Type of action:
Coordination and Support Action (CSA)

D 3.8
REPORT OF THE FINAL PUBLIC CONFERENCE

PUBLIC

EC Grant Agreement number	GA nº870954	Lead beneficiary of this deliverable	IRMO
Start date of Project	1 January 2020	Due date of deliverable:	25 February 2022
Duration:	24 months	Actual submission date:	25 February 2022
		Version #	R0.5

Project funded by the Program of the European Union for and Innovation Horizon 2020		Research	
Type			
R	Document, report excluding the periodic and final reports		X
DEM	Demonstrator, pilot, prototype, plan designs		
DEC	Websites, patents filing, press & media actions, videos etc.		
OTHER	Software, technical diagram, etc.		
Dissemination level			
PU	PUBLIC, fully open, e.g. web		X
CO	CONFIDENTIAL, restricted under conditions set out in Model Grant Agreement		
CI	CLASSIFIED information as referred to the Commission Decision 2001/844/EC		

Revision History

R#	Date	Description / Reason of change	Author
R0.1	03/02/2022	First draft	ROMA TRE
R0.2	18/02/2022	First internal revision	ROMA TRE
R0.3	22/02/2022	Final revision	ROMA TRE
R0.4	24/02/2022	Final version after language editing	IRMO
R0.5	25/02/2022	Definitive version	IRMO ROMA TRE

Table of Content

_____

Background and Introduction

_____

The SoPHIA Final Conference was hosted in a hybrid format broadcasted from Roma Tre University on December 16th and 17th, 2021. It gathered over 60 participants, 37 onsite and 30 online (including partners from the Consortium, Advisory Board members, stakeholders from the SoPHIA Social Platform, practitioners, and policymakers) to discuss the results produced by the project.

SoPHIA aimed at contributing to the reflection on impact assessment and quality of interventions in European historical environment and cultural heritage by pursuing three different yet complementary aims:

1) to create a holistic impact assessment model to evaluate interventions on cultural heritage;

2) to gather a diverse community (research community, heritage professionals, experts, policymakers, practitioners, public and private actors as well as active citizens) within a new digital social platform to harness the benefits of the social media when applied to research and practice in the Cultural Heritage (CH) field;

3) to provide suggestions for future European actions on impact assessment by drafting policy briefs and recommendations.

Throughout the last two years, partners of the SoPHIA Consortium and its community of practice have designed a holistic heritage impact assessment model that covers all dimensions of sustainable development (namely the social, economic, cultural, and environmental). The model had been finalized through the interaction with representatives and stakeholders of twelve European case studies. Moreover, a toolkit for practitioners and four policy briefs with recommendations for policymakers had been put together to ease and enhance the process of impact assessment, and guidelines for an action plan on EU operational programmes and a future needs and research agenda.

The Final Conference addressed new scenarios for cultural heritage, namely the Manifesto of Culture at COP 26 and the New European Bauhaus. In contrast, the results produced by the SoPHIA project were presented and largely discussed in panels with key organizations and European networks, capable of reflecting on the potential for future deployment and prospects for the uptake of cultural heritage impact assessment from a holistic perspective.

Conference speakers and panelists included highly renowned experts from the academia and civil society as well as policymakers: Silvia Costa, former Member of the European Parliament and Italy's Special Government Commissioner for the Recovery of the Former

Santo Stefano/Ventotene Prison, Erminia Sciacchitano, Officer of the Minister´s Cabinet (Italian Ministry of Culture), Alessandra Gariboldi, Fitzcarraldo Foundation, Pierluigi Sacco, IULM University Milan, Olov Amelin, Jamtli Foundation, Josef Konvitz, former Chief of Regulatory Affairs, OECD, or Cornelia Dümcke, Scientific Coordinator of the European Expert Network for Culture (EENC).

Here is the report of the contributions from partners and experts that attended the conference.

Day 1: New Scenarios for Cultural Heritage

Being the coordinator of the project, Michela Marchiori opened the conference by addressing the main features of the project, the Consortium, and the final event itself. After this brief introduction, she passed the word to the two keynote speakers for the first day: Erminia Sciacchitano (Officer of the Minister´s Cabinet, Italian Ministry of Culture, and Advisory Board Member of the SoPHIA project) and Alessandro Rancati (European Commission's Science Service and Design for policy at the New European Bauhaus).

1.1 Addressing climate change through culture

Climate change is one of the most (if not the most) urgent challenges that must be addressed in our modern days. Erminia Sciacchitano, Officer of the Minister´s Cabinet, Italian Ministry of Culture, and Advisory Board Member of the SoPHIA project, gave a keynote speech presenting the importance of adopting a holistic approach (like the one proposed by the SoPHIA model) and recognizing the role of culture and heritage in achieving a climate-resilient world.

The connection between culture and climate change has become more evident and relevant every year. CH is highly affected by environmental crises; nevertheless, people working in the CH field had not been involved in the policy and decision-making process until the last two years.

