of the case study has taken into consideration data provided by the museum (e.g., on-site visitors and ticketing revenues, and online users of the social networks of the museum), in order to analyse their evolution over time. A specific analysis has been carried out on the number of visits to the Wikipedia page of the Museum through mobile and desktop users, with particular attention to the dynamics in the period of Covid-19 restrictions. Moreover, an experimental text analysis was carried out on all the reviews to the ‘Father and son’ videogame written in Italian and English (1 215 in Italian language and 7 500 reviews in English language) between 2016 and April 2021. The analysis allows for the representation of word clouds of the most used lemmas, clusters of the main semantic areas, and graphs representing the linkages among the lemmas within each clusters. Moreover, interviews with relevant stakeholders have been carried out to verify and discuss the findings of the analysis.

The following paragraphs present a synthesis of the main findings emerging from the case study, while the full case study is presented in Annex 2.4.

The focus of the case study was on the digitalisation strategy of the MANN, as a way to foster the cognitive accessibility of the Museum. The museum is present in several social networks and in the Google Arts & Culture platform; it has also developed specific educational and digital policies. The museum developed in 2017 the video game Father and Son, the first videogame in the world published by an archaeological museum: screen after screen, it takes the audience in an adventure that, using as a cornerstone the MANN’s collections and its rooms, works as a bridge between different historical eras. The Museum also fostered several other projects to improve the accessibility of resources to impaired people and for offering new entertainment experiences for different target audiences.

According to the preliminary theory of change drawn in the HERIWELL inception report, the type of societal well-being (SWB) outcomes impacted by the MANN’s digitisations strategy are the following (see figure 3.2 below): 1) at societal level: enhanced integration and inclusion; strengthened place identity and symbolic representation; and, 2) at individual level: improvement in education level and digital skills.

Even though very dynamic, the digitisation strategy of the MANN is quite recent. Available data show the increase of the MANN’s online followers, users and online popularity, that pair with a relevant increase (pre-Covid) of the number of visitors, and ticket revenues. However, new reflections, and analysis have been required to appreciate if and how the digitisation policy has contributed to other outcome dimensions of societal well-being.

The social network and digital tools data allow for an enrichment of information about the characteristics and type of the online users, in particularly their gender, age and place of living. The analysis shows that in the case of MANN, the digital tools used until now involved more woman (that prevail online, differently from what happens in visits in person), middle-aged people, and people living in Naples, city’s surroundings and Southern Italy. Moreover, there is an important role of connection with the Italian communities abroad. These findings account for the contribution of digitisation to enhance equal opportunities and inclusion. Further reflection and activities should be to use the digitisation strategy in a truly international perspective, from one side, and to engage young people, on the other side, for which different, more targeted approaches are required.
Regarding users’ behaviours, the analysis of Wikipedia mobile consultation trends shows that people consult the MANN’s Wikipedia page when they are planning an on-site visit. This also shows the possibility of using the indicator ‘number of mobile visits to Wikipedia pages in a specific period’, as a proxy of actual visits, when primary data are lacking.

Other findings derive from the experimental text analysis of the reviews to the Father and Son videogame, developed starting from the archaeological collections of the Museum. The analysis clustered the comments into three main types: comments on the videogame; emotions and reflections; heritage discovery and appreciation. Apart from the comments on the quality of the videogame, the other clusters show how this innovative form of communicating the archaeological heritage stimulated the gamers’ reflections about what could be summarised as the archetypes of the human history, thanks to the emotions provoked by the story narrated. Secondly, comments refer to the capacity of the game to stimulate a new learning experience (i.e., learning about the past in a different way). Finally, the game stimulated the foreigners’ desire to visit the Museum and Naples, and/or the pride to belong to Naples or Italy.

Some mechanisms seem to favour the contribution of the different streams of the MANN’s digitisation strategy to the identified SWB results. The main mechanisms refer to: the appreciation of the MANN’s heritage; the pride to belong to the same ‘cradle of history’; the entertainment and amusement of the new communication tool (the game); and most of all, the emotions that cultural heritage can arouse, when communicated with special attention to this aspect.

It is worth noting that these outcomes and mechanisms do not depend only from the digital tools themselves, but also from the conservation, care and development of the Museum’s heritage, developed through many other different policies. The MANN’s strategic plan aims at achieving, and probably has already achieved, other types of societal outcomes, not fully accounted for in this case study. As main examples are the restoration expansion and communication of the collections, that amplified the visitors and ticket revenues; and the ‘enhanced community engagement’, that is expected to derive from the intense strategy of cooperation with local actors and from the initiatives to present the Museum and its gardens as a resource open to the city and its inhabitants. The latter cooperation should also benefit the economic chain of the museum, thanks to the various marketing initiatives that have been promoted.

**Figure 3.2 The theory of change of the MANN’s digitisation strategy**
4 The contribution of EU investments to societal well-being

4.1 Societal well-being and CH in ESIF investments

4.1.1 Methodology

To assess the contribution of ESIF investments in Cultural Heritage to social well-being at regional level, we propose to use a mixed quali-quantitive methodology approach based on three steps, as presented in the following figure.

Figure 4.1 Methodological approach

Step 1: Mapping of project/allocations on CH in ESI funds

This step is composed by three sub-steps.

Sub-step 1.1: Collecting data and mapping financial allocations in CH from the Open Cohesion categorisation data.

The Open Cohesion categorisation data of the ERDF/ESF/Cohesion Fund programmes, allows an analysis of the EU financial allocations only for ERDF, focusing on intervention fields related to the cultural heritage sector. The Open Cohesion categorisation data does not provide information on the total number of projects related to CH.

In the 2014–2020 programming period, 5 out of 123 intervention fields in the Open Cohesion categorisation system, are related to the cultural sector and two specifically to cultural heritage:

- 76 – Development and promotion of cultural and creative assets in SMEs;
- 77 – Development and promotion of cultural and creative services in or for SMEs;

• 79 – Access to public sector information (including open data e-Culture, digital libraries, e-Content and e-Tourism);
• 94 – Protection, development and promotion of public cultural and heritage assets;
• 95 – Development and promotion of public cultural and heritage services.

Sub-step 1.1 is therefore focussed on **ERDF investment 2014-2020 in CH**, under the specific investment field 94 - *Protection, development and promotion of public cultural and heritage assets* and the intervention field 95 - *Development and promotion of public cultural and heritage services*. In addition, we consider the investment allocated to the intervention field related to cultural heritage under the IPAE fund for territorial cooperation.

Using open cohesion data it has been possible to consider the cumulate planned ERDF allocations 2014–2020 in CH in terms of: (i) incidence % of CH allocations over total ERDF planned allocations, and (ii) ERDF CH allocations per inhabitants (using data on population by region from Eurostat).

