Mapping of current heritage re-use policies and regulations in Europe

WP lead: Newcastle University

John Pendlebury

Loes Veldpaus

Project Full title		Organizing, Promoting and Enabling Heritage Re-use through Inclusion, Technology, Access, Governance and Empowerment	
Project Acronym		OpenHeritage	
Grant Agreement No.		776766	
Coordinator		Metropolitan Research Institute (MRI)	
Project start date and duration		June 2018 – Mai 2021 (48months)	
Project website		www.openheritage.eu	
Deliverable Nr.	D1.1	Planned delivery date	August 2018
		Actual delivery date	September 2018
Work Package No		1	
Work Package Title		Mapping of current heritage re-use policies and regulations in Europe	
Responsible		UNEW	
Author(s)		John Pendlebury Loes Veldpaus	
Contributor(s)			
Reviewer(s) (if applicable)			
Status:		Final (F)	F
		Draft (D)	
		Revised draft (RV)	
Dissemination level:		Public (PU)	PU
		Confidential, only for members of the consortium (CO)	

Contents

Work package	1							Lead beneficiary **UNEW**			
Work package title								Mapping of current heritage re-use policies and regulations in Europe			
Participant number	3	4	5	6	8	10	11	14			
	UGENT	UNEW	UBER	OW SARP	EURODITE	UNIROMA3	CENTER FOR URBAN HIST.	CEU			
Person months	4	18	10	11	4	14	12	12			
Role in the WP		WP and TL		TL		TL		TL			
Start month	1							End month **24**			

1. WP1 overview

Task descriptions and deliverables as defined in the original proposal:

Task 1.1: Institutional and regulatory context of adaptive heritage re-use (M1-M18):
Adopts an appropriate methodology together with Task 1.2 and 1.3 to create the combined deliverable of D1.2; Collates and analyses data on governance models, including community involvement, and legal regulation across Europe and drafts a task report; Combines the results with reports from Tasks 1.2 and 1.3 for policy overview report D1.2.

Task 1.2: Funding mechanisms and economic models (M1-M18): collates and analyses data the main economic models and funding mechanisms for heritage protection and adaptive re-use, including the identification of good practices and bottlenecks in the system

Task 1.3: Territorial development and architectural regulations (M1-M18): Tackling the final aspects of the overview, Task 1.3 supplements the work done in Task 1.1 and Task 1.2. Collates and analyses data of how the different architectural regulations determine the possibilities of re-use, and how the current regulatory system treats (encourages or discourages) the integration of the re-use process into the wider frameworks. Looking at identification of good practices and bottlenecks in the system

Task 1.4: Typology of policies and regulations (M7-M24): Using the preliminary findings from Tasks 1.1-1.3 the typology developed in Task 1.4 will categorize the various adaptive re-use

practices today. It will focus particularly on regional differences, if (and what) kind of patterns can be established in the approaches to adaptive heritage re-use in Europe.

The development process of the typology will go hand-in-hand with the database development (see Task 2.3) and will influence strongly its final structure.

Deliverables

D1.1 Detailed work plan for WP1 - refines and summarizes the work to be conducted in WP1, will serve as a guideline for the WP leader and the participants, <u>Task 1.1, delivered at M3</u>

D1.2: Complex policy overview of adaptive heritage re-use – it combines the existing policy and legal regulations of adaptive re-use, funding and economic environment and current adaptive reuse practice, points out major bottlenecks but also regulations that work very well – <u>synthetizes inputs from Tasks 1.1.- 1.3, responsibility of Task 1.1, delivered at M18, Key deliverable</u>;

The combined report (D1.2) will serve as a basis to develop the database (see Task 2.3) which focuses on showcasing the different regulatory environments, and connecting them to actual cases of adaptive re-use on the example of the Observatory Cases (see WP2).

D1.3 Typology of current adaptive heritage re-use policies – the deliverable highlights the national/regional differences, points to their embeddedness into the socio-economic and institutional framework of a particular country, <u>Task 1.4, delivered at M24.</u>

Deliverable	Responsible TL	when
D1.1	Unew	M3
D1.2 Draft	**Unew**, Roma3, SARP	M16
rev D1.2	Ugent	M17
D1.2 Final	**Unew**, Roma3, SARP	M18
D1.3	CEU	M24

For full timeline see section 10

2. Expectations

Following the consortium agreement, and especially section 4.1 we expect

- Each Party undertakes to take part in the efficient implementation of the Project, and to cooperate, perform and fulfil, promptly and on time, all of its obligations under the Grant Agreement and this Consortium Agreement.
- Each Party undertakes to notify promptly, in accordance with the governance structure of the Project, any significant information, fact, problem or delay likely to affect the Project.
- Each Party shall promptly provide all information reasonably required by a Consortium Body or by the Coordinator to carry out its tasks.
- Each Party shall take reasonable measures to ensure the accuracy of any information or materials it supplies to the other Parties.