Since 2020, a series of unprecedented documents against climate change have been implemented; among these, the Rome Declaration of the G20 Ministers of Culture and the Manifesto of Culture at the 26th UN Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP26 - Glasgow on 31 October – 13 November 2021) stands out for recognizing the role that culture and heritage may play against the climate crisis.

The Rome Declaration of the G20 Ministers of Culture, issued in Rome in July 2021, was led by the Italian Presidency and signed by the Ministers of Culture of each Member State of the G20. It identifies five key priorities that provide a framework for cultural heritage mobilization for sustainability:

- the protection of cultural heritage;
- culture and climate change;
- culture and education;
- cultural and creative industries;
- culture in the digital transformation.

Sciacchitano emphasized how these goals are linked to the Paris Agreement (2015) on climate change and, at the same time, how they represent a step forward by finally recognizing the importance of addressing climate change through culture.

As reported in the Declaration, culture plays a transformative role in sustainable development, helping address economic, social, and ecological pressures and needs. Thus, the G20 calls for the full recognition and integration of culture and the creative economy into development processes and policies, involving all levels of societies, including local communities, as a driver and an enabler for the achievement of the Goals set out in the United Nations' 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

According to Sciacchitano, this is a crucial change in the cultural landscape since it finally recognized the power of culture and heritage to drive climate actions. The "new", active role of culture against climate change follows three steps: threat, solutions, and resources.

1. THREAT: hazardous events linked to climate change impacting on heritage are detected;
2. SOLUTIONS: culture-led mitigation, adaptation, and cultural considerations are put in place. Culture and heritage aim at implementing action against climate change and sustainable development, according to the Paris Agreement;
3. RESOURCES for implementing such actions are many and diverse: intangible and tangible cultural heritage, creativity, Indigenous peoples' and local communities' languages, wisdom and knowledge systems, traditional crafts and materials (especially Indigenous' and local women's).

Picking up from work done in the G20, the Manifesto of Culture at COP26 focuses on accelerating climate action through the power of arts, culture, and heritage.

Sciacchitano, who took part in the Climate Heritage Network Working Group 8 that drafted the Manifesto itself, explained how the Manifesto aims at connecting the perspectives of culture actors to the political and policy agendas at the COP. In fact, many arts, culture, and heritage actors, operators, and advocates have still not been mobilized for climate action, nor their voices have not yet been adequately applied to climate change or accounted for in climate science.

In this regard, Sciacchitano underlines the importance of adopting an open and people-centered perspective that would overcome the divides between culture and science, people, and policy. This means, for example, combining indigenous knowledge and endogenous technologies, using the power of art to advocate for a more resilient and sustainable world, and ensuring cultural actors (civil society and institutional) with a seat at the table required to make it happen.

After collecting some questions from the audience, Sciacchitano further emphasized the importance of making clear the interrelation between climate and culture, which is not obvious for many people, including policymakers. Also, Josef Konvitz (former OECD officer) agreed on this point, underlining the difference in language between academics and decision-makers and the difficulties that come with some English words that may convey a different meaning. To overcome these problems, Sciacchitano reaffirms the urgency of a participative and holistic approach to work together.

1.2 The New European Bauhaus[1]

Alessandro Rancati works at the European Commission's Science Service. He is an architect, designer, and policy analyzer for the New European Bauhaus. This new initiative aims at creating sustainable, beautiful, and inclusive places for people to live in by gathering an extended and diverse community of people interested in efficiently combining the old with the new.

Currently, the delivery phase is to create, expand and empower the existing community (mainly consisting of non-profit organizations, universities but soon to be open to different kinds of associations) while starting new projects on creating places that are beautiful, inclusive, and sustainable (also through CH, that is a clear example of diversity and inclusion).

In this context, Rancati explained that the concept of "innovation" does not refer only to new technologies but also to all practices (including knowledge) of the past that can be (re)adapted and (re)introduced in a new context. In this way, places may become open

---

[1] The New European Bauhaus is a creative and interdisciplinary initiative, convening a space of encounter to design future ways of living, situated at the crossroads between art, culture, social inclusion, science and technology. The initiative connects the European Green Deal to the living spaces of European citizens.

learning places that value and disseminate new ideas and traditional and local skills. Moreover, since context impacts the place we inhabit, the way we learn, and the way we tech, heritage is an opportunity to redefine the way we experience the place itself.

Thus, preserving places, knowledge, and heritage, in general, is a duty to future generations that can be supported by the EC and all people involved in heritage protection and valorization projects.

During the discussion session, Rancati replied to Paola Demartini (member of the SoPHIA Consortium), explaining that the New European Bauhaus does not have a specific evaluation tool yet. In fact, the initiative aims at promoting and disseminating new ideas and tools by connecting experts with different backgrounds within the platform. Instead of checking the outcomes of the actions taken, the EC adopted an open approach to monitoring by considering all the report information as a way to learn from other experiences. The Commission only facilitates the process and makes connections, instead of telling what should be or not be done, leaving space for partners to feely experiment and adopt or adapt to good practices in different parts of Europe.

