Social Platform
for Holistic Heritage
Impact Assessment

Type of action:
Coordination and Support Action (CSA)

D3.7
GUIDELINES FOR AN ACTION PLAN ON THE EU FUTURE ACTION REGARDING OPERATIONAL PROGRAMMES AND PUBLIC POLICIES

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 #	R0.6

Project funded by the Program of the European Union for Research and Innovation Horizon 2020		
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	
CO	CONFIDENTIAL, restricted under conditions set out in Model Grant Agreement	X
CI	CLASSIFIED information as referred to the Commission Decision 2001/844/EC	

Revision History

R#	Date	Description / Reason of change	Author
R0.1	20 November 2021	First draft	IRMO
R0.2	24 November 2021	Draft revision	Roma Tre
R0.3	01 December 2021	Final draft	IRMO team
R0.4	30 December	Final Draft version	Roma Tre
R0.5	28 January	IRMO comments	IRMO
R0.6	08 February 2022	Final Draft revision	Roma Tre
R0.5	17 February 2022	Final version after language editing	IRMO
R0.6	25 February 2022	Definitive version	IRMO Roma Tre

Table of Content

Contents

1. Introduction

SoPHIA - Social Platform for Holistic Heritage Impact Assessment project was launched within the H2020 work program (2018-2020) call "Social platform on the impact assessment and the quality of interventions in European historical environment and cultural heritage sites" to contribute to the discussion on the adequacy of the standing models of impact assessment of cultural heritage interventions (hereafter CH interventions) and support the introduction of more advanced and coherent models that will foster sustainability. The new model is expected to impact the quality of interventions in the European historical environment and cultural heritage.

This document titled *"Guidelines for an action plan on the EU future action regarding operational programmes and public policies"* primarily serves in providing guidelines to EU policymakers regarding cultural heritage impact assessment (hereafter CH impact assessment). Recommendations should be introduced in future operational programmes (consequently also recommendations for public policies at the Member States' national levels) to ensure and monitor the quality of heritage interventions to be funded under the operational programmes. However, the document may also serve as a reference for national and local policymakers seeking to introduce national/local policies supporting heritage sustainable and resilient interventions with a real quality impact. The SoPHIA project, thus, proposed a holistic impact assessment model (the SoPHIA model further in the text) that can serve policymakers in the preparation of calls for funding heritage projects and in selecting the criteria to grant funding. It is expected that funded projects will result in quality interventions leading to sustainability and resilience of heritage, which would justify the funding.

Finally, the guidelines/recommendations provided in the document may also serve cultural heritage professionals, experts, and practitioners in planning the expected impacts of heritage intervention and adjusting the intervention accordingly.

The structure of the document is divided into two chapters following the first introductory chapter and one annex:

1. In Chapter 2, guidelines for an action plan on the EU future operational programmes referring to CH impact assessment are put forward in the form of recommendations.
2. Chapter 3 addresses how to put heritage impact assessment into relation with sustainable development and SDGs framework. It further highlights how the holistic approach to CH impact assessment could foster the New European Bauhaus initiative.
3. Annex 1 features an overview and a brief analysis of the EU policies and programmes.

2. Guidelines for an action plan on the EU future action regarding operational programmes referring to impact assessment of CH interventions

_____

When introduced in future operational programmes and public policies, the SoPHIA model can be considered a recommended tool for impact assessment of all future CH projects funded by European, national or local programmes. It serves as a planning and monitoring tool ensuring the quality and sustainability of CH interventions supported and funded under the operational programmes and policies. It enables ex-ante, mid-term and ex-post analysis of impact assessment for CH professionals, experts, practitioners, project managers as well as decision-makers. It aims at ensuring a balanced approach to measuring the 'success'of CH interventions and their contributions to our sustainable future.

As much as the task of this document is to provide guidelines for Operational Programmes, here we propose some recommendations strictly related to the specific features of the SoPHIA project.