Ultimately we all have responsibility to get the job done, and for that to be possible, some flexibility will be required, throughout the 24 months the WP will be 'live'. This is only an initial proposal, any comments are very welcome, and equally it is very likely we might have to change some of it in later stages.

Our plan assigns responsibility for different tasks to the WP leader/ Task leaders. This is responsibility for organisation and work division within the task to ensure its satisfactory, timely completion, not for undertaking the task in its entirety.

3. Communication

- WP lead will communicate with MRI / and other WP leads (in terms of management) through bimonthly Skype.
- A week before this Project Skype, there will be a WP Skype amongst UNew, Uber, SARP, Roma3, CUH, and CEU. While Eurodite and UGent are very welcome to also join those Skypes, this might be a big ask given the limited time they have available in this WP. Initially, we will also organise WP Skypes in the months in between and collectively keep under review how many of these are needed.
- TLs are responsible for the delivery of the task and communication with the task partners. Every Task lead is responsible to prepare an overview of their task to report on during WP Skypes, and thus organise Task Skypes as appropriate.
- Communication with other WPs will be important at various points. It will be the responsibility of task leads to organise appropriate communications, keeping others including the WP leader in the loop as appropriate.
- Communication with other projects might be highly beneficial. The lead on how this should be undertaken will come from the overall Project Co-ordinator.

Project skype: WP leads + Project lead

WP skype: WP lead + TLs (or all WP partners)

Task Skype: TL + Task partners

4. Language groups proposal

We propose (as discussed in Budapest) to divide work for data collection in language groups.

This is also why we think it would be good to redistribute the months slightly different between the specific tasks (but the overall allocation of months for the WP remains the same for all partners, see section 5).

UNEW	NL	BE	UK	Dutch / English (including supranational, e.g. EU / CoE / UNESCO)
UBER	DE	SE		German, Swedish
SARP	PL	FR		Polish, French, German[1]
R3	IT	PT	ES	Italian, Portuguese, Spanish
CUH	UA	SK	AT	Ukrainian, Slovak, German[2]
CEU	HU	RO		Hungarian, Romanian

---

[1] Austrian; together with CUH

[2] Austrian; together with SARP

5. Months per task / deliverables

To make sure the above is possible, we propose a minor modification from the original proposal, meaning UNew, Uber, SARP, Roma3, CUH and CEU contribute to T1.1-1.2-1.3 to cover all language groups as proposed above (but as indicated, only as a minor redistribution within WP1).

We've tried to make a fair distribution based on the assumption that:

- T1.1 is slightly bigger than 1.2 and 1.3 as it includes combining the results with reports from Tasks 1.2 and 1.3 for report D1.2.
- T1.2 and T1.3 are similar in size
- T1.4 currently involves everyone, and is slightly smaller in terms of total months based on the fact that the majority of the work can only start after month 18. To give CEU time to work on the other tasks, the proposal is to only have a small part of T1.4 between M7-M17.
- Gent is responsible for the full review of D1.2, with 2 months for review and not included in the total months for the tasks 1.1;1.2;1.3
- Each partner responsible for a language group has at least 2 months to collect data within a task. As far as possible, the analysis of this data, and writing up in reports will be undertaken by the Task Partners with more than 2 months in the Task, as guided by the Task Leader. For example, for T.1.1 this will mean UNew, Uber, CUH, CEU, as guided by Unew. It is anticipated that partners will have to collaborate on the data collection and the data analysis. For example, while one partner might have the language skills, they may not have the in-depth knowledge on certain policy or cultural contexts or vice-versa.