Riva Lava (member of the SoPHIA Consortium) shared NTUA's experience within the New European Bauhaus with the project "New European Bauhaus goes south". The program addressed many topics related to climate change and its impacts on space (housing, landscape design, KM0 architecture, etc.), highlighting the importance of the environment and the engagement of young people in the international and political agenda.

Moreover, she also emphasized the importance of considering language a crucial part of heritage since language itself is an important feature of everyone's culture. Thus, she suggested that initiatives such as the New European Bauhaus would consider the possibility of allocating funds for professional translators to allow people to use their mother tongue when speaking about heritage, as they are trying to do with the "New European Bauhaus goes south" project.

1.3 Closing

Giovanni Caudo, professor of Urban Planning and member of the SoPHIA Consortium, wrapped up the first day of the conference by sharing his perspective on the meaning of CH in his field of study.

In particular, he highlighted how the "tabula rasa" does not exist in modern days: the city is all around us, we are fully immersed in it. The future city is to be discovered in what has already been built, rather than in new settlements to be planned.

At the same time, also CH has broadened its meaning. Rather than looking at heritage under the lens of protecting historical assets, we should focus our attention on "heritage-making" processes.

Heritage-making is a way to describe the possibility to reinvent and re-inhabit the world. Accordingly, we should recognize and assess how these processes can improve the living conditions and meet the desires of the people involved. In this regard, professor Caudo recognized the importance of projects such as SoPHIA in assessing the people dimension and the interventions on CH. In particular, he praised the holistic and longitudinal approach of the SoPHIA model to address the following issues:

- How to use resources? How to protect them?
- How to make an environment inclusive and socially cohesive?
- How to manage identity/identities?
- How to innovate through education, art, and research?
- How to ensure prosperity?

These questions paved the way for the discussion on the SoPHIA model on the next day, during the first panel session.

Day 2: Beyond the SoPHIA project

_____

The second day of the SoPHIA final conference was structured in three panel sessions:

- The SoPHIA model and its potential for future deployment,
- Recommendations on policies,
- Prospects for Holistic Heritage Impact Assessment beyond the SoPHIA project.

Each session included a presentation from invited guests/cultural heritage experts, followed by open discussions that benefitted by the diverse audience gathered for the conference, proving (once again) that the interdisciplinary approach proposed by SoPHIA is a key element in addressing the cultural heritage field.

Before starting the debate, participants received the greeting of the heads of the Roma Tre University and Department of Business Studies, and the Project's officer.

Professor Luca Pietromarchi, Rector of Roma Tre University, started the conference by praising the work implemented by the Consortium, both research and network-wise, and by hoping that the new collaborations started under the SoPHIA project will continue in the following year.

Professor Mario De Nonno, the vice Rector of the University, thanked the Consortium and its Community of practice for their work and underlined the importance of the SoPHIA project in creating a more multi-disciplinary approach in the research field, capable of overcoming the dualism between liberal arts and technical-scientific studies.

Professor Marco Tutino, head of the Department of Business Studies, took the word to praise the work of the Consortium and to thank all the project's teams for creating a strong network among the organizations involved in the project and the European Commission.

Finally, Sabrina Yaiche, SoPHIAs's Project Officer, remarked on the quality of the deliverables produced by the Consortium and thanked partners for their collaborative approach.

After the official greetings, Honorable Silvia Costa, special Commissioner for the renovation of the Santo Stefano prison (Ventotene, Italy) and formal member of the European Parliament, officially started the second day of work.

Silvia Costa highlighted how the cultural and creative sector has become more important in the EU in recent years, especially for its potential role in sustainable development.

She then praised the SoPHIA model for its multi-disciplinary approach and for being such a flexible and integrated tool that embodies the principles and needs of both the European Commission and Parliament. Therefore, owing to its innovative features, Honorable Costa proposed to the Consortium to implement the SoPHIA model in the restoration and valorization project of the ancient Saint Stephen Prison. Indeed, she believes that the SoPHIA model can effectively address the complexity and challenges of the renovation process and, if supported by a robust communication plan, the assessment process could raise awareness of the necessity and convenience of interventions on CH.

2.1 Holistic Impact Assessment Model and its Potential for Future Deployment

Panelists:

• *Mauro Baioni – Roma Tre University*

• *Aron Weigl – Denken und Handeln in Kultur und Bildung (EDUCULT)*

• *Sanja Tišma/Sunčana Franić – Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO)*

• *Annalisa Cicerchia – Roma Tre University*

Discussion: Henrik Zipsane (European Museums Academy EMA), Ines Bettencourt da Camara (Culture Action Europe), Riin Alatalu (ICOMOS), Alessandra Gariboldi (Fitzcarraldo Foundation)

Moderation: Mercedes Giovinazzo (Interarts)

Being the moderator of the first panel, Mercedes Giovinazzo opened the session by introducing the SoPHIA model, underlining how its innovative features aim to provide policymakers and communities with a renewed outlook towards impact assessments in culture in Europe. She then gave the floor to the four panelists to analyze the characteristics and functioning of the model.