- The SoPHIA model has a transversal nature and is to be regarded as a multisectoral as well as an intersectoral policy instrument, which calls for a wide acceptance of the model by all policies/programmes which fund and support CH interventions; this also entails integrated policymaking and multi-stakeholder approach;
- It is highly suggested to consider the SoPHIA model as a stand-alone policy instrument for different types of heritage interventions (public, private, civil) that have a direct impact on registered heritage assets;
- Participatory approach and consultations with the interested heritage stakeholders are advocated even in the implementation of the SoPHIA model in the policy/programmes framework;
- Ex-post analysis of Operational programmes (OP) 2014-2020 may be done to have a clear picture of the impacts of the heritage projects funded under this framework. Cost-benefit and public-benefit analysis of heritage interventions may also be done to see if the funding of heritage interventions has been justified and if it brought benefits for the community well-being. This would serve as a basis for the mid-term review of the new Operational Programmes (OP) 2021-2027;
- Mid-term review of the OPs 2021-2027 should seek to introduce the SoPHIA model as a recommended tool for impact assessment of all future CH projects funded; in this way, this would be an effective mechanism for ensuring that CH impact is measured on the project level both at short and long terms;
- Training on the SoPHIA model is recommended for practitioners responsible for heritage impact assessment and those providing heritage-related statistics; specific funds should be designated to that activity (see D 3.3);

- Results of the impact assessment Of CH interventions should regularly be monitored and made available publicly to inform policymakers. A devoted Observatory should be created at the EU level to this aim. The SoPHIA platform developed within the project may serve as a central place for collecting and disseminating these results. Further funds should be ensured for this activity;
- National, regional and local decision-makers should also be encouraged to introduce the SoPHIA model in their policy instruments, and recommendation for it should come from the EU level. In this way, heritage impact assessment would also be introduced at the site-specific heritage assets;
- Additional recommendations relating to some of the main relevant themes emerged from the SoPHIA project (i.e. green management, social inclusion and citizens' participation, the relevance of data in CH impact assessment for evidence-based policy formation, and life-long education for new skills development for heritage professionals) should be considered as a specific direction of policy action according to separate policy briefs (see deliverables D3.3, D3.4, D3.5, D3.6)

It is expected that such CH projects will be offered substantial funding opportunities within operational programmes in the 2021-2027 programming period. Introducing the SoPHIA model in those programmes as a recommended tool for impact assessment of CH interventions is rather demanding but subsequently rewarding. Additionally, there are many operational programmes, so any recommendations should be made nationally, which takes the SoPHIA model on a different level of advocacy for its inclusion in the national and subnational policy provisions and structures. On a concluding note, the new holistic heritage impact assessment model should be seen as a novel democratic, economically responsible, socially, and environmentally attuned policy instrument that can enter the "official" and practical policy domain on many levels and through many outlets of European programmes. As such, its introduction and implementation can mark a new stage of cultural heritage protection, preservation, programming, governance, and management.

3. How to link the SoPHIA model with the relevant international framework?

_____

3.1 Sustainable development and heritage impact assessment

The concept of sustainability is an overarching principle that should guide CH interventions, and the link between culture and development is a topic that has been discussed for several decades. World Commission on Environment and Development (1987, p. 16) defined sustainable development as development that "meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". In the context of sustainable development, culture was put forward only in 2009 when the United Cities and Local Government's (UCLG) Agenda 21 for Culture was adopted. This was an important step forward, which stressed the importance of culture, proposed as the fourth pillar of sustainable development, alongside the economic, social, and ecological pillars (Jelinčić & Tišma, 2020). Although we usually speak of cultural sustainability, it is important to differentiate the concept from the sustainability of culture. It is seen as a two-way process: ensuring sustainability by way of culture, as in cultural sustainability, and maintaining culture *per se* (its practices, beliefs, values and identity, including heritage, and the future existence of a given culture) as in the sustainability of culture. The same applies to heritage sustainability. In practice, however, it is usually the case that heritage sustainability focuses on its instrumental values and less on the intrinsic ones (Jelinčić & Tišma, 2020). When speaking of heritage impact assessment, the focus is primarily on the sustainability of cultural heritage *per se*, as the goal is to ensure quality interventions on cultural goods. However, preserving heritage and ensuring its sustainability and durability opens the door for heritage sustainability, therefore ensuring that heritage instrumental values (e.g., economic ones) can also be used in local and regional development. SoPHIA aims to provide an impact assessment tool that would ensure a balanced approach to measuring the 'success'of heritage interventions and their contributions to our sustainable future, which is a complex issue that cannot be resolved easily.

The UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), adopted in 2015, based on the three pillars of sustainable development—its economic, social, and environmental objectives—represent a conceptual shift in thinking about development beyond economic growth, envisioning a desirable future that is equitable, inclusive, peaceful, and environmentally sustainable. Within its framework, the international development agenda refers to culture for the first time. Culture and creativity contribute to each of these pillars transversally. In contrast, the economic, social, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development should contribute to the safeguarding of cultural heritage and nurturing creativity. In such a framework, cultural heritage and creativity should be recognised as resources that must be protected and carefully managed because they can serve as drivers and enablers for achieving the SDGs.

Nevertheless, public policies usually focus on heritage instrumental values while intrinsic values are of minor importance. It is seen, e.g., in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable

Development adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2015: although this document considers the importance of culture, cultural heritage and creativity in sustainable development, it only marginally mentions the need for cultural heritage protection, and it fails to refer to its valorisation or regeneration (Vecco and Srakar, 2018). Thus, cultural heritage is specifically mentioned only in Target 11.4 (Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage) as an enabler of sustainable development contributing to Goal 11 (Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable). The role of culture in sustainable development is somewhat more specifically pronounced in this document and is reflected in other Goals and Targets, such as those related to education (Goal 4 / Target 4.7), the creative economy and tourism (Goal 8 / Targets 8.9 and 12.b), urban planning (Goal 11). Indirectly, its impact is also acknowledged throughout other Goals in food security (Goal 2), gender equality (Goal 5), securing decent work (Goal 8), innovation (Goal 9), reducing inequalities (Goal 10), climate actions (Goal 13) and peaceful and inclusive societies (Goal 16) (Nova Univerza, 2021). It is still a way forward for culture and heritage, but more should be done to strengthen their role in sustainable development.

Sustainable development goals are hard to be achieved if not implemented by national/local public policies. Research conducted by the Nova Univerza to gather information on how public authorities responsible for cultural heritage deal with sustainable development issues empowering heritage communities showed that most European countries have adopted or updated legal commitments or implementation strategies regarding sustainable development as per the 2030 Agenda, but the majority of them still fails in adopting a document defining the role of cultural heritage in the implementation of SDGs. Further on, the adoption of SDGs is likely to happen only if implemented through projects at the level of heritage communities. However, the main obstacles in strengthening the role of heritage communities in achieving SDGs, as resulting from the same research, are found in the following:

- Inability to see local benefit from achieving SDGs (SDGs perceived as complex and confusing).
- Other urgent priorities (role of heritage seen only indirectly),
- SDGs related to political preference.
- Lack of legal means for local communities to influence SDGs.
- Lack of funds.
- COVID-19 crisis and natural disasters (e.g., earthquake) uncovering vulnerability of cultural heritage.
- Low social capital.
- Low readiness among officials to implement effective participatory measures.
- Unconsolidated regulations/policies in the field of heritage and spatial planning and environmental matters.

This calls for a **participatory approach** to the implementation of SDGs at the local level to explain the local benefits, work on a common solution for legal actions in influencing SDGs and creation of participatory public policymaking. **Long-term planning** should be ensured in public policies to avoid the focus only on urgent priorities. This is also in line with political preferences for SDGs, which should be subject to long-term planning without any politicisation of cultural

heritage. Integrated planning and governance could ensure the consolidation of regulations related to heritage so far under different policies (heritage, spatial and environmental planning). **Support to capacity building** may prove effects in increasing the low social capital and, finally, **financial support to programmes fostering cultural heritage sustainability and heritage impact assessment** could ensure the resilience of CH interventions, thus also justifying the invested funds in heritage interventions.

> The SoPHIA model is all-encompassing and responds to all the mentioned obstacles. Although some SDGs reflect heritage only sporadically, some of their topics are also present in the SoPHIA model. For example:
> - education - Goal 4 / Target 4.7,
> - creative economy and tourism - Goal 8 / Targets 8.9 and 12.b,
> - climate actions - Goal 13,
> - peaceful and inclusive societies - Goal 16.
>
> Therefore, if introduced in public policies under which heritage interventions are funded, the model may substantially contribute to SDG implementation on the community level. Further actions for the promotion of the SoPHIA model within the UN structure are, therefore, advised. The advocacy efforts should also be extended towards international organisations in charge of heritage, such as ICOM, ICOMOS and ICCROM, which may influence policymakers and cultural heritage operators, owners, managers, etc., through their operational networks at country levels.