The data is provided for each regional and national programme allowing us to calculate allocations at NUTS 2 level for the 15 Member States that have regional programmes. Conversely, AT, BG, CZ, DK, FI, HR, HU, RO, SI have programmes only at national level, and BE, DE, NL, UK have programmes at NUTS 1 level.

Allocations related to CH are reported by 21 MSs, while no specific allocations on CH are reported for AT, DK, LU and NL.

**Sub-step 1.2: collecting data available on projects and financial investment funded under ERDF, ESF and EAFRD from the national data-sources.**

As highlighted in the first Interim report³⁰, managing authorities classify interventions discretionally and therefore some interventions on cultural heritage may be classified under other categories than 94 or 95 or may be financed under other ESIF funds (e.g. ESF and EAFRD). In order to overcome this issue and the lack of data on the number of projects, we propose in this sub-step to collect and map the data available on the number of projects and financial investment funded under ERDF, ESF and EAFRD in the national data sources. This will allow us to individuate, through the use of keywords, the presence of projects addressing CH and SWB and classified by managing authorities in other investment categories. The specific objective of this assessment is to derive the total number of projects and investments in CH at national (and regional level) in the 2014–2020 programme period.

Table 4.3 in Annex 4.2 presents evidence of the recognition conducted by the HERIWELL country experts on national databases available in their countries. The recognition shows that, while for ESF and ERDF information is available in most of the EU MSs, less information is available regarding the EAFRD. As in many countries, databases or websites available on EAFRD do not include the information needed for the mapping of the cultural heritage projects, the Consortium decided to use the European Network for Rural Development (ENRD) database that includes an overview of all projects funded. However, the database presents some limits: the information cannot be downloaded in a database format that allows automatic elaborations, which implies that a database has to be created manually; the general information included in the dataset synthesis is not always complete (e.g. territorial level is missing from the dataset), which implies that the reading of the project syntheses (in a pdf format) available in the dataset is needed. Despite these flaws, the dataset still proves useful for understanding the resources allocated to cultural heritage. Furthermore, as the pdf synthesis includes an overview of the main results, the dataset is also useful for understanding the linkages between EAFRD investments and SWB dimensions. The analysis will be conducted at NUTs 0 level, as not only the territorial level is not associated to a NUTS2 region, but it also varies extensively between projects and in the case of some projects (i.e. LEADER) only the NUTs 0 level is provided.

---

³⁰ [https://www.espon.eu/HERIWELL](https://www.espon.eu/HERIWELL)
To identify the projects involving CH investments in national open databases, country experts have been asked to perform a search using multiple keywords\(^31\) (in their national language) and then to extract the list of projects potentially dealing with the topics of the HERIWELL research for ERDF (excluding INTERREG projects) and ESF. The experts have been asked to organise the information in databases, with data disaggregated at regional level whenever possible. The databases received in time for this report cover the 2014-2020 programming periods for the following countries: AT, BE, BG, CY, DK, EE, EL, ES, FR, HR, IE, IT, LV, LT, HU, MT, NL, PL, RO, SK, FI, SE, UK. Portugal, Luxembourg, Germany, Slovenia and Czech Republic are still pending or have to be checked due to significant differences with evidence from the Open Cohesion categorization data.

Sub-step 1.3. collecting data and information on projects funded under the programme ETC Interreg Europe (Interregional Cooperation Programme) from the keep.eu online portal.

The ETC Interreg Europe also involves countries not covered by the ESIF analysis (for example, Norway). To avoid duplication problems between the participating regions, it was decided to consider a single source for this programme: the online portal keep.eu, which provides aggregated data regarding projects and beneficiaries of European Union cross-border, transnational and interregional cooperation programmes among Member States, and between Member States and neighbouring or pre-accession countries. This database has been created and is maintained by the Interact Programme, with the support of the European Commission and the remaining Interreg, Interreg IPA cross-border, ENPI/ENI, and IPA-IPA cross-border programmes.

For the 2014-2020 programming period the database covers the following countries: BE, DK, DE, EE, ES, FR, HR, IT, LV, LT, LU, HU, MT, NL, NO, PL, PT, RO, CH, SI, SK, FI, SE, UK, IE, AT, CZ, EL, CY, BG.

The portal was queried with the following steps:

- Step 1: extrapolation of the projects for Interreg Europe 2014-2020 classified under the theme cultural heritage and arts;
- Step 2: use of the keywords adopted for the ERDF/ESF mapping to double check if the database extracted in the first step was complete and cleaning of the database to avoid duplications;
- Step 3: Checks on selected projects (selected with keywords) to ensure they are linked to cultural heritage as framed in the HERIWELL project.

Step 2: Selection of SWB indicators

According to the operational definition of societal well-being and the pan-european analysis presented in chapter 1, several indicators available at regional NUTS 2 level have been identified as proxies of the three societal well-being dimensions identified in the HERIWELL ToC. The list of indicators is presented in table 3.1 in Annex 3.1 and summarised in Box 1.2 in chapter 1.

Step 3: Correlation analysis

The third methodological step is a correlation analysis between the ESIF investment in CH and the SWB indicators. Correlations express the linear relationship between two variables and are widely used to describe simple relationships without any cause and effect implications.

The correlation analysis will be carried out considering on one side the cumulate planned ESIF allocations 2014–2020 by Fund (ERDF, ESF and Interreg) in CH in terms of: (i) incidence % of CH allocations over ESIF planned allocations (by Fund), and (ii) ERDF CH allocations per inhabitants; and, on the other side, the list of SWB indicators available at NUTS2 level in terms of: (i) the latest available data, (ii) the average 2014–2019 period, and (iii) the change between 2014 and 2019 where available.

More detailed insights on the role of ESIF funds in supporting specific strategies/policies that contribute to societal well-being will derive from some of the case studies.

