OPEN HERITAGE

People. Places. Potential.

OpenHeritage: Deliverable 3.2

Evaluation Framework of WP3

August 28, 2019

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 duration	June 2018 – Mai 2021 (48 months)
Project website	www.openheritage.eu
Work Package	No. 3
Deliverable	D3.2 Submitted evaluation framework
Delivery Date	28.08.2019 (month 15)
Author(s)	Markus Kip, UBER
Contributor(s)	Beitske Boonstra Federica Fava Elena De Nictolis Christian Iaione Dóra Mérai Alessandro Piperno Levente Polyák Iryna Sklokina Hanna Szemző Andrea Tönkő Loes Veldpaus
Reviewer(s) (if applicable)	
Dissemination level:	Public (PU) **X**
	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (CO)

This document has been prepared in the framework of the European project OpenHeritage – Organizing, Promoting and Enabling Heritage Re-use through Inclusion, Technology, Access, Governance and Empowerment. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 776766.

The sole responsibility for the content of this document lies with the authors. It does not necessarily represent the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EASME nor the European Commission is responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary

The purpose of this deliverable is to guide the complex evaluation process and prepare the methodological ground for the transferability matrix. The evaluation framework is to enable project members to evaluate policies (analyzed in WP1) and practices (analyzed in WP2). The evaluation framework guides the work of T3.2/3.3/3.4.

The framework describes the process in which research questions will be developed in order to understand how practices and policy are situated, how they are conditioned and what implications they can have. Moreover, the framework outlines the process in which a set of normative criteria will be identified and justified in order to assess "good policies and practices". Insights about good policies and practices from case studies can be showcased as "inspirational cases" and "cases for policy learning". The framework also includes a comprehensive and integrated analysis of good practices and good policies that allow "the inclusive model of adaptive re-use of cultural heritage" to be developed. The detailed evaluation is the basis for the creation of the transferability matrix.

In this deliverable, the overall method of the evaluation framework is outlined in ten steps. It leads from general aims for the evaluation (step 1), to the development of research questions (step 2 and 3), to the identification of normative criteria for evaluation (step 4), to the evaluative analysis of practices and policies (step 5), the identification of "inspirational cases" and "cases for policy learning" (step 6) and the integration of insights (steps 7 – 9) towards developing the "inclusive model of adaptive re-use of cultural heritage" and the creation of a transferability matrix (step 10).

An additional method for transferring insights of case studies to a general conceptual understanding is outlined and the challenge of combining insights from a macro-level (WP1) and micro-level (WP2) is addressed with the sociological notion of practice.

This deliverable presents a preliminary list of research questions for Task Groups 3.2/3.3/3.4 that have been prepared in a peer-review process among consortium members since October 2018. As of now, the list of research questions allows for amendments as insights from work packages 1 and 2 are still emerging.

2. Overall method

The method of evaluating follows a systematic structure of 10 steps. Some of them are consecutive, others happen in parallel. Having followed through the 10 steps, we attain the "OpenHeritage inclusive model of adaptive re-use of cultural heritage".

(1) The **general aims for the evaluation** are set by the grant application and its description of WP3 (p. 4 and p. 49). In brief, the evaluation framework is to enable project members to evaluate policies (analyzed in WP1) and practices (analyzed in WP2) **to identify "good policies and practices."** On the basis of such lessons learned, "the inclusive model of adaptive re-use of cultural heritage" will be developed. The detailed evaluation is the basis for the creation of the transferability matrix.

The evaluation framework guides the work of task groups T3.2/3.3/3.4 of evaluating policies and practices drawn from the analysis of WP1 and WP2. The evaluation framework thus is to be applied by Open Heritage researchers. However, it should also be coherent and transferable that it may be used by other actors interested in adaptive reuse of cultural heritage.

The framework should allow for an evaluation of an ongoing project. This also implies that the evaluation always needs to be considered as relative to the factor of time. It cannot be an evaluation of case studies' future development to come.

(2) As of now, the current process of generating general research questions allows for amendments as insights from work packages 1 and 2 are still emerging. A key purpose of the general research questions in view of the evaluation is to delimit the object of analysis (conditions, outcomes, etc.) to look at. A preliminary list of general research questions that the Open Heritage consortium has developed in a peer-review process since October 2018 can be found below.

(3) Given the general research questions, more **specific research questions** are to be generated. For one, they clarify empirical indicators to study the "object of analysis" in a comprehensive fashion. This also entails a clarification and operationalization of the concepts that we work with across tasks and work packages (e.g. What do we understand by "alternative credit opportunity"? How do we study it, i.e. how do we know it is there when we see it…? etc.).