Mauro Baioni started its presentation by underlining the change from a logic of spending to the quality of the intervention represented by the Horizon 2020 call that brought to the SoPHIA project itself. In the last two years, SoPHIA has dealt with exploring methods of giving evidence of investment in culture. It eventually developed a holistic impact assessment model, a social platform, and policy briefs that add to the overall debate surrounding investments in culture by the EU.

Baioni presented the starting points of the project (namely: Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe (2015), European Quality Principles for EU funded-interventions with potential impact upon cultural heritage (2019), and Impacts 08 (2010)) that led the Consortium to create its three-axis model:

- DOMAINS AXIS: focuses on cross-cutting issues and countereffects among the economic, social, cultural, and environmental domains.
- PEOPLE AXIS: focuses and address the different need of all stakeholders involved in the intervention (promoters, funders, beneficiaries, managers, etc.).
- TIME AXIS: focuses on the key moments of the lifecycle of the intervention (ex-ante, ongoing, ex-post) in a longitudinal perspective. This is particularly important to grasp those impacts that emerge years after the official conclusion of the intervention.

Baioni also explained that the SoPHIA model was conceived for a wide and diverse cluster of users, such as:

- Policymakers (to help them choose criteria to grant funding and/or tender bids)
- Manager and practitioners (to improve the monitoring and planning activities to be reported in their social / sustainability records)
- Institutional observers and independent researchers (since the model also grasps the cumulative impacts and legacy of the intervention on the extended period. And it also may help advocate for the importance of CH interventions)

Finally, Baioni underlined the importance of the SoPHIA model in linking the assessment on quality to the spectrum of values generated by the intervention itself. Those values are related to the transmission of heritage from the past to the future, through the present, and are analyzed by assessing their impacts through the model.

After this first overview of the SoPHIA model, Aron Weigl explained in detail the process of developing the model, which began with the literature review, followed by the first draft in an extensive excel sheet.

This draft model was tested via 12 case studies around Europe, after which it was developed further and then refined, resulting in the model as it is today.

The final form of the SoPHIA model is displayed in an online visualization on the project website that was presented for the first time during this very same panel. Weigl showed the functioning of the "SoPHIA model" section, going through the different functionalities and using the Social Capital and Governance theme and Inclusive Access sub-theme to explain in detail how the model was designed and implemented.

Sunčana Franić presented the toolkit for the SoPHIA stakeholders (D 3.1) that aims at explaining the SoPHIA model. She explained how the SoPHIA model foresees three phases through which heritage impact assessment is performed:

- Phase 1: defining the context for IA analysis by examining the intervention and its context through the model and defining the stakeholders.

- Phase 2: tailoring and implementing the multi-domain framework through its themes, sub-themes, and indicators.

- Phase 3: analysis of the outcomes through reports, lessons learned, and recommendations to be considered in future steps.

After presenting in detail the model implementation by going through the three phases and related actions ("steps"), Franić remarked on the potentialities of the SoPHIA model:

- it provides heritage policy and decision-makers with insights that enable appropriate selection of intervention with long-term positive impacts on the community;
- it enables and facilitates the monitoring process by providing specific information (both qualitative and quantitative) on the intervention;
- it enables the connection between CH projects and interventions with recent policies, programs, and priorities;
- it manages to separate the effects of CH interventions from other impacts.

To conclude the description of the SoPHIA model, Annalisa Cicerchia focused her intervention on its innovative features. In particular:

1. the SoPHIA model determines what works and what doesn't work in an intervention. The idea of the one-to-one attribution of effects to causes has been overcome by a multicausal perspective that allows for a wider spectrum of elements to contribute to the impact of the intervention. This also put SoPHIA in line with the UNESCO 2030 indicators.

2. the SoPHIA model is holistic and, thus, comprehensive:

a) It aims at building bridges across various disciplines without neglecting their identity, theories, and conceptual framework. As a matter of fact, the SoPHIA model guides the interaction and connection among all of them to define crosscutting issues and perspectives to be analyzed.

b) A complete and holistic approach is ensured by including the time and dynamic contextual factors in the SoPHIA model. In fact, SoPHIA aims at grasping relevant sequences and processes rather than single, fixed points in time.

c) SoPHIA also aims at switching from an "inherently undemocratic" nature of impact evaluations (which have traditionally been handed over to "experts and technicians") to a more inclusive one by recognizing the crucial role played by the people in the

assessment process that has been traditionally overlooked.

3) the SoPHIA model is a unicum for its flexibility.

a.   It builds upon past developments, but it is also open to embracing future developments.

b.   It is adaptable, while at the same time it is systematic and structured.

c.   It is inherently social-oriented and can be used by different users (academics, practitioners, beneficiaries, etc.).

After the SoPHIA model presentation, Mercedes Giovinazzo gave the world to the invited discussant to share their thoughts and suggestions on it.