Next steps to be carried out for Delivery 4

\(^{31}\) Cultural heritage; museum, library; monument; protected building; church; religious building; archaeological site; archives; industrial heritage; cultural / historical events; rituals; festivities; traditional crafts / arts; digital heritage / collections; digitization of libraries / museums / archives.
To complete the analysis of ESIF investments in CH the following activities will be done:

- **final update of the mapping** on ERDF financial allocations based on the Open Cohesion categorisation data;
- **analysis the Major Project Database** in order to find interventions related to CH: the database contains 575 major projects, of which only 373 provide an English translation of the project title. A keyword search will be carried out to assess how many of these projects are CH related. A preliminary analysis in English, Italian and French resulted in only two projects related to the field of cultural heritage in Italy;
- **fine tuning the recognition** on projects and financial investment funded under ERDF, ESF from the national data-sources;
- **harmonization with respect to the same territorial level of the indicators on projects and allocations and SWB and final correlation analysis**: this will require the completion of the data collection at national level and of the checks for internal consistency, as well as the harmonisation of the data (ESIF indicators and SWB indicators) at the same territorial level, in order to make data comparable across countries with differences in the NUTS level and proceed with further elaborations.
- **analysis of the ENRD EAFRD dataset at EU level** in order to find interventions in cultural heritage and to understand the links between them and SWB. To this end the following actions will be undertaken: key search word to identify investments in cultural heritage (from an initial search using the cultural heritage key word 183 projects have been identified); content analysis of the projects results section to identify the HERIWELL SWB dimensions for which outcomes have been achieved; descriptive statistical analysis to pinpoint the overall amount invested in cultural heritage in rural areas, the distribution of investments among ESPON countries (where investments are available), the average dimension of investments in cultural heritage in rural environments overall and among ESPON countries; content analysis to identify the SWB dimensions and sub-dimensions for which outcomes have been achieved; overall analysis of data collected and interpretation of results.

In addition, we will provide for each country analysed (the EU 28MSs and countries involved in the ETC programme) a Country Fiche summarizing the evidence emerging from the country-level recognition. The template of the Country fiche is included in Annex 4.4.

### 4.1.2 Interim results

This section presents the preliminary results according the above methodology.

**Step 1: Mapping of ESIF allocations on CH**

**ERDF allocations resulting from the Open Cohesion database**

According to data in the Open Cohesion Categorisation system[^32], about EUR 6.7 billion of ERDF funds (equivalent to 3.4 % of total allocated ERDF funds) have been invested up to 2020 in the sector of culture in the 2014–2020 programming period.

As shown in figure 4.1, the largest part of these funds is allocated to CH: about EUR 4.866 million under the specific investment field 94 - Protection, development and promotion of public cultural and heritage assets (72 % of total planned allocations under ERDF), and EUR 499 million (8 %) under the intervention field 95 - Development and promotion of public cultural and heritage services. Additional EUR 67 million have been allocated to the intervention field related to cultural heritage under the IPAES fund for territorial cooperation.

Figure 4.2 Distribution of total planned allocations by intervention fields related to the cultural sector in the EU – euro and % – cumulative 2014–2020

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on Open Cohesion data

When it comes to ERDF investments in CH (cod_94 and cod_95), available data show the following (figures 4.3, 4.4 and map 4.1):

- EU MSs with the highest allocations (absolute amount) are PL (EUR 1.026 billion), PT (EUR 768 m), IT (EUR 713 million), CZ (EUR 408 million) and RO (EUR 313 million).
- Compared to 2.7 % of the EU average, MSs with the highest incidence of CH allocations over total ERDF allocations are MT (14.2 %), PT (7%) and CY (5 %); in Poland and Italy, CH accounts for 2.5 % and 3.3 % of total ERDF allocations respectively.
- Regions with the highest incidence in CH allocations over total ERDF allocations are: Centro, PT (17.2% –EUR 312 million); Alentejo, PT (14.6 % –EUR 132 million); Valle d’Aosta, IT (14.4 % –EUR 5 million); Ionian Islands, EL (14.3 % –EUR 19 million); Malta (14.2 % –EUR 48 million); Limousin, FR (10 % –EUR 13 million); South Aegean, EL (9.2 % –EUR 5 million); Continental Greece, EL (9.1 % –EUR 6 million); Umbria, IT (9 % –EUR 19 million); Nord-Pas-de-Calais, FR (8.9 % –EUR 60 million); Région de Bruxelles-Capitale, BE (8.2 % –EUR 8 million) and Norte, PT (8.1 % –EUR 229 million).
- Portuguese regions also show the highest level of allocations per inhabitant: the CH allocation per capita is more than €100 in Alentejo (€183), the Autonomous Region of the Azores (€147), Centro (€147); also Malta and the Ionian Islands, EL register high levels of per capita allocations for CH, at €104 and €92 respectively.
**Figure 4.3** Total planned allocations in intervention fields related to CH in EU by country – millions of euro, cumulative 2014–2020

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on Open Cohesion data - TC = Territorial Cooperation.

**Figure 4.4** Planned allocations in intervention fields related to CH in EU by country – incidence percentage over total ERDF allocations, cumulative 2014–2020

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on Open Cohesion data
Map 4.1 Planned ERDF allocation in intervention fields related to CH (94 and 95), Cumulative 2014–2020 (incidence of total ERDF allocations, % and euro per capita)

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on Open Cohesion and Eurostat data.

Note: NUTS 0 for AT, BG, CZ, DK, FI, HR, HU, RO, SI; NUTS 1 for BE, DE, NL, UK; NUTS 2 all other MSs.

Delivery 4 will present an updated analysis with data available by August 2021.

**ERDF and ESF projects and allocations resulting from national databases**

A first analysis of the national databases received in time for this report shows that overall, 6,004 projects related to cultural heritage under ERDF (Interreg excluded) and 381 under ESF have been financed in the 2014–2020 programming period under ERDF and ESF for a total amount of, respectively EUR 5,408,384,309 and 172,585,097.6, equivalent to 2.7% and 0.2% of the total planned allocations on these two funds.
Table 4.1: Projects and total allocations in CH under ERDF (INTERREG excluded) and ESF according to national databases, Cumulative 2014-2020 (n. of projects and EUR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ERDF (excluded ETC)</th>
<th></th>
<th>ESF</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECTS</td>
<td>ALLOCATIONS</td>
<td>PROJECTS</td>
<td>ALLOCATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3651728.01</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2468266.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64969970.38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5442325.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>122232812.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9140522.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3948023</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19968285.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1207643</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4053732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>101019869.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>116819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>774247554.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3856531.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>306334864.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2732799.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4934527</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5026480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41704166</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3767682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>203133108.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2465568.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46102000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>340000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>455000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>825831738.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1143577.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>157003198.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>127104958.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>95193193.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1033837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23400000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1472674208</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1424429.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>400534999.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10939874.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37102109</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6927867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>519482975.7</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>50370406.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23706322</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3308372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6004</td>
<td>5408384309</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>172585097.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on Opencohesion and data provided by the HERIWELL team of country experts

As clearly emerges from this first assessment (see table 4.4 in Annex 4.3), in the majority of countries (excluding BG, CY, FR, HU, IE and UK, which will be further checked with the national experts), the number of ERDF projects involving CH are greater than those indicated in the Open Cohesion database under the 94 and 95 categories. In addition, although the ERDF projects on CH are the majority, some CH projects have also been funded under the ESF, showing that many projects dealing with CH are classified by Managing Authorities under other codes, besides the codes 94 and 95 of the ERDF.