3.2 New European Bauhaus (NEB) and heritage impact assessment

Another framework on the EU level that represents a conceptual shift in thinking about sustainable development and envisioning our desirable future is the new European Commission initiative in the 2021-2027 framework, New European Bauhaus (NEB). NEB is conceived at the crossroads between art, culture, social inclusion, science and technology with the aim of designing future ways of living (European Commission, 2021). It is a creative and interdisciplinary initiative, and its main goal is a sustainable and inclusive future building on the European Green Deal ideas to be connected to our living spaces. It embeds aesthetics, smart solutions, and well-being to ensure the sustainability of physical living spaces and provide for quality of life. Its main feature is interdisciplinarity, fostering collaboration between art, culture, science and technology, putting it into a social dimension. While art and culture are mainly connected with providing aesthetic solutions and science and technology with smart ones, rather than conceiving the initiative as interdisciplinary, it should be regarded as transdisciplinary, thus crossing the sectorial and disciplinary borders while seeking exceptionally creative and innovative solutions for living spaces. Apart from collaboration, it is necessary to strive for experimentation, which fosters crossing the disciplinary borders to enhance and transform our lives. It fosters participatory approaches to solving complex societal challenges based on co-creation.

It is expected that the NEB initiative will mobilise knowledge communities and creative classes (e.g., researchers, engineers, architects, designers, artists, etc.) to improve the quality of our

9

living experiences while ensuring sustainability. This entails principles such as functionality, simplicity, circularity, inclusivity, diversity, affordability, fair distribution of wealth, learning and accessibility while providing comfort and attractiveness. The built environment should be in line with the ecosystems as regenerative solutions are to be inspired by natural cycles protecting biodiversity. If so, it also provides for enriching experiences and quality of life.

The initiative is elaborated in three phases, co-design (10/2020-6/2021)[1], delivery (9/2021 – onward)[2] and dissemination (1/2023 – onward), promoting community involvement and wide participation. Citizens are invited to contribute with their ideas to shape the very concept of the initiative, but their contribution is also envisioned in the framework of deliveries to be aligned with the funding to be ensured through calls for proposals.

The initiative is aimed at shaping how we think and potentially impacting our behaviour and markets regarding how we live and build. Operationally, it is envisioned as providing financial support to innovative ideas and products through ad-hoc calls for proposals and coordinated programmes included in the Multi-Annual Financial Framework. Further on, other supporting initiatives are also envisioned alongside additional policy instruments beyond the mentioned call for proposals. Eventually, it can also substantially impact public procurement.

As heritage substantially shapes the European living space, its role cannot be disregarded in the NEB initiative. It provides material evidence of European identity and aesthetics and potentially offers often forgotten traditional and local knowledge and skills related to smart and sustainable solutions. The shaping of our living spaces is often challenged in the discourse of contestation between modern/contemporary and old/traditional. In this discourse, heritage should not be regarded as a burden; on the contrary, it offers opportunities for smart and sustainable solutions promoting well-being for all. To grasp the full potential that heritage can offer in this process, it is necessary to ensure the sustainability of cultural heritage itself.

Thus, the programmes included in the Multi-Annual Financial Framework under which NEB projects will be financed and supporting initiatives and additional policy instruments could consider including the SoPHIA model in the elaboration of the calls concerning the impact assessment of CH interventions. It would ensure the quality of interventions with measurable outcomes making transferability of good practice examples much easier, more effective and more efficient. Further on, the SoPHIA model may provide a useful tool for monitoring pilots envisioned in the delivery phase.

---

[1] In the first phase of co-design, good practice examples have been gathered and showcased, promoting NEB principles. During this phase, almost 2000 examples have been collected, more than 200 papers and essays submitted accompanied by several local conversations across Europe. The NEB prize was also launched to stimulate the collection of contemporary examples, new ideas and concepts.

[2] The delivery phase focuses on the implementation of NEB pilots and is supported by calls for proposals. Monitoring of pilots will be performed as they should provide for transferability and learning experiences envisioned in the next phase - dissemination. Networking and knowledge sharing will be fostered, and replicable solutions put forward. The identified solutions will be openly and widely available (EC, n.d.-b).