		UGent	UNew	UBer	SARP	Roma3	CUH	CEU	Eurodite	M/Task
total months[3]		3 +1 rev	18	10	11	14	12	12	4	83
	D1.1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
T1.1	D1.2	1 review	11	3	2	2	4	3	0	25
T1.2	D1.2		2	2	6	3	2	2	3	20
T1.3	D1.2		2	2	2	8	4	2	0	20
T1.4	D1.3	3	2	3	1	1	2	5	1	18

	UGent	UNew	UBer	SARP	Roma3	CUH	CEU	Eurodite
total months D1.2	0	15	7	10	13	10	7	3
total months D1.3	3	2	3	1	1	2	5	1

---

[3] as provided in proposal

Redistributed Months. i.e. months in a task which was not originally assigned to this partner. Overall allocation of months for the WP remains the same for all partners.

Task Lead (TL)

6. Deliverable 1.1: detailed work plan

UNew prepares, and others comment / add / improve, finished by end of August.

When not yet possible to describe concrete outputs, we've aimed to describe the process that will lead to the outputs. E.g. based on outcomes of section 7 we might have to develop more detailed work plans per task. To be reviewed as indicated in section 7.

7. Deliverable 1.2 Policy overview of adaptive heritage re-use

Deliverable 1.2 is a report based on the results of 3 tasks. These tasks are executed in parallel, and in order to make them compatible, we propose several 'in between' steps (we divided the work into parts as you will see below) and results. These steps are the same for each of the tasks in D1.2.

The tasks are

Task 1.1: Institutional and regulatory context of adaptive heritage re-use (M1-M18)

Task 1.2: Funding mechanisms and economic models (M1-M18)

Task 1.3: Territorial development and architectural regulations (M1-M18)

The three tasks follow a similar timeline (as outlined in section 10) **and for the moment the core tasks are assumed to be equal in size (20 months total for each) although T1.1 has been allocated additional time** as it includes combining and the results with reports from Tasks 1.2 and 1.3, and reworking it after review by UGent.

We might have to redistribute some of the person months after finishing position papers and templates, as by then we should have a better overview of what needs to be done for each of the tasks.

Any of the 'in-between' results are not stand alone publications or deliverables, they are for use, either to sense check if we are on the same wavelength (e.g. position paper), or as data input for the actual deliverables / final report (e.g. datasheets and result reports)!

Part 1: Framing

1A position paper

Position paper per Task 1.1, 1.2, 1.3

- Task Leaders are experts in their thematic task field, the position paper is to share this expertise and guide the Task Partners.
- By a position paper we mean an argued (and appropriately referenced) outline of what the TL thinks are the main scoping the main issues and research themes regarding their particular theme (1500-2000 words). The position paper will provide everyone in the WP with a quick framing of the key issues within the respective task, on the basis of existing expertise of task leaders.
- The position papers should be
    - Based on the current knowledge and expertise of the TLs in their field
    - Developed in discussions with WP2, 4 to make sure current issues from our own 'field' are included.
    - Focus on the current situation, but framed within the post-2000 period to contextualise for direction of travel (e.g. identify trends).
    - Introduce the currently expected potentials and bottlenecks (based on experience and known literature) within their thematic field,

- Introduce the main influences by other knowledge / policy fields;
- Introduce influential factors (e.g. austerity, climate change, neoliberal discourse),
- Explain where and how further data is expected to be obtained (e.g. in documents; in papers; through policy analysis, interviews) (Oct 2018)
- UNEW will produce a 'demonstrator' / draft position paper for T1.1, to further clarify the intentions and discuss outline and workings (September 2018).
- All WP partners to reflect on the three position papers, and specifically to reflect on the validity of the framing from the position of the country (or countries) they know best through writing a short commentary, as a way of sense-testing the wider applicability of the position papers (before Spain meeting Nov 2018)
- Based on this we might have to develop more detailed work plans per task. To be reviewed after Part 1a is concluded.

1B literature review

Part 1B exists of:

- Draft bibliography for Spain meeting Nov 2018, responsibility of TL including
  - List of task / thematic literature
  - List of Country specific literature (obtained in collaboration with Task Partners)
  - List of reference Projects (other research projects, e.g. Urbact, EU, JPI, …) and databases (further developing section 10) overview.
  - WP2 and 4 cases literature if available
  - Typology literature (T1.4)
- Full Literature review per Task (Draft for Germany meeting, May 2019; finished Nov 2019, Portugal Meeting)
- Full overall literature review (Draft for Germany meeting, May 2019; finished May 2020, England Meeting)

Part 2: Country datasheets

Based on the findings in part 1a and b, TLs develop a **template for the country datasheets**, for full data collection per country / language group (we will send you an example / draft based on previous experiences ASAP, if you have experiences / ideas please let us know).