Average allocations per project under ERDF and ESF in the relevant fields of cultural heritage, as identified by the national experts from national data-bases, are presented in Maps 4.2 and 4.3 while Annex 4.3 presents maps on the number of projects and total allocations.

While for the majority of countries it has been possible to collect information at NUTS 2 level, for France data are available only at NUTS 1 level, and for Latvia, Lithuania and Slovakia only at national level. For this
reason, we will have to harmonise the data at the same regional level (using averages) in order to proceed with further elaborations, as done in Delivery 2\(^3\).

Furthermore, in four countries (FI, IT, BG, SE), a number of projects related to Cultural Heritage have been identified in National Operational Programmes without any indication on how allocations have been distributed at regional level (for example, in Italy the National Operational Program on “Culture and Development” -NOP Culture and Development, and the National Operational Programme “Città Metropolitane” -NOP Metropolitan Cities).

**Map 4.2 ERDF (INTERREG excluded) average allocation in CH according to national databases, Cumulative 2014–2020 (mio. EUR per project)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average allocation per project (ERDF) in Cultural Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legend:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average ERDF allocation (mio EUR per project) in the relevant fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,5 · 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 · 1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5 · 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No projects identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Warning: In addition to regional values (ERDF), the Expert for IT allocated also 3 Projects of national level in the relevant fields for a total of EUR 4,055,311.58 (IT). In total: 766,003,003 per project.

In addition to regional values (ERDF), the Expert for SE allocated also 3 Projects of national level in the relevant fields for a total of EUR 25,333,513 (SE) EUR 27,392,346.59 per project.

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on data provided by the HERIWELL team of country experts

---

\(^3\) https://www.espon.eu/HERIWELL
Map 4.3 ESF average allocation in CH according to national databases, Cumulative 2014–2020 (mio. EUR per project)

**Legend:**
- Average ESF allocation (mio EUR per project) in the relevant fields:
  - < 0.5
  - 0.5 - 1
  - 1 - 1.5
  - 1.5 - 2
  - > 2
  - No projects identified
  - Pending

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on data provided by the HERIWELL team of country experts

**Interreg expenditures on CH**

As far as concern the database on INTERREG (step 1.3), it is possible to make 3 types of selection: the list of lead partner, the list of partners and the list of calls. Using information available in the keep.eu portal on the partners’ localisation at NUTS level it will be possible to sum up the total eligible budget / expenditure at regional (NUTS2) level. The following maps provide an overview of the allocations under INTERREG in the relevant fields of cultural heritage (as defined in the methodology).

Map 4.4 INTERREG total eligible budget/expenditure in CH, Cumulative 2014–2020 (EUR)

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on data provided by keepsearch.eu
**Step 3: Correlation analysis**

A first explorative correlation analysis has been carried out considering the cumulative planned ERDF allocations 2014–2020 in CH resulting from Open Cohesion data (Annex 4.3, table 4.4) and a subset of the SWB indicators available at NUTS2.

The preliminary analysis presented in Annex 3.1 shows a general low level of correlation between ERDF allocations in CH and the SWB indicators, even if the correlation signs show a positive relationship between CH allocations and SWB. These preliminary results reflect the complexity of the relationship and the difficulty of grasping it at macro level, as discussed in Chapter 1.

Among Quality of Life indicators, ERDF allocations in CH are positively correlated with the tertiary education attainment indicator and the adult participation in lifelong learning indicator, while the correlation is negative with the Public Expenditure in R&D indicator.

Looking at the Societal Cohesion dimensions, ERDF allocations in CH are positively correlated with indicators of freedom over life choices, job opportunities, making friends and volunteering, while a higher incidence of ERDF allocations in CH is associated to lower poverty risks, severe deprivation, and inequality (NEET rate and the employment gender gap).

### 4.2 Creative Europe investments in CH

#### 4.2.1 Methodology

The Creative Europe programme funds some special actions targeting CH. According to the Commission’s mid-term evaluation of the Creative Europe programme, in the period 2014–2016 it delivered an estimated 4,200 activities, 89 % of which focused on common creation of artworks, and reached an estimated 8.83 million people. They contributed strongly to transnational mobility of creative and cultural players as well as enabled cooperation between EU and third-country cultural organisations.

Even though Creative Europe is a secondary source of funding for CH investments, it includes some special actions and regular funding that target CH and foster impacts on some dimensions of societal well-being. The official source of Creative Europe project results is the Creative Europe webpage. According to the database, 4,451 projects in the cultural and creative sectors have been funded in the programming period 2014–2020. In the database, the relevant information available are: Programme (for the purpose of this study, only Creative Europe has been considered), Funding year, Start date/End date, Project summary, Coordinator’s country, Partners’ countries and Expected Funding. However, the database does not provide any information on the investments by type of sector or topic (e.g. cultural heritage). Furthermore, the advance search tools do not allow a categorisation of projects according to their topic(s) or investment sectors.

Within this context, in order to identify projects related to CH investments, it was agreed to proceed by using a manual search of the database. To this end, in order to include the largest amount of potentially relevant projects, the keyword “Heritage” is used. However, in the next steps of the analysis other key words, experimented within the ESIF analysis, will be tested to capture all cultural heritage projects.

Once the list of projects including the selected keyword is extracted, researchers need to operate an additional manual data cleaning to avoid the inclusion of any projects not dealing with CH, or not relevant for the aim of this study. Just for providing an example, the search with the key term ‘heritage’ will also include in the automatic extraction also files where the key work “heritage” is presented in negative such as ‘This project does not focus specifically on cultural heritage’. The manual data cleaning thus allows to delete these kind of projects from the final list of the projects to be analysed.

For each project included in the final list the following analysis are provided according to the steps below:

- **Step 1:** each project of the final cleaned list is manually associated to one of the macro-categories of CH (“tangible”, “intangible”, “digital”) individuated in the methodology by the HERIWELL team;
- **Step 2:** the totality of the projects of the final cleaned list are analysed in terms of number and funding taking into account the project’s coordinator;
- **Step 3:** the totality of the projects of the final cleaned list are qualitatively assessed according the potential impact on SWB dimensions (quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions) as identified within the HERIWELL study.
4.2.2 Interim results

This section presents the analysis’s interim results according the first two steps of the above methodology.

As described in the methodology above, for the selection of relevant projects, we used the automatic search with the key-word “Heritage”. This allowed to select 338 projects. After the process of data cleaning, the final selection consisted of 138 projects on which the following analysis are presented.

Step 1

The Step 1 includes a classification of the activities covered by the 138 extracted project on the basis of the macro-categories of CH individuated in the methodology by the Heriwell team. This classification was done reading the project description. In the detail, as Figure 1 shows, the 37% of the projects is focused on Tangible Heritage, while the 32.4% on Intangible Heritage. The remaining 30.4% concerns mixed typologies of CH, including tangible, intangible and digital.