Riin Alatalu (ICOMOS) took the word as the first discussant, and she highlighted how the SoPHIA project and ICOMOS work in parallel.

She explained that ICOMOS develops its quality principles (also) because HIA is either not done or is poorly implemented. In fact, although EIA is used throughout Europe, HIA's application is often very superficial. She proposed working further on legislation and influencing politicians since, as Silvia Costa underlined in her opening speech, that is what will make the difference in the future.

She explained that in the case of ICOMOS' quality principles, ICOMOS created channels to introduce them on the EU and national level and, thus, influence policymakers. She suggested that ICOMOS and SoPHIA collaborate in the near future to influence and convince politicians and policymakers to include the (SoPHIA) holistic impact assessment model in the legislation.

Inês Bettencourt da Câmara (Culture Action Europe) warned about the risk for the SoPHIA model to be considered, on the one hand, too complex to be used (although the toolkit may greatly help on this point), and, on the other hand, to be oversimplified by some implementers.

In her opinion, the greatest contribution of the SoPHIA project are the policy briefs, as they help recognize the impact of cultural heritage in our entire civic and social lives. She then proposed that Culture Action Europe can help disseminate the project's results through its network, also to help and to facilitate continuing the discussion started in the SoPHIA Consortium.

Henrik Zipsane (EMA) focused on the situation of the European Museums. He underlined that the majority of the 55-60.000 museums existing in Europe are very small. Thus,

although there is a high demand for impact assessment in museums, he believes that small museums will need many years to start using such a complex model as SoPHIA's.

Therefore, he suggested that museums pick inspiration from the model in the meantime. At the same time, the Consortium, in collaboration with NEMO and Italia Nostra, can market the model to museums, test the model on more cases, and provide more guidance on how to use the model.

Alessandra Gariboldi (Fitzcarraldo Foundation) appreciated SoPHIA's value for policymakers and implementers of heritage interventions. Nevertheless, she feared that the SoPHIA model might not be sustainable process-wise.

In fact, impact assessments, especially at the multi-domain level, require huge resources and specific competencies for implementing the assessment process. Although the SoPHIA model may be adjusted to the organization's resources, there is still a lot of work that not many are willing to do. As noted in the case studies analysis carried out by the Consortium, it is difficult to engage stakeholders into reflecting and negotiating since they are really expensive (benefit-wise).

She suggested, then, to test more on small realities and to continue working on trying to change the ongoing legislation.

2.2 Recommendations for Policies, Action and Research on Heritage Impact Assessment

Panelists:

• *Aleksandra Uzelac (IRMO)*

• *Daniela Jelinčić (IRMO)*

• *Paola Demartini (Roma Tre University)*

Discussion: Josef Konvitz (former Chief of Regulatory Affairs, OECD), Cornelia Dümcke (Scientific Coordinator of the European Expert Network for Culture (EENC), Linda Mockton (Historic England)

Moderation: Ana Žuvela (IRMO)

After presenting the model, the Consortium focused on analyzing the project's policy briefs (PBs).

Aleksandra Uzelac explained that the purpose of SoPHIA's policy briefs is to convince policymakers to change their perception of the impact assessment model by adopting the SoPHIA model. The policy briefs provide argumentative support for introducing the

model to present possible solutions (in the form of recommendations) to the problems addressed by policymakers. In particular, the documents analyze the following topics that had been selected by the SoPHIA Consortium and its community of practice as the most relevant in the four domains (cultural, social, economic, and environmental):

- CH and education: new skills for heritage professionals in D 3.3 *Policy brief with recommendations on cultural impact for policymakers* (by EMA)

- CH and social inclusion: the importance of citizens' participation in D 3.4 *Policy brief with recommendations on social impact for policymakers* (by IRMO)

- The relevance of data in CH assessment in D 3.5 *Policy brief with recommendations on economic impact for policymakers* (by Roma Tre)

- Transformation strategies for CH: resilience, sustainability, and green management in D 3.6 *Policy brief with recommendations on environmental impact for policymakers* (by NTUA)

After presenting the main points reported in the four PBs, Aleksandra stressed the importance of overcoming the discrepancy between rhetoric and practice and, thus, ensuring proper implementation of recommendations at the policy level.

In this scenario, SoPHIA proposes:

- Its model as a multi and intersectoral policy instrument. In fact, policy transfer, coordination, and convergence are also fundamental to guarantee successful implementation and positive effects of the holistic impact assessment model and widespread multi-stakeholder governance.

- To enhance citizens' participation so that they can access CH as a common and shared resource.

- To rely on locals' knowledge to assure a more sustainable behavior for natural and cultural heritage to seek stronger network in education and higher investment on research.

Daniela Jelinčić picked up from Uzelac's presentation to share insights on how the project's recommendations and outputs can be translated into European operational programs. In particular, Jelinčić focused on the guideline for the EU's future actions regarding operational programs and public policies (SoPHIA D 3.7).