- **Templates for the country datasheets** should not simply be a list of headings, but include expected type of outcomes, the methods and approaches to be used, in other words they should make it possible for partners with less specific thematic knowledge to collate data, and do some basic analysis. They should align with each other (as it has to become one report) as well as with needs as determined in WP2 and WP4 (more empirically) or WP3 and 5 (more theoretically), and where possible should already be a stepping stone to T1.4. / D1.3. Draft templates shared by Nov. 20, for discussion in Spain meeting. (Nov 2018)
- To make sure we achieve a consistent approach and quality, we propose TLs revise the template after the Spain meeting and also complete a draft example of a model template for the country they know best, for circulation within the WP1 group. Data collection need not wait for this model template. Circulation model country sheet template Jan 2019
- Early 2019 (Skype) TLs and WPLs will discuss the format / setup of the three **Task Result Reports**, in relation to the final report (D1.2) and brainstorm on the development of the typology / needs for D1.3.
- Early 2019 (Skype) feedback moment with WP2, 3, 4 (WPL; TLs)

Part 3: Collect and analyse data including policy context per language group and per task

Everyone (except for UGent) who collects data should produce country datasheets, to collate data per task theme per country.

As mentioned in section 5 each partner responsible for a language group has at least 2 months to collect data within a task. The analysis of this data, and writing up in Task Result Reports will be undertaken by the Task Partners with more than 2 months in the Task, as guided by the Task Leader.

- Dec 2018 - March 2019 data collection period
- Jan 2019 – March 2019 produce Country Datasheet
- March 2019 – May 2019 Merging and analysing Country data, produce **Task Result Reports** (present initial findings in Germany meeting, May 2019)

Part 4: Final policy overview report

4A   final report

- June 2019 – Sept 2019 review Task reports and bring together in draft report D1.2 (for ICCLEI conference Sept 2019)
- Widening Scope Exercise: using the ICCLEI conference to have externals reflect on findings from their perspective, and interview them to collect additional examples, policies, practices etc for adding to the full overview.

4B   review final report

- Sept 2019 – Nov 2019 finish D1.2, including review (UGent) and finalise based on review for presentation in Portugal meeting Nov 2019. Policy overview of adaptive heritage re-use. This will also be coordinated with and become available via the online platform (format?).

8. Deliverable 1.3 Typology of current adaptive heritage re-use policies

Exists of: **Task 1.4: Typology of policies and regulations (M7-M24)**

		UGent	UNew	UBer	SARP	Roma3	CUH	CEU	Eurodite	M/Task
total months		4	18	10	11	14	12	12	4	
T1.4	D1.3	3	2	3	1	1	2	5	1	18

Specific roles / inputs for this will be discussed in the Spain meeting, to be prepared by TL (CEU).

The majority of the work for D1.3/T1.4 will have to be done between the Portugal (Nov. 2019) and UK (May 2020) meeting. Please consider this in your planning, especially CEU, UBer and UGent!

Part 5 Literature typology & coordination WP2

- Review of existing typologies in conservation / heritage / planning / reuse / etc. policies (from January 2019, finish by Portugal meeting, Nov 2019)
- Critical reflection on / Theorising typology, what are the restrictions, benefits, etc. of typology (from January 2019, finish by Portugal meeting, Nov 2019)
- Coordination with WP2 on 'on the ground findings' as will provide the structure for the online platform (from January 2019 onwards).

Part 6 Typology

- TD1.3 Workshop during Portugal meeting, Nov 2019
- A multidimensional typology based on findings in T1.1; 1.2; 1.3, WP2, and part 5 finished for the May 2020 UK meeting.
- Once a typology has been developed we can decide how we go about potentially adding in policies, frameworks, findings outside of 15 participant countries

9. WP specific concerns and connections

Risks

The main risks we identify in the WP are:

Risk	Mitigation
Language skills / not being able to access all / analyse all data necessary due to lack of availability of language skills	we've tried to cover this by redistributing the work slightly differently from the initial WP plan in the research proposal, but are still unsure about Swedish, and possibly Slovak
While partners might have the language skills, they might not have all the specific knowledge / skills to work in particular themes, disciplines, policy fields, developing an understanding of a policy context takes time.	collaborations between those who know the field and those who know the language

Connections to other WPs

The integration of the WPs is important and maintaining and improving them will be a continuous effort. The following links have been included in the WP plan as presented above, but also will be developed further and made more explicit over the next months.