(4) Normative criteria will be established on two levels. First, they help us **identify "good practice" or "good policy"**. These criteria thus point to goals or objectives. They should be broad enough to be applicable regardless of circumstances. They are not intended to allow for comparison (good, better, best), but serve more as a value orientation that guides our project. A preliminary set of criteria of "good practice goals" and "good policy goals" that Open Heritage researchers operate with is to be made explicit in a first step. In the second step, such criteria need to be subjected to a critical reflection through

a focused literature review of academic and professional fields. The general research questions help to delimit the field (and possibly neighboring fields) in which to look for existing normative criteria since otherwise, the review could become overwhelming. In the process, the preliminary set of criteria will be further reflected on and might require revision. In any case, the literature review serves us as a backdrop against which we need to justify our criteria in an argumentative fashion.

Moreover, a review of the literature also should inform us about what resources or factors (internal or external) can be identified as strengths (and weaknesses) or opportunities (and threats) with respect to the attainment of goals (such as inclusive cogovernance arrangements, creation of jobs, etc.). To be sure, we need to be critical about such assessments about strengths and opportunities, since they are most likely to be context-sensitive.

The literature review is one of the tasks for each T3.2/3.3/3.4. The **product of this step** is a clarification and justification of the normative criteria that we employ in the OH project, i.e. at the level of goals "good practice criteria" and "good policy criteria" and at the level of factors. It needs to be clear that in this step we are developing normative criteria that may not be in tune with the criteria that the case study projects have set for themselves. And it is also our task to take note of the difference if it becomes evident. This is, of course, not to say that we should not learn from case studies and consider additional criteria or different criteria in order to revise our own.

(5) For general research questions that focus on the practice of case studies, a SWOT analysis will be conducted.

A **SWOT analysis** (S - strengths; W – weaknesses; O – opportunities; T – threats) integrates the empirical and the normative research of steps 2, 3 and 4 together into an **evaluation of the Observatory Cases (OCs)**. This would also be the task for T3.2/3.3/3.4. **In this step, the SWOT analyses are first partial and only address the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats as they relate to a particular research question and the related normative goals at stake.** (In a later step (step 9), these partial SWOT analyses are to be integrated into more comprehensive SWOT analyses for each case that consider their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats with respect to attaining the "inclusive governance model of adaptive reuse of cultural heritage" in the deliverable 3.6 "Report on European Heritage Management Practices".)

"Strategic practices" are the key elements in this step of our SWOT analysis of OCs. "**Strategic practices**" are those practices of the OCs that combine strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in a productive fashion with each other. The analysis of strategic practices serves to identify **"inspirational cases"** that can be showcased by the Open Heritage project as having "worked successfully". It is important to point out the idea that we are not trying to make comparisons in terms of what case studies are "good" or even "better" or "best". Each case has its particular conditions and, at this stage, we should only point to aspects that seem to have worked well and try to explain why.

(6) Given the SWOT analysis of case studies, a few (about two
or three) **"inspirational cases" will be identified** with respect to the particular
research question (e.g. related to ownership) that are worthwhile to showcase to
inspire an interested audience. These practice-oriented inspirational cases will be
further supplemented by the SWOT analysis of policies.

The research of policies will identify **"cases for policy learning"** as related to
general research questions. The "cases for policy learning" are also to be
showcased to an interested audience. The "cases for policy learning" can usefully
function as an empirical basis for the later development of D3.8 "Policy
recommendations".

This **selection and presentation of "inspirational cases" and "cases for
policy learning"** will be the task of T3.2/3.3/3.4.

**(7) Aggregated insights of the case study-based SWOT-analyses or the
macro-policy analyses** could also be made with respect to certain types of
goals (e.g. alternative funding for adaptive reuse of listed buildings;
crowdsourcing), types of strengths, or the **WP1 typology.** What are common
strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that we observe in certain
types of cases? What are common strategic practices have proven beneficial in
case studies? In other words, can we discern methods or strategies that have
proven to be successful even under different circumstances? Such aggregated
insights would be prepared by T3.2/3.3/3.4 and could be the basis for D3.6
"Finalized report on the European adaptive reuse management practices."

(8) Such SWOT analyses of Observatory Cases (OCs), as well as the
aggregated analyses of step 7, could further **be grouped around the three
OH pillars** (community integration; resource integration; regional integration).
This would be a key piece for D3.6 "Finalized report on the European adaptive
reuse management practices." And a basis for D3.8 "Recommendations and
suggested roadmap for the EU".

The output of steps 1 to 8 will be the basis of the deliverables D3.3/3.4/3.5.