She highlighted that, so far, the EU had focused their assessment process on formal accountability instead of evaluating the quality of interventions. This had led to a lack of comprehensive/holistic heritage impact assessment models or poor implementation of the existing ones. Therefore, the need for a more advanced and coherent model, such as the one proposed by the SoPHIA project, has been raised.

She then explained that the aim of D 3.7 is two-fold: on the one hand, it provides guidelines to EU policymakers regarding heritage impact assessment; on the other, it ensures and monitors the quality of CH interventions funded by operational programs.

In particular, the proposed guidelines for future EU action plans recognize the SoPHIA model as an important and useful tool for EU programs and policies addressing heritage interventions that should be promoted as mandatory for all projects to be funded under specific programs. In fact, the document recommends the SoPHIA model as a policy instrument for all types of heritage interventions and for ensuring a close engagement between the project and its stakeholders. On these bases:

-   Ex-post analysis of 2014-2020 operational programs should be designed with a clear picture of the impacts of the heritage projects funded under this previous framework. Moreover, it should be the basis for the mid-term evaluation of 2021-2027 operational programs, which is when the Consortium envision that the SoPHIA model should be introduced.

-   The SoPHIA model may also be used for analyzing the cost-benefit and public-benefit of heritage interventions under the 2021-2027 operational programs to understand if the funding used in heritage interventions had been justified (cost-benefit analysis) and if they had brought benefits to the community's wellbeing (public benefit analysis).

-   The Midterm review should introduce the SoPHIA model as a recommended tool for all future heritage funded projects.

-   Specific funds should be allocated for training practitioners that will be responsible for applying the SoPHIA model in the impact assessment process.

-   Monitoring activities on implementing the SoPHIA model should be introduced and regularly reported on the project's website/platform for collecting and disseminating results.

-   Funds for testing the SoPHIA model on pilot projects in the Members States should be provided.

-   The setting of a network of CH operators should be supported.

-   National, regional, and local decision-makers should be encouraged to introduce the SoPHIA model among their policy instruments (as

recommended by the EU level).

- The SoPHIA model is a flexible tool, so it should be tailored to each intervention by choosing those themes and sub-themes that apply to the specific case.

-

In conclusion, Jelinčić suggested that another project (SoPHIA 2) should be started to implement the model and get the most out of the SoPHIA's outputs. That would allow to continue the cooperation with the different stakeholders that are already part of the SoPHIA community, implement the existing tools (such as the website) for further purposes, and propose new activities (also) related to the operational plans and other EU projects, the new European Bauhaus initiative, and the SDG's framework.

Picking up from where Jelinčić's presentation ended, Paola Demartini focused her presentation on future research needs. In particular, three research avenues were presented:

1.   Applicability of the SoPHIA model (both in terms of different programs and in different phases of a CH project/intervention).

2.   Research on new sub-themes for the open grid. In fact, the grid is a dynamic tool, and it should align it with relevant emerging themes (such as those presented in the new European Bauhaus initiative) and specific relevant subthemes related to Cultural Heritage Interventions Sustainability (e.g., innovative financing of heritage interventions, contested heritage-related solutions, poor maintenance, etc.).

3.   Extension of the SoPHIA model. For example, since sustainability had been one of the pillars of the project, a more in-depth analysis of the SDGs should be added (e.g., the development of the SoPHIA model to support the evaluation of SDGs' impacts, alongside effective and efficient ways of their implementation in public policies and heritage interventions).

Therefore, SoPHIA allows for diverse future developments that should be supported by funds, sponsorships, (a new) use of the existing tools (such as the SoPHIA platform), and consistent research.

After this presentation, Žuvela gave the floor to the panel discussants to share their thoughts.

Cornelia Dümcke underlined that, since the beginning of the covid pandemic, there has been a growing interest in impacts without providing the needed data. Therefore, she appreciated show the Consortium contributed to this (D 3.5).

Then she pointed out that the standard evaluation system comes from the economic field; hence it is difficult to apply terms and concepts such as effectiveness, efficiency,

and relevance to the artistic and cultural field. Thus, one of the major challenges of the SoPHIA project is to change the evaluation approach.

Finally, she shared three recommendations on how to move forward.

First, the Consortium should invest in a strong communication strategy to make the project more known and potential users aware of it.

Secondly, the research should focus (also) on the question: "why knowledge implementation is not well established?" and find pathways for the needed change.

Lastly, she underlined that it is important to advocate for including the SoPHIA model in the EU Commission's assessment approach.

Linda Mockton took the word to highlight the importance of including diverse points of view to ensure to report different perspectives in the model implementation. She suggested considering the model as a tool for people, and not just organizations only, to achieve their goals and to monitor and understand what they have done already. In this regard, she also recommended deepening the analysis on combining the bottom-up and top-down approach.

She also proposed to apply the SoPHIA model to those countries (such as Scotland, New Zealand, Finland, and Iceland) that are developing well-being economies to see how the model works on them since the Consortium have already done so much work on the collective power and socially-oriented approach that these countries advocate for.