WP2 and WP3: the work in WP1 and **WP2** needs to be complementary, to be combined in **WP3** (UBER) and T2.3 (CUH). Continuous dialogue between WPs is essential.

WP1 needs input from WP2 on the direction of travel identified in the OCs so we can make sure our macro level policy analysis covers the policy fields connected to those operationalised in the OCs, we can collect some of the needed data together (e.g. interviews can include questions useful for both WPs).

Special attention for T2.3 (CUH) to develop an easily accessible, searchable database with the aim to display the results of the macro and micro level overview, and allowing to contrast the institutional/legislative environment with the actual practice of adaptive re-use.

WP4: Early identification of issues in CoLabs may help nuance the understanding of reuse processes and thus the scope of data collected in WP1. In turn the CoLabs may benefit from knowledge produced in WP1 early on their process. Continuous dialogue between WP1 and WP4 is necessary.

WP 6: Dissemination and knowledge sharing

Impact and dissemination need to be part of the process rather than an 'output', therefore continuous dialogue between WP1 and WP6 will be essential.

Some initial ideas on how to interact with WP6 are

- Open source data sheets and results (academic); for sharing, as well as to be reviewed / contributed to. > This will be an extensive resource on adaptive reuse policies. We need to think about a way to promote this, as it will be a useful and potentially well used resource in both academic and policy worlds.
- To make it accessible for wider audience (online, heritage points) will need additional work, maybe through WP5? E.g. info graphic or short videos
- Presentation of work (oral or otherwise) during ICLEi conference

10.   Timeline per month

M	date	meeting	Part	What	Finish
1	30-Jun-18	**Hungary Meeting**	1a	Work plan, position paper	
2	31-Jul-18		1a;1b	Work plan, position paper; lit review	Draft D1.1
3	31-Aug-18		1a;1b	Work plan, position paper; lit review	**Final D.1.1 Work plan**
4	30-Sep-18		1a;1b;2	Position paper; bibliography; template	
				link with WP2 on indicators and initial findings on framing and influences	
5	31-Oct-18		1a;1b;2	position paper; lit review; template	Position Paper
6	30-Nov-18	**Spain Meeting**	1b;2	Reflect on position paper; start lit review; datasheet template	Present T1.1; 1.2; 1.3; Template draft; discuss T1.4
7	31-Dec-18		1b;2;3	Datasheet template; data collection	
8	31-Jan-19		2;3;5	Model template; data collection; start working on T1.4	Model template circulate
9	28-Feb-19		1b;3;5	Data collection;; T1.4 literature / WP2	
10	31-Mar-19		1b;3;5	Data collection; T1.4 literature / WP2	Country datasheets
11	30-Apr-19		1b;3;5	Data collection & task report writing ; T1.4 literature / WP2	
12	31-May-19	**Germany Meeting**	1b;3;5	Data collection & task report writing ; T1.4 literature / WP2	Present T1.1; 1.2; 1.3 result reports
13	30-Jun-19		3;4a;5	final report writing	
14	31-Jul-19		4a;5	final report writing	
15	31-Aug-19		4a;5	final report writing	
16	30-Sep-19	**ICCLEI Poland**	4b;5	final report review / rewrite	**present Draft D1.2**
17	31-Oct-19		4b;5	final report review / rewrite	review D1.2
18	30-Nov-19	**Portugal Meeting**	4b;6	final report review / rewrite;	**Present Final Report D1.2** (T1.1; 1.2;1.3); Workshop T1.4
19	31-Dec-19		6	typology	
20	31-Jan-20		6	typology	
21	29-Feb-20		6	typology	
22	31-Mar-20		6	typology	
23	30-Apr-20		6	typology	**Draft D1.3**
24	31-May-20	**UK**	6	typology	**Present Final**

		Meeting			Report D1.3

11. Sources

Please add!

Books / papers

Chapuis, M. (Ed.), 2008. *Preserving our heritage, improving our environment. Vol. 1: 20 years of EU research into cultural heritage*, EUR. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Chapuis, M., Lydon, A., Brandt-Grau, A. (Eds.), 2009. *Preserving our heritage, improving our environment. Vol. 2: Cultural heritage research: FP5, FP6 and related projects*, EUR. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Cheshire, P. C., & Hay, D. G. (2017). *Urban Problems in Western Europe: an economic analysis*. Routledge.