(9) Preparing D3.6 "Finalized report on the European adaptive reuse
management practices", the insights from steps 3 to 8 that were gained in the
context of separate tasks (T3.2/3.3/3.4) are to be integrated. While probably
complementary, some new insights might emerge when **considering the
intersections of community integration, resource integration, and
regional integration.** In step 9, we will also bring the previous SWOT analyses
together that were conducted in relation to particular good practice criteria. Step
9 will thus produce **SWOT analyses of each case study in view of the Open
Heritage collection of good practice criteria and good policy criteria.** The
result of these comprehensive SWOT analyses is the identification of a set of
strategic practices that have proven successful in view of fulfilling the
OpenHeritage good practice criteria.

In total, the entire set of insights gathered in this step about how and in what
ways strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats have been combined in
strategic practices to attain (successfully) OpenHeritage criteria is what we call

the "Open Heritage model of inclusive governance of adaptive reuse of cultural heritage".

(10) The deliverable D3.7 "The Transferability Matrix" supports a focused investigation of insights from our project gained in previous steps. The purpose of "The Transferability Matrix" is to promote transferability of insights from OpenHeritage case studies and policy learnings to other projects and practitioners.

To promote transferability of insights and our evaluation (especially for practitioners), it is useful to allow for making analogies on the basis of similarities. What a proper analogy is between a case *study* and a case to which the insights of the study are to be related, is mostly dependent on the eye of the beholder. The transferability thus should enable the person interested in transferring knowledge to draw such analogies herself.

Therefore, to connect the evaluation and its framework to the deliverable of a transferability matrix, the proposal is to develop a **typology of keywords to classify our case studies** in different ways. The keyword typology may include various types of practices (e.g. crowdsourcing), types of policies, types of buildings, etc.

The keywords should allow readers or visitors of the website to identify "inspirational cases" and "cases for policy learning" based on classifying keywords (industrial heritage; involvement of knowledge institutions etc.) that allow them to draw analogies with their own interests based on similarities. A searchable database amounts to what we call "the transferability matrix" in view of D3.7.

To conclude, through these nine steps, we offer a thorough evaluation of policies and practices

- at the level of case studies (identifying "inspirational cases" or "policy cases of learning", step 6)
- at the level of types of policies and practices (step 7)
- in relation to the three OH pillars (step 8)
- in relation to the "transferability matrix" (keywords, step 9)

Such complex analysis (following steps 1-9) amounts to what we could call the "OpenHeritage model of inclusive adaptive reuse of cultural heritage". Hence, integrating these insights will lead us to D3.7 Transferability matrix.

2.1 Additional method for transferring insights from local case studies to general understandings

An additional method needs to be considered in relevance to the transferability of insights. Given the reliance of the evaluation on an understanding of general relationships and dynamics and of what is in the realm of the "possible", it is necessary to be alert for insights that challenge previous assumptions and theories. It might be that **unexpected results** are revealed in our research (WP1-4), which then require us to **revisit our previous assumptions and theories and modify them.**

Modifying existing theories (or widely held assumptions) on the basis of our (surprising) insights would also be a way of "transferring" insights from local case studies to a more general conceptual understanding.

2.2 Remarks on the combination of macro- and micro-analysis

The combination of macro- and micro analysis draws inspiration from **sociological insights on the notion of practice**, particularly from Bourdieu and Giddens and Kurasawa. These authors steer clear of the shortcomings of both structural determinism and voluntarist subjectivism. Thus, on the one side, it is necessary to avoid the idea that macro-structural elements such as policies, laws or customs determine what is happening in case studies. On the other side, it can't be assumed that practices develop in a vacuum and independently of laws (and their enforcement institutions) or policies.

Practices are therefore always to be understood as embedded within structures that in part enable, in part hinder certain actions. Given these structures, the room for experimenting with actions is limited, giving practices a certain degree of regularity. At the same time, innovation cannot be excluded, since structures can never predetermine possible actions and modified actions may be taken, leading to innovations.

Considering policies and laws, they thus give certain incentives and sanctions for particular types of actions and lead to certain patterns of practice. Depending on the reach of policies and laws, practices may just as well circumvent such policies/laws. Or they may not be informed by policies and laws and thus not take advantage of corresponding opportunities. Practices are thus not to be thought of as on a different level than macro-structures, but rather as constitutive building blocks of them. Practices thus reproduce macro-structures,

but in reproducing them, they also consistently modify them to react to changes in the environment.

Our research and evaluation, therefore, consider this intersection of macro-structural elements (particularly policies, laws, governmental authorities, etc. WP1) with local practices in case studies. In the analysis of local practices, it is therefore relevant to investigate how policies, laws, and governmental authorities are being dealt with, how they set incentives or sanctions for certain actions, how far they reach or influence actors. We should, therefore, be alert to how policies that under certain respects may be considered "bad" do not necessarily determine "bad" local practices.