Annex 1   EU operational programmes and policies on CH

Monitoring cultural heritage funding within the EU programmes is a demanding task since heritage is not subject to cultural policy only; CH interventions are often funded under different programmes (e.g., European Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund, Cohesion Policy). In continuation, we present an overview of EU policies and programmes related to cultural heritage.

Cultural heritage in EU policies

Cultural heritage naturally belongs to cultural policy remit and is addressed in the New European Agenda for Culture policy framework[3]. The Agenda provides "the framework for cooperation on culture at the EU level. [It] focus[es] on the positive contribution that culture brings to Europe's society, its economy and international relations. The Agenda also sets out enhanced working methods with the Member States, civil society organisations and international partners" (EC, n.d.-d)

The New Agenda was initiated in 2018, setting three strategic objectives relating to social, economic, and international aspects of cultural heritage. Active participation in culture and awareness of Europe's shared cultural heritage, history, and values are the focus of the social aspect, while the international aspect opens doors for cultural heritage as an important factor for building developmental relations in Europe, based on European identity and citizenship. The year 2018 was specifically dedicated to cultural heritage, which allowed „EU citizens to gain a broad understanding of their cultural heritage in all its aspects, democratically share responsibility for it, celebrate it and benefit from the creation it inspires" (Pasikowska-Schnass, 2018). The economic aspect also continues to present its importance in the EU 2021-2027 programming period through creativity, creative industries and access to finance.

Except for the cultural policy, EU actions for cultural heritage are found in policies such as education, cohesion policy, research and innovation policy, tourism, enterprise and industry policy, external relations and development, common agricultural policy, maritime policy, environment policy, citizenship, etc. As already stated, this poses a challenge in collecting unified statistical information on heritage funding as well as in its integrated governance on the EU policy level. On the other hand, such a dispersal provides greater funding opportunities for ensuring heritage financial sustainability.

---

[3] Historically, heritage was first dedicated to a specific action programme, Raphaël, in 1995. Later on, it was exchanged for a wider, Culture 2000 framework programme, running from 2000 to 2006, and further continuing with Culture 2007-2013 framework programme. This was followed by an even wider topic Creative Europe 2014-2020 framework programme. It is evident that EU policies went from a specific focus on heritage to a wider framework of culture and then creativity. In the current framework Creative Europe 2021-2027, creativity is again in focus. Cultural heritage is among its specific objectives, while a new focus is put on societal resilience, cultural participation, and the strengthening of European identity and values, particularly via strong synergies between cultural heritage and education (Tišma, Mileusnić Škrtić, Maleković & Jelinčić, 2021).

Cultural heritage funding from EU funds 2014-2020

In the 2014-2020 period, the European Union confirmed the importance of cultural heritage by granting funding for CH projects from a number of sources (Tišma, Mileusnić Škrtić, Maleković & Jelinčić, 2021). Table 2. presents cultural heritage funding opportunities within the 2014–2020 financial framework. The exact data within each instrument are not available, which presents the previously mentioned challenge for unified statistical monitoring of cultural heritage funding. Some recommendations in that respect are offered in the last chapter of this document.

Table 2. highlights that, through its Creative Europe programme 2014–2020, the EU cultural policy in the EU 2014–2020 financial framework designated some funds for cultural heritage activities. Namely, €1.46 billion have been designated for cultural and media projects, out of which nearly €27 million have been dedicated to cultural-heritage-related projects (Pasikowska-Schnass, 2018). However, this amount is substantially lower than the amounts allocated from the structural funds. Relatively large amounts for research in areas such as heritage science, industrial leadership, and societal challenges were also earmarked within the Horizon 2020 programme. Heritage projects were also eligible for numerous funding opportunities within other instruments with a geographic focus or even within programmes that seemingly do not deal with heritage at all (e.g., within agricultural, fisheries or external relations policies) (Tišma, Mileusnić Škrtić, Maleković & Jelinčić, 2021).