**Figure 4.5 Shares of projects by CH typology (%)**

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on Creative Europe data

Step 2

The amount of funded projects across the years went from a minimum of 17 projects in 2014 to a maximum of 37 projects in 2018. As can be seen by the figure below, the trend for CH projects followed the same development of the totally of the projects financed by Creative Europe, with the exception of 2019. The projects’ duration varied: the 22.5% of projects lasted less than 12 months, the 35.5% of projects lasted between 13 and 24 months and the 42% more than 24 months.

**Figure 4.6 Amount of CH projects, by year of financing**

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on Creative Europe data
The distribution of projects and funding among coordinators’ countries provides a first overview on where the Creative Europe financing might have impacted more. Figure 3 and 4 below show respectively the distribution of projects and the total amount of expected funding by coordinator’s country. As can be seen, IT and FR are the countries which coordinated the highest number of the projects associated to CH (respectively 21 and 20 projects). The following are ES (13 projects), NL (12 projects) and BE (12 projects).

Map 4.5 Number of projects, by coordinator’s country

![Map 4.5 Number of projects, by coordinator’s country](Image)

Source: HERIWELL elaboration on Creative Europe data

The major amount of projects coordinated does not imply directly that the country received the highest amount of funding. Indeed, the projects differ by duration, as seen above, and expected funding.

Starting with the distribution of projects by coordinators’ country, Figure below illustrates the total amount of expected financing received during the entire period 2014-2020. Unfortunately, the available data does not allow to disaggregated by projects’ partners, neither to establish the effective amount of received funding. However, this preliminary assessment on the distribution of funding will support the further analysis on potential impact on SWB dimensions, as proposed in the theory of change methodology. The country in which the projects coordinators were expected to receive the highest amount of financing is FR, with more than 6 million of euros in the 2014-2020 period.

Map 4.6 Total amount of funding, by coordinator’s country

![Map 4.6 Total amount of funding, by coordinator’s country](Image)
Source: IRS elaboration on Creative Europe data

4.3 Societal well-being and CH in the European Capitals of Culture

4.3.1 Methodology

The European Capitals of Culture (ECoC) initiative aims at promoting and celebrating Europe’s rich cultural diversity and heritages, mutual understanding and intercultural dialogue, and to put cities at the centre of cultural life across Europe. The European Capitals of Culture receive various types of funding, including EU funds: e.g. national funding, ESIF funding and Creative Europe funding (such as the Melina Mercouri Prize).

The initiative includes several types of interventions, among which is the refurbishment and valorisation of cultural heritage (e.g. museums and historical buildings). Despite its results, the analysis of the contribution of CH investments to societal well-being is hindered by the limited comparable quantitative data on its effects. The evaluation reports available for the 2007–2015 period only contain narrative information and lack a comparison of the results achieved with the ex-ante situation.

However, in order to identify possible positive societal impacts of the European Capital of Culture initiative, a qualitative meta-analysis can be provided. This can be done on the basis of the available data and information included the ECoC evaluation reports, which cover the ECoC financed in the period from 2014 to 2019. For the purposes of this study, the analysis of ECoC focused on those cities that proposed in their ECoC application a specific focus on issues linked to CH promotion, preservation or valorisation. This evaluation moved from the information included in ECoC ex-post evaluation reports provided by European Commission. More details are provided within Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2 European Capitals of Culture selected by HERIWELL team (2014–2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CH promotion, preservation or valorisation included in ECoC application</th>
<th>Type of CH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umea</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Promotion of Sami culture and inclusion of Sami people in the planning of the ECoC year.</td>
<td>Intangible Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riga</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>The city dates back to 800 years. Its historic centre gathers many historical building and it has been UNESCO World Heritage site since 1997.</td>
<td>Tangible Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mons</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The Mundaneum in Mons is listed in UNESCO’s Memory of the World Register and was awarded the EU’s European Heritage Label.</td>
<td>Tangible Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroclaw</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The varied history of the city has given it a rich architectural heritage, as expressed by the Centennial Hall which is a UNESCO World Heritage Site.</td>
<td>Tangible Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pafos</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>The city dates back to the Neolithic Period. It is at the crossroads of the Eastern Mediterranean making it a multicultural melting pot. Its geographical proximity to Lebanon, Turkey, Syria, Egypt, Palestine and Israel, as well as continental Europe characterises its culture.</td>
<td>Intangible heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valletta</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>The city history has given it a rich cultural and architectural heritage. This includes the Hypogeum of Hl-Saflieni, a Neolithic subterranean structure dating back 5,000 years, as well as some Roman architecture. There are also more recent buildings in the Mannerist, Neo-Classical and Modern styles. This heritage enabled Valletta to be given UNESCO World Heritage status in 1980.</td>
<td>Tangible heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matera</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>I Sassi, typical structures deriving from ancient caves, was awarded a World Heritage Site by UNESCO, representing “an outstanding example of rock-cut settlement, adapted perfectly to its geomorphological setting and ecosystem”, and also “an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble and landscape illustrating a number of significant stages in human history”.</td>
<td>Tangible heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plovdiv</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>With its numerous remains from antiquity, the city has more than 200 archaeological sites. The most important of them are the Ancient Theatre and the Roman Stadium.</td>
<td>Tangible heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative meta-analysis will shed light on ECoC’s objectives and results in the field of cultural heritage, to the extent possible, across European Capitals of Culture and to link them to the societal impacts dimensions as identified in the study theory of change.

The qualitative meta-analysis will be carried out through the following two steps.

First of all, the analysis will start from the identification of the overall financial resources received by the ECoC during the title year, the main events/actions/activities implemented, with particular reference to cultural heritage, and the principal results reported in the results section of the report, to the extent possible limited to CH. Due to the narrative structure of the reports, the information will not always be available in terms of quantitative indicators. However, any available quantitative data will be documented in addition to qualitative descriptions. Some preliminary results are presented in section 3.2.2 below.