3. Preliminary Set of General Research Questions

sorted into the three pillars of Open Heritage

3.1. Preliminary Research Questions for T3.2 Community and Stakeholder Integration

In what ways do co-governance arrangements of civil society organizations, the unorganized public, public authorities, private actors and knowledge institutions create societal benefits for the involved communities?

In what ways can heritage reuse projects strengthen the collaboration among stakeholders and local community members? In what ways do heritage reuse projects empower women, youth, and ethnic minorities?

In what ways were small groups of very active people driven by their passion for collective heritage a precondition to initiate the projects?

In what ways have projects integrated a variety of heritage meanings? What benefits and problems did this create?

In what ways do not-for-profit and non-governmental heritage project enable the participation of different communities?

In what ways does a heritage policy that is not only focused on the physical appearance of the site but also on immaterial and social aspects, offer support for projects of adaptive reuse? How do heritage policies that only focus on physical appearance block reuse projects?

3.2. Preliminary Research Questions for T3.3 Resource Integration

In what ways do co-governance arrangements of civil society organizations, the unorganized public, public authorities, private actors and knowledge institutions create economic benefits for the involved communities?

What are (heritage) policies, regulatory frameworks, and funding instruments that support the community-led adaptive reuse project to acquire the site?

In what ways do public policies that are explicitly tailored for adaptive reuse support such projects?

What are innovative practices that encourage community participation to substitute state or market-based funding sources? What are the benefits or drawbacks?

What kind of alternative credit and funding opportunities have been accessed and what role did they play in the overall project?

In what ways does (co-)ownership of the site/building support the adaptive reuse project? In what ways does it support a sustainable development of the project, particularly against the threat of gentrification)

3.3. Preliminary Research Questions for T3.4 Regional Integration

In what way does a reliable and civic-minded institutional environment support adaptive reuse projects?

In what ways do local projects create a network with other not-for-profit and non-governmental organizations for exchange of (material) resources? What are the social and economic benefits of such networks?

In what ways do local projects create a network with other projects based on soft ties (exchange of knowledge, political, practical or symbolic support, etc.)? What are the social and economic benefits of such networks?

In what ways do adaptive reuse projects address the challenge to provide affordable spaces and while ensuring adequate density, connectivity, and infrastructure to allow for sustainable small businesses?

What kind of services and learning projects do projects in OH create for the communities?

What kind of jobs and business opportunities do not-for-profit/non-governmental adaptive reuse projects create?

What kind of improvements do projects do in the built environment? And how does this improvement integrate conservation, spatial planning, and territorial development effectively?

OPEN
HERITAGE

4. WP3 partners and contact details

Partner	Involved in	Contact persons	E-mail
CentUrbHist	T3.1; T3.2	Sofia Dyak Iryna Sklokina Taras Nazaruk	s.dyak@lvivcenter.org i.sklokina@lvivcenter.org t.nazaruk@lvivcenter.org
CEU	T3.1; T3.5	József Laslovszky Dóra Mérai Volodymyr Kulikov	laszlov@gmail.com meraid@ceu.edu kulikovv@ceu.edu
Eutropian GmbH	T3.1; T3.2	Levente Polyák Daniela Patti Julia Baudier Bahanur Nasya	levente.polyak@eutropian.org daniela.patti@eutropian.org Julia.baudier@gmail.com bahanur.nasya@eutropian.org
LUISS	T3.1; T3.3	Christian Iaione Benedetta Grillo Elena De Nictolis Chiara De Angelis	ciaione@luiss.it benedetta.gillio@labgov.it edenictolis@luiss.it chiara.deangelis@labgov.it
MRI	T3.1; T3.3	Hanna Szemző Andrea Tönkő	szemzo@mri.hu tonko@mri.hu
UBER	T3.1; T3.3; T3.5	Markus Kip Heike Oevermann	markus.kip@gsz.hu-berlin.de heike.oevermann@gsz.hu-berlin.de
UGENT	T3.1; T3.2; T3.4; T3.5	Beitske Boonstra Karim van Knippenberg Luuk Boelens	beitske.boonstra@ugent.be karim.vanknippenberg@ugent.be luuk.boelens@ugent.be
UNEW	T3.1 (&reviewer); T3.4; T3.5	John Pendlebury Loes Veldpaus	john.pendlebury@newcastle.ac.uk loes.veldpaus@ncl.ac.uk
UNIROMA3	T3.1; T3.5	Giovanni Caudo Mauro Baioni Federica Fava	giovanni.caudo@uniroma3.it baioni.mauro@gmail.com federica.fava@uniroma3.it