Finally, she suggested that SoPHIA should be aligned with those EU organizations looking into public benefits in different parts of the heritage sector (e.g., the European Archeological Council that focuses on the public benefits on archeology) to make a bigger case studies collection.

Based on his recent experience with a cultural program with cities and regions in northern France, Josef Konvitz strongly advised the Consortium to pay attention to failures and learn from negative experiences. In fact, impact assessments are not usually applied to failures but keeping track of these negative experiences is crucial for implementing better procedures.

He also recommended piloting the SoPHIA model and, at the same time, focusing on capacity building by working with Foundations instead of waiting for the EU endorsement.

Dorota Ilczuk shared her thoughts on the final version of the model, praising the connection between all the different outcomes of the project itself.

She recommended more research and testing in the next phases, pointing out that a specific analysis of the "creation phase" should be included in the ex-ante evaluation.

2.3 Prospects for Holistic Impact Assessment

Panelists:

•   *Evinc Dogan (Boğaziçi University)*

•   *Dubravko Bačić (University of Zagreb)*

•   *Olov Amelin (Jamtli Foundation)*

Moderation: Lucia Marchegiani (Roma Tre University)

The last session of the conference was a roundtable on the prospect of holistic heritage impact assessment. Lucia Marchegiani (Professor at Roma Tre University, member of the Consortium) invited the discussants to imagine it as a final verdict on the SoPHIA model and share their final thoughts on the results reached so far.

Olov Amelin praised the SoPHIA model and strongly recommended refurbishing and changing it over time. He also advised not to make it a mandatory method but to allow users to freely used it and test in those fields/situations where it would be a valuable tool.

Dubravko Bačić found interesting and new information in the SoPHIA model in comparison to the ICOMOS guidelines that he had been using for assessing projects. He recommended focusing on cumulative effects from different perspectives and the importance of the difference between expected and actual impacts (also in relation to the public involvement). As underlined by Evinç Dogan, that is possible only by applying a holistic impact assessment model.

Talking about the model, Dogan found it interesting that values focus on social impacts (such as social capital governance, quality of life, the identity of place) are included because assessment should always be done for people. She reported how lately, in Turkey, people have been an active part of the development of heritage interventions, and they have become more aware of their heritage and sense of belonging, thanks to their engagement in the process.

Olov Amelin recommended considering the SoPHIA model as a flexible tool; thus, allowing users not to consider those themes (and sub-themes) that do not apply to the specific intervention. To do this, more research on how to make the time framework more flexible (especially when it comes to the ex-ante phase) should be implemented.

Ana Žuvela advised using the model properly since the model may become an alibi to develop projects that have very little to do with the communities but with those exploiting the resources of that community. To avoid this, constant community engagement is requested.

Henrik Zipsane commented on the possibility of making the SoPHIA model mandatory. In his opinion, the EU commission may offer it to the Member States to try, but it would not be mandatory (especially because the national government would probably oppose it). Also, he underlined that many countries (and he referred to Scandinavian ones, in particularly) lack experts on culture and art and, therefore, they might need to engage some of them, hence creating new economic spillovers that should be, as suggested by Lucia Marchegiani, included in the model.

Rob Mark advocated for including in the model those people that are excluded or that self-exclude themselves from participating in the cultural interventions (such as older people, people with a low level of education, migrants). Thus, he suggested the keep them in consideration in future research.

To conclude the roundtable and involve other participants in the discussion, Lucia Marchegiani asked if they would suggest the Consortium create an education course and training to help users implement the model.

Dubravko Bačić underlined the difficulty of training experts from very different backgrounds (also when it comes to which materials should be taught). Moreover, although impact assessment will not be made mandatory, he believes that private forums and organizations should devise criteria to understand when it should be implemented.

Leonidas Koutsoumpos suggested that the next phase of the SoPHIA project should focus on testing the model on the case studies already retrieved during the second year. Those could be considered examples of implementation of the model itself that could help users understand it and appreciate it.

Alessandra Gariboldi praised the work done by the Consortium in the last two years as a great starting point that had allowed the SoPHIA project to get the attention of the policymakers and those who are already interested in impact assessment.

She believed that experts in impact evaluation should be trained to have vertical competencies to develop their research and, at the same time, to teach operators the importance of understanding social responsibility, not just technical application.

Finally, she suggested collecting and analyzing few standardized quantitative data to understand if, throughout the years, the intervention had managed to engage different people or not.

Talking about the future, Evangelos Kyriakidis shared advice on the next implementation phase of the project:

- make sure that the model is explained in a few, precise words;

- focus on expanding the project's network, especially by building alliances with organizations and individuals that are working on the same

topics;

- although being a holistic model, we should all accept that some criteria will not be feasible to all interventions and, therefore, some information may not be captured.

The session ended with Maria Teresa Iaquinta (ICOMOS), who praised the SoPHIA project for creating more awareness on the importance of evaluation. In the subsequent phases, the Consortium should focus on bringing the achieved results to the decision-makers and deepening the information retrieved so far through new partnerships with organizations that work on the same topics.