Secondly, the analysis will move from the HERIWELL ToC to attribute data and information included in the ECoC evaluation reports in the theory of change boxes. We can move on from the assumption that the ECoC programme aims to preserve, valorise and make more accessible the specific cultural heritage assets (tangible and intangible) of each city. Following the lexicon introduced for the theory of change, the financial resources received and the title itself can be considered as the resources and inputs, while the main activities/events implemented can be the programmes, policies and initiatives. In a similar way, the results reported in the evaluation documents can be considered as the outputs. On this basis, it would be possible to define an evaluation framework aimed to detect the short-term and long-term outcomes related to the three macro-dimensions of societal well-being: quality of life, societal cohesion and material conditions. For every macro-dimension, the activities and results of ECoC described in the reports will be integrated with the existing literature, to analyse the potential changes and achievements correlated with ECoC implementation. The evaluation framework will consist of results on subdimensions for societal well-being and a qualitative assessment/explanation of the potentially societal impacts for each city, depending on social science theories, economic literature and related data. The information collected through desk analysis will be integrated with interviews to national experts and organisation managing the European Capital of Culture programme, in order to better define the perceived and effective impact of ECoC actions on SWB dimensions. Furthermore, the findings will be validated through an online workshop involving representatives of the analysed ECoC.

Table 4.3 Template – theory of change and ECoC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Qualitative assessment of the potential impact</th>
<th>Quality of life</th>
<th>Societal cohesion</th>
<th>Material conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative assessment of the potential impact</td>
<td>Growth in happiness and life satisfaction</td>
<td>Enhanced community engagement, volunteering and charitable giving</td>
<td>Territorial attractiveness and branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving contentment and eudaemonic</td>
<td>Strengthened place identity and symbolic representation</td>
<td>Growth in jobs and earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements in education levels and empowerment in adults’ capacities, including digital skills</td>
<td>Enhanced community awareness, civic cohesion and sense of belonging</td>
<td>Growth of property places and housing conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level of knowledge and research</td>
<td>Integration and inclusion of minorities, migrants and other disadvantaged groups, social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The conclusions will draw an overview of how the dimensions and/or sub-dimensions are potentially valorised by the action of ECoC, according to the information available on financing resources, events and activities implemented, and observed outputs. This analysis might lead to derive a linkage between the European Capital of Culture activities and improvements in overall societal well-being of involved communities, offering ground to further researches and studies on the topic. The applied methodology is described synthetically in the figure below.

**Figure 4.7 Methodology for evaluation of European Capital of Culture programme in the framework of theory of change**

### 4.3.2 Interim results

This section of the report presents the preliminary results of the analysis of ECoC data sources for what concerns three of the eight selected cities: Umea, Riga and Mons. Annex 5 synthetizes the resources/inputs and programme/outputs dimensions, referring to the theory of change framework.

Using the official sources of ex-post evaluation report of the programme, it is possible to draw some preliminary conclusions on the potential effects on dimensions of SWB as described in the theory of changes. The tables A, B and C below report the results of this first assessment on the three considered cities. As anticipated above, the information obtained from the ex-post evaluation reports will be integrated with information collected by specific interviews with national experts engaged in the implementation of ECoC activities.

For each of the individuated SWB sub-dimensions, this preliminary assessment is aimed to define if the results of ECoC implementation might have generated an improvement. The green cell indicates, for the respective sub-dimension, if the change is explicitly reported within the ex-post evaluation. The further steps of the assessment will definitively establish if the change has to be excluded (red cell) or cannot be determined (yellow cell). A final overall evaluation, integrating the information from the ex-post reports and the interviews, will summarize to what extent ECoC financing might have impacted on the SWB of the involved territories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>of environment</th>
<th>inclusion, inclusive growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Trust</td>
<td>Qualitative explanation of potential effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HERIWELL elaboration
### Table 4.4a Indicators of quality of life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Growth in happiness and life satisfaction</th>
<th>Improving contentment and eudemonic</th>
<th>Improvements in education levels and empowerment in adults’ capacities, including digital skills</th>
<th>Higher level of knowledge and research</th>
<th>Improved quality and sustainability of environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HERIWELL team’s evaluation on ECoC data

### Table 4.5b Indicators of societal cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Enhanced community engagement, volunteering and charitable giving</th>
<th>Strengthened place identity and symbolic representation</th>
<th>Enhanced community awareness, civic cohesion and sense of belonging</th>
<th>Integration and inclusion of minorities, migrants and other disadvantaged groups, social inclusion, inclusive growth</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HERIWELL team’s evaluation on ECoC data

### Table 4.6c Indicators of material conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Territorial attractiveness and branding</th>
<th>Growth in jobs and earnings</th>
<th>Growth of property places and housing condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HERIWELL team’s evaluation on ECoC data
5 Initial policy indications

Based on the analysis conducted so far it is possible to derive some initial indications for CH policy makers and stakeholders on the following aspects: definitions of CH; CH data availability and comparability; and CH strategies at European, national and regional level to address the impact of cultural heritage in development policies at various territorial levels.

Developing comparable and measurable CH definitions

As discussed in the first Interim report, developing a definition of CH encompassing all its tangible, intangible and digital dimensions that is commonly accepted by stakeholders and is measurable with available data and comparable across countries and over time is a challenging task.

Indeed, what constitutes cultural heritage can change over time (particularly when considering contested heritage, intangible heritage or cultural landscape) and it remains an open issue among stakeholders in the field, policy makers and the population at large.

In line with the suggestion of CH stakeholders to define CH broadly and to take into consideration its dynamic and value-based nature, the HERIWELL project adopted a definition of CH that builds on the CoE FARO Convention, on the work of the EU JPI initiative and UNESCO. The resulting concept has been developed and discussed in the first two reports; details of the definition are again provided chapter 1. According to this definition, CH encompasses physical items from the past – tangible cultural heritage (TCH) – as well as living socio-cultural traditions – intangible cultural heritage (ICH) – considered to be of value for contemporary societies or specific communities, and for future generations. More recently, digital heritage (‘born digital’ or digitised) and the issue of contested/neglected heritage can be found on policy agendas in the heritage field.

Regarding **Tangible CH**, the diversity in the definitions adopted by international, national and local authorities in their registers of TCH and in available indicators make comparative analyses difficult. Most ESPON countries, taking as a reference the ‘national heritage community’, measure the size of their national heritage by counting the objects that constitute their CH by typology in order to create an inventory of the protected heritage. This measurement is based on the strong assumption that quite different objects (in relation to history, function, size, etc.) can be added as they all are considered as being part of the cultural heritage of a given community. These lists are however not comparable across countries (in some cases not even within them), being selected with different criteria. This suggests renewed efforts of responsible authorities and other stakeholders to arrive at more harmonised definitions.

Regarding **Intangible Cultural Heritage**. To conduct the HERIWELL analysis of traditional practices in ESPON countries that are recognised in the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and two related lists (cf. the last Interim Report), the definition of types of ICH manifestations provided by UNESCO has already been slightly modified in order to better cover European experiences and priorities (adding e.g. early industrial practices, food & beverage traditions or those concerning environmental care). This could be an occasion to revisit the, sometimes controversial, question of an appropriate ICH definition covering all European regions, possibly in the context of the FARO Convention Action Plan.