Dühr, S., Colomb, C., & Nadin, V. (2010). European Spatial Planning and Territorial Cooperation. Routledge.

European Commission, 2015. Closing the loop - An EU action plan for the Circular Economy, Com (2015) 614 communication from the commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European economic and social committee and the Committee of the regions. European Commission, Brussels https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52015DC0614

Nadin, V., & Stead, D. (2008). European Spatial Planning Systems, Social Models and Learning. DisP - The Planning Review, 44(172), 35–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2008.10557001

Nadin, V., & Stead, D. (2013). Opening up the Compendium: An Evaluation of International Comparative Planning Research Methodologies. European Planning Studies, 21(10), 1542–1561. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.722958

Pickard, R. (2002a). A Comparative Review of Policy for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe. International Journal of Heritage Studies, 8(4), 349–363. https://doi.org/10.1080/1352725022000037191e

Pickard, R. (2002b). Area-Based Protection Mechanisms for Heritage Conservation: A European Comparison. Journal of Architectural Conservation, 8(2), 69–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556207.2002.10785320

Pickard, R. (2010). European heritage laws and planning regulations: integration, regeneration and sustainable development. In M. Guštin & T. Nypan (Eds.), Cultural heritage and legal aspects in Europe (pp. 56–98). Slovenia: Annales University Press. Retrieved from http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/6249/

Preston, F. (2012). *A global redesign?: Shaping the circular economy*. London: Chatham House. https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/Research/Energy%2C%20Environment%20and%20Development/bp0312_preston.pdf

Stubbs, J. H. (2009). Time Honored: A Global View of Architectural Conservation. John Wiley & Sons.

Stubbs, J. H., & Makaš, E. G. (2011). *Architectural Conservation in Europe and the Americas.* John Wiley and Sons.

"COMPILATION OF THE LATEST DEVELOPMENTS ON HERITAGE MANAGEMENT IN THE EUROPEAN STATES Potsdam/Berlin | 23 – 25 May 2012" somewhere here (online via http://ehhf.eu/)

Law / Policy databases

https://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/index.php

https://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html

https://www.herein-system.eu/

http://www.unesco.org/culture/natlaws/

https://epthinktank.eu/2014/12/16/cultural-heritage-policy-in-the-european-union/

https://ec.europa.eu/culture/policy_en

http://www.patrimoniocultural.gov.pt/static/data/noticias/strategy21.pdf

http://ehhf.eu/sites/default/files/Cultural%20heritage%20and%20legal%20aspects%20in%20Europe%20BOOK.pdf

http://ehhf.eu/sites/default/files/EffectsofEULeg_2009.pdf

https://www.europae-archaeologiae-consilium.org/archaeological-heritage-management

https://iabr.nl/en

https://www.eui.eu/Projects/InternationalArtHeritageLaw

Projects (EU)

https://www.iriss.cnr.it/en/projects/clic-circular-models-leveraging-investments-cultural-heritage-adaptive-reuse/

https://rockproject.eu/

https://www.clicproject.eu/

https://planningandheritage.wordpress.com/

http://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/int_herit_state-of-the-art_v12_4-04-2017.pdf

http://www.europanostra.org/our-work/policy/

https://www.iucn.org/

https://www.icomos.org/en/what-we-do/involvement-in-international-conventions/underwater-cultural-heritage

12.   List of WP1 partners / contact details

Unew	John Pendlebury	John.Pendlebury@ncl.ac.uk
Unew	Loes Veldpaus	Loes.veldpaus@ncl.ac.uk
UGent	Beitske Boonstra	beitske.boonstra@ugent.be
	Karim van Knippenberg	Karim.vanKnippenberg@UGent.be
UBer	Markus Kip	markus.kip@gsz.hu-berlin.de
OW SARP	Katarzyna Sadowy	warszawa.ks@gmail.com
	Dominika P. Brodowicz	dominika.p.brodowicz@gmail.com
Roma3	Giovanni Caudo	caudo@uniroma3.it
	Mauro Baioni	baioni.mauro@gmail.com
	Nicola Vazzoler	nicola.vazzoler@uniroma3.it
CUH	Sofia Dyak	s.dyak@lvivcenter.org
	Iryna Sklokina	i.sklokina@lvivcenter.org
CEU	Dóra Mérai	meraid@ceu.edu
Eurodite	Joep Erik de Roo	deroo@eurodite.eu
	Alina Tomescu	tomescu@eurodite.eu