Final remarks

_____

Michela Marchiori concluded the second day of the conference by thanking all participants for their valuable contributions and reporting the main points discussed during the session of the day.

As remarked throughout the conference, the project will start a new cycle aiming at raising consensus on the effectiveness and applicability of the SoPHIA model as a recommended tool for heritage impact assessment. To do this, a twofold process should be implemented. On the one hand, the SoPHIA model should gain legitimacy at the European level and should be promoted by the European Commission with a top-down approach; at the same time, a bottom-up process should be implemented to engage all cultural organizations and associations that may be interested in using the model.

Another important aspect that had been stressed during the conference was the need for a strong communication plan. Although promoting and disseminating the SoPHIA model is not a simple task, the Consortium may count on the Community of Practices created in the last two years and all the new collaborations to come. In this regard, the Consortium looks forward to the opportunity given by Silvia Costa (Italy's Special Government Commissioner for the Recovery of the Former Santo Stefano/Ventotene Prison), Riin Alatalu (ICOMOS), and Alessandra Gariboldi (Fitzacarraldo Foundation) to implement the SoPHIA model.

Annex 1: Final Conference Agenda

SoPHIA Final Conference

Rome (hybrid event), December 16-17, 2021

Thursday, December 16th, 2021 Department of Business Studies (Classroom 5, second floor), Roma Tre University Via Silvio D'Amico 77, 00145, Rome Link to online conference: shorturl.at/orD09	
16:30 – 16:40	**Opening**
	• **Michela Marchiori |** Coordinator of SoPHIA, Roma Tre University
16:40 – 16:45	Organisational details
	• **Flavia Marucci|** Roma Tre University
16:45 – 17:45	Keynote and discussion I: **New Scenarios for Cultural Heritage - Manifesto of Culture at COP 26**
	• **Erminia Sciacchitano	** MiC *Moderation*: **Nicholas Anastasopoulos**	National Technical University of Athens (NTUA)
17:45 – 18:45	Keynote and discussion II: **New Scenarios for Cultural Heritage - the New European Bauhaus**
	• **Alessandro Rancati**	Joint Research Center (JRC)-European Commission's Science Service *Moderation*: **Paraic Mc Quaid**	Institute of Art, Design and Technology (IADT)
18:45 – 19:00	**Closing**
	• **Giovanni Caudo**	Roma Tre University
19:15	Transfer by bus
20:00	Social dinner

24

Friday, December 17th, 2021 Law Department (Aula Magna, ground floor), Roma Tre University Via Ostiense 159, 00154 Rome Link to online conference: shorturl.at/mABIT	
09:00 – 09:20	**Welcome**
	• **Luca Pietromarchi** | Dean, Roma Tre University • **Mario de Nonno** | Vice Dean, Roma Tre University • **Marco Tutino** | Dean, Department of Business Studies, Roma Tre University • **Sabrina Yaiche** | Project Officer, European Commission • **Michela Marchiori** | Coordinator of SoPHIA, Roma Tre University
09:20 – 09:30	**Opening**
	• **Silvia Costa** | Special Commissioner of the Italian Government and former Member of the European Parliament
09:30 – 11:00	**SoPHIA Holistic Impact Assessment Model and its Potential for Future Deployment**
	• **Mauro Baioni** | Roma Tre University • **Aron Weigl** | Denken und Handeln in Kultur und Bildung (EDUCULT) • **Sanja Tisma** | Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO) • **Annalisa Cicerchia** | Roma Tre University *Discussion*: **Henrik Zipsane** | European Museums Academy (EMA), **Inês Bettencourt da Câmara** | Culture Action Europe, **Riin Alatalu** | ICOMOS, **Alessandra Gariboldi** | Fitzcarraldo Foundation *Moderation*: **Mercedes Giovinazzo** | Interarts
11:00 – 11:30	*Coffee Break*
11:30 – 13:00	**Recommendations for Policies, Action and Research on Heritage Impact Assessment**
	• **Aleksandra Uzelac** | IRMO • **Daniela Jelincic** | IRMO • **Paola Demartini** | Roma Tre University *Discussion*: **Josef Konvitz** | former Chief of Regulatory Affairs, OECD, **Cornelia Dümcke** | Scientific Coordinator of the European Expert Network for Culture (EENC), **Linda Mockton** | Historic England *Moderation*: **Ana Zuvela**, IRMO
13:00 – 14:30	*Lunch*
14:30 - 15:15	**Round table: Beyond SoPHIA - Prospects for Holistic Heritage Impact Assessment**
	• **Beatriz García** | University of Liverpool • **Evinc Dogan** | Boğaziçi University • **Dubravko Bačić** | University of Zagreb • **Olov Amelin** | Jamtli Foundation • **Pier Luigi Sacco** | IULM University

	Moderation: **Lucia Marchegiani**	Roma Tre University
15:15 – 15:30	**Closing remarks**
	• **Michela Marchiori**	Coordinator of SoPHIA, Roma Tre University
17:00	Cultural tour - Centrale Montemartini
20:00	Social dinner