To overcome this heterogeneity and improve the comparability among national and international inventories for both TCH and ICH, two main proposals can be suggested: The first is to provide clear indications and guidelines with common criteria on what can be considered CH and on how to improve data collection at national level. In order to derive a common and shared definition of CH manifestations, a collaborative process should be put into place. This process can use scientific exchanges, for example in the EU HORIZON EUROPE programme, as well as structured dialogues including CH specialists, representatives of communities and cultural minorities, or deliberative events involving policymakers, experts in the field, stakeholders in the field and citizens, etc. Among the issues to be addressed in this process is also a clearer and practicable definition of the roles of heritage communities, including as regards the division of labour with State authorities, that is so far not provided in both the UNESCO ICH Convention and the CoE FARO Convention.
The second issue is to define a common weight system able to harmonize the different types of objects and traditional practices that compose CH across countries. Several methods and techniques have been proposed to this end. For example, the UK DCMS proposes to value, and not just count, the heritage assets using the methodologies developed in the Social Cost Benefit Analysis, while Eurostat, in experimental statistics, proposes not only to count the number of sites registered in each country in the World Heritage List, but to value them according to their popularity or cultural consumption using Wikipedia page views as a weight.

As regards controversial CH, as indicated in section 2.5 of this report, we propose to provide a first systematic Europe-wide mapping of important items and manifestations of “contested and neglected CH”, thus taking up recent debates as well as proposals made in the context of the ESPON project. In fact, a majority of the respondents in the HERIWELL survey is aware of the fact that CH can be controversial or needs to be re-interpreted from time to time. However, for a more in-depth picture of popular views of contested CH or even feelings of “bad-behaving” caused by certain cultural heritage objects and practices, related issues could later be taken up in a more comprehensive survey, either in the context of another Eurobarometer dealing with CH or in a special survey staged by professional bodies such as EUROPA NOSTRA.

Harmonized approaches are also needed to identify heritage at risk, as the UNESCO or national delegates of EUROPA NOSTRA’s Red Lists appear to be understaffed to cover all the potential cases.

**Initial indications on CH data sources and comparability**

**Data on CH endowments**

In order to compare CH endowments across countries and to verify and quantify the existence of a causal relationship between CH and SWB, it is necessary to have territorially homogeneous qualitative and quantitative data and that the indicators used to account for CH are defined and collated in the same way in all territorial areas of reference (NUTS1, 2 or 3) as happens in all statistical surveys that want to compare an economic (i.e., employment) or social (i.e., quality of life) category between different territories.

The mapping of available data sources presented in the Inception report shows that there are various data sources on cultural heritage both at EU/international level and national/regional level and the reasons why these sources cannot be used in econometric analyses. Besides official data largely deriving from administrative sources, various big data sources (e.g. Wikipedia, TripAdvisor, Google Trends, Google News, Flickr geotagged photos, AirDNA) can be used for integrating information provided by official sources.

The HERIWELL analysis of CH data sources and indicators shows that two strategies can be followed to produce the necessary data at EU, national and regional/local level. The first is to build a long term strategy based on publicly produced and managed CH open data systems. The second is to develop long term partnerships between public authorities at EU and national level and big data providers, addressing the ethical and managerial questions associated with the use of information collected and made available by private commercial providers. To this end, it is important that their use in the heritage field, as in other fields, is based on “smart” and sustainable strategies.

Big data may indeed may be used for analyses of the stock and popularity of sites or territories at the NUTS2 and NUTS3 level, using the different sources to answer different problems.

At the regional level, or at a more micro territorial level, TripAdvisor data can be used to provide an estimate of both the popularity and the number of objects that make up the CH of that territory. This information, derived from the preferences (utilities) of the users of the sites, draws a "sentiment" map of the cultural assets of the different territories. The repeatability of the analysis over time would account for the changes that have occurred in these preferences as a result of policies pursued or investments made or the communication processes activated. The application of Sentiment Analyses on TripAdvisor reviews would allow to better understand the type and quality of the relationships between sites and users and the reasons that determined the visit as well as the changes that have occurred and are in progress. Indeed, the sentiment analysis of digital data in the MANN case study has shown how digital tools can provide useful data to CH institutions on the characteristics and behaviours of cultural heritage users.

As shown by the HERIWELL pilot study in the first Interim report, Wikipedia data can also be used to analyze the popularity and dynamics of the virtual cultural demand for a territory’s heritage, specifying the sites to
analyze. For example, one could define a diverse and representative set of the CH of the territories, the 10 most visited sites in each region, and then analyze the pages consulted for each of these sites and the changes over time. Considering the different languages through which Wikipedia can be queried, the levels and dynamics of the demand of the selected sites can also be analyzed on the basis of the residence of the Wiki users.

An annual publication could summarize and communicate the relative popularity of sites or territories, and the changes that have occurred, monitored respectively through Wikipedia or TripAdvisor.

**Data on public and private funding to CH**

**Data on public and private CH funding are very limited** and often it is not possible to disentangle CH from culture data.

Public funding data require more specific elaborations than the customary reports based on COFOC categories, which do not identify CH expenses properly. Detailed reports on expenditure in terms of ESA2010 categories (better classification in terms of creation of new assets – gross capital formation – or compensation of employees) are needed.

There are no comparative data available for private funding of CH, with donations representing one of the most important sources. Some data may be derived by the Eurobarometer survey for the European Year of Cultural Heritage which includes information on the donation rates of European Union countries in terms of money and time. Another possibility is currently being studied by the HERIWELL team and may suggest follow-up studies later on, namely the financial dimension of tax allowances or incentives available for private CH objects.

Regarding available data on EU Funding programmes, the HERIWELL mapping shows that EU funds have a potential impact on all the three categories of SWB related to CH: quality of life (e.g. education), societal cohesion (e.g. societal diversity and inclusion) and material conditions (e.g. territorial attractiveness and tourism).

Available data on the ESI funds provide some information on investments in CH. Open Cohesion data show that ERDF allocates a significant amount of resources to investments related to CH, however there is no data on ESF and EARDF CH-related allocations and on the projects implemented and their results. A mapping of national data-sources on ESIF investments and projects carried out by the HERIWELL national experts shows many drawbacks (see section 3.2). Therefore, in future studies it is necessary to:

- Extend the categorization system to projects and the other funds besides the ERDF;
- Provide data on number of projects and allocations at NUTS2 level whenever possible, in particular for what concern national programs;
- Provide data and indicators on outputs and outcomes of CH-related projects;
- Organise regional data on ESIF according to a common structure, in order to ensure comparability across European countries. One suggestion is to follow the European categorisation of regions according to the NUTS system.
- As far as concern the Open cohesion portal on major projects, provide the English translation of projects’ names and summaries to allow key-words searches on specific themes.

Concerning the other funds, the actual link between CH and well-being is often implicit, making the identification of CH impacts on well-being complex. In addition, the EU funding lacks clear indications of the interventions dealing with CH and even more of the ones tackling both CH and SWB, thus making it difficult to assess their linkages. Furthermore, particularly in the case of Creative Europe, EACEA data are not released for public use, while available data are not disaggregated by projects’ partners making it difficult to assess the distribution at national and sub-national level. In the case of the ECoC programme, evaluation reports are often based on a narrative structure, with information on quantitative indicators often lacking.

**Data on heritage employment, outputs and outcomes**

---

35 See on this the recent study by Ateca-Amestoy and Gorostiaga, 2021, estimating that rates for volunteering to heritage organizations range between 3 to 14% of the population in the EU
More data and information is needed on employment in CH, as well as monitoring data on outputs and outcomes of EU, national and local programmes related to CH.

**Initial indications on CH strategies**

As underlined in the Theory of Change conceptual model, the effects of CH on social and individual well-being do not depend only on the presence of CH endowments, but largely on the implementation of CH strategies valorising CH endowments and their potential effects on social well-being.

So far, the HERIWELL analysis has focussed on issues related to data and indicators, however some initial indications for CH strategies may be derived from the literature review and the MANN case study.

As pointed out in the literature, policymakers should pay specific attention to the fact that the design and delivery of comprehensive and sustainable strategies valorising cultural heritage depend on the recognition of the value of the heritage resource by the society at large. Two are the main issues that seem particularly relevant for the collective recognition of the value of cultural heritage:

- **The accessibility of cultural heritage** to all categories of people, including for those at risk of social exclusion (e.g. people with disabilities, minorities, migrants, people with low levels of education, people living in vulnerable areas)

The Mann case study shows that **digitisation of cultural heritage** can contribute to increasing the accessibility of cultural heritage as it makes available new communication affordable by people with different level of education and it enhances the potentiality of CH in stimulating critical thinking, by working with feelings and emotions that are *based on* historical facts and goods. Furthermore, digital tools also appear to be effective to stimulate the interest and desire to visit a place, with interesting implications in terms of CH marketing.

- **Citizens’ engagement in cultural heritage** not as passive users, but rather as active participants of the processes of cultural heritage protection and valorisation.

The literature review and the Mann case study shows that **valorisation processes of cultural heritage should be embedded in specific strategies that are continuous over time.** Cultural heritage programmes and policies, like all public policies, to be effective need to be based on a strategic approach in terms of identifying the goals of the interventions, key stakeholders, earmarked funding, as well as implementation, monitoring and evaluation systems and tools including progress, output, outcome and impact indicators.

The MANN case study also shows that digital tools can contribute to specific societal well-being outcomes, when they are embedded in a **broader strategy of the institutions dealing with heritage.** Digitisation policies have to be planned and periodically revised in order to fine-tune the strategy and tools for the achievement of the strategy goals. Moreover, the development of a clear strategy allows the institutions to better meet the requirements of the EU and national funding, thus strengthening the possibility and capacity of implementation.
6 Outreach activities

In the report period the main outreach activities consisted of: organisation of the HERIWELL Social Storm; participation of the HERIWELL team in conferences and events.

6.1 The HERIWELL Social Storm: methodology

In the period March-May 2021, the HERIWELL consortium organized a specific dissemination event on the 11th of March 2021, i.e. the HERIWELL social storm. The social storm aimed to reach as many people as possible, sharing information about the HERIWELL project (purposes, framework, main results, partners involved), through an innovative and smart methodology.

The social storm consisted of disseminating messages on the HERIWELL project objectives, activities and main topics on social media (i.e. Facebook, Twitter and Linkedin) from 11.00 to 13.00 (CET) of the 11th of March. The main steps for the design and delivery of the Social storm included the following:

- Engagement of the HERIWELL project team, including country experts, and network in the event to ensure that
- Preparation of the dissemination messages in advance by the HERIWELL core team and outreach manager, with the contribution of the HERIWELL team of country experts;
- Preparation of instructions for the HERIWELL team members, HERIWELL Network and ESPON EGTC on how to participate in the event by posting messages allocated to them and reposting those of the other members of the HERIWELL team;
- Posting and re-posting the messages prepared previously on the 11th of March from 11.00 to 13.00 CET on Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn.

The figure below shows the main actors involved in the Social storm and the communication flow.

Figure 6.1 The community in the HERIWELL Social storm and the communication flow

Source: author’s elaboration

6.2 The HERIWELL Social Storm: results

The figure below details the main results of the event. In addition to the results illustrated below, it is worth mentioning that 38% of the people/organisations joined the HERIWELL Network during March 2021 and that 39% of the new subscriptions registered in March 2021 was done during the dissemination day.
6.3 Other outreach activities

In the report period the members of the Consortium participated in the following events organized by other actors:

- **European Heritage Heads Forum** organised on the 1st of April 2021 to which Ms. Manuela Samek, Cristina Vasilescu and Pietro Valentino introduced the HERIWELL project and its preliminary results.

- **SoPHIA’s Virtual Stakeholder Conference Cultural Heritage - Rethinking Impact Assessments**, organised on the 21st and 22nd of April 2021 and involving several members of the HERIWELL team: Ms. Flavia Barca, Ms. Cristina Vasilescu, Ms. Emma Paladino, Mr. Andreas Wiesand, Mr. Pietro Valentino.

- **E-Conference on “EU Values, Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue: Enhancing the debate”**, organised on the 23rd of April by University of Macedonia, to which Mr. Wiesand delivered a presentation on the “Heritage professionals on the road towards gender equality?”.

- HериWELL Presentation at the workshop organised by the General Directorate of Heritage of the regional government of Castilla y León delivered by Ms. Victoria Ateca.

In addition to these events, Ms. Anna Villaroya presented the HERIWELL project to an internal seminar of the University of Barcelona.

In the next months the HERIWELL team members plan to participate in the following events:

- The 21th International Conference on Cultural Economics - Evaluation and public funding, revisited?, ACEI 2021 conference, Lille/online to be organised on July 2021;

- 2021 Well-being Conference – Knowledge for Informed Decisions replaced by a Seminar Series (last quarter of 2021), to which a joint paper by Victoria Ateca Amestoy, Anna Villarroya and Andreas Wiesand entitled “Heritage Engagement and Subjective Well-being” has been accepted.

- European Week of Cities and Regions, October 2021 – HERIWELL Consortium in partnership with ESPON EGTC will participate in the workshop "Cultural heritage, cohesion policies and wellbeing: a virtuous circle " led by Europa Nostra.
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