	Area EU	Programme/Funding	Budget
1.	Culture	European Union Year of Cultural Heritage 2018	€8 million
		Creative Europe programme (2014–2020)	€1.46 billion (out of which €422 million for the Culture Sub-programme, and €27 million for heritage)
		Special actions relevant to the heritage sector, supported under the Creative Europe programme: - European Heritage Days (EHD) - Joint Action with the Council of Europe (CoE) - European Capitals of Culture (ECOC) - European Heritage Label (EHL) - European Union Prize for Cultural Heritage/Europa Nostra Awards	European Capitals of Culture (ECoC): a grant of €1.5 million; total amounts vary between €6 and €100 million. The amounts invested in capital expenditure have ranged between €10 and €220 million, sometimes partly from the Structural Funds.
2.	Education	ERASMUS+ programme	
3.	Cohesion Policy	EU structural funds 2014–2020: - European Regional Development Fund - European Social Fund - European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development - European Maritime and Fisheries Fund - INTERREG, URBACT, etc.	European Maritime and Fisheries Fund: €647 million
4.	Digital Culture	EUROPEANA	
		Horizon 2020 programme	

5.	Research and Innovation	Horizon 2020 programme (H2020 Excellent Science, H2020 Industrial Leadership, H2020 Societal Challenges, H2020 Open SME Instrument Calls)	
		Other initiatives: - Community of Innovators on Cultural heritage and EU R&I Ambassadors on Cultural Heritage - Innovation actions in Horizon 2020: large multistakeholder demonstration projects - Horizon 2020 Prizes - Public-Private Partnership on "Energy-efficient Buildings" and the European Construction Technology Platform	
6.	Joint Research		
7.	Internal market, Industry, Tourism, and Entrepreneurship	COSME Programme (2014–2020) and Cultural Tourism: - European cultural routes - Diversification of tourism offered through synergies with creative and high-end industries - EDEN—European Destinations of Excellence	
		Space Programme Copernicus (2014–2020)	
8.	Combatting Illicit Trade of Cultural Goods	In 2017–2018, the EU financed a UNESCO-implemented action on engaging European art market stakeholders	
9.	Competition		
10.	Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)	Support for studies and investments associated with the maintenance, restoration, and upgrading of the cultural and natural heritage of villages, rural landscapes, and sites of high natural value, including related socio-economic aspects, as well as environmental awareness actions	

		LEADER community-led local development — funds available to upgrade rural cultural heritage and improve access to cultural services in rural areas	
		Business development (start-up aid for non-agricultural activities in rural areas and related investments): business support for rural micro- and small businesses. It provides start-up money of up to €70,000 for new businesses.	Up to €70,000 for new businesses
		Vocational training and skills acquisition	
11.	Maritime Policy	European Fisheries Fund (EFF)	2014–2020 budget of €5.7 billion — €647 million available, including allocation for the support of projects under maritime cultural heritage
12.	Environment Policy	A whole range of initiatives focusing on environmental issues like the Natura 2000 award and the European Green Capital Award and various projects supported by the LIFE programme (2014–2020) and again by the European Structural and Investment Funds contribute to enhancing and preserving cultural heritage.	
13.	Citizenship	Europe for Citizens programme (2014–2020)	
14.	External Relations and Development European Neighbourhood	Instrument for pre-accession assistance IPA II	
		European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI)	€15.4 billion
	Eastern Neighbourhood	EU–Eastern Partnership Culture and Creativity 2015–2018	

		The Media and Culture for Development in the Southern Mediterranean Programme (2013–2017)	
	Southern Neighbourhood	Med Culture (2014–2018) UNESCO–EU Cooperation in the Southern Mediterranean region	€2.46 million
	Rest of the World	The Development Co-operation Instrument (DCI) (2014–2020)	
		ACP Cultures+ programme (2012–2017)	€30 million
		Endangered heritage in the Northern regions of Mali: safeguarding, reconstruction, rehabilitation, restoration, and revitalisation (2014–2018)	€1.1 million
		11th European Development Fund EDF (2014–2020)	
		10th EDF Support to Culture, Tanzania (2011–2017)	€10 million
		Protecting cultural heritage and diversity in complex emergencies for stability and peace, Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP), 2017–2018	€1070 million

Table 2: Cultural heritage funding opportunities from EU funds (2014-2020)
Source: Tišma, Mileusnić Škrtić, Maleković & Jelinčić, 2021 based on Pasikowska-Schnass, 2018.

EU programmes relevant for cultural heritage 2021-2027

COVID-19 crisis is one of the key factors setting the direction of the funding priorities in the new programming period and for new opportunities for heritage funding. Along with the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2021–2027, the most relevant recovery instrument is the NextGenerationEU. They are both part of the European Recovery Plan with an earmarked budget of € 1835 billion (European Commission 2020a, 2020b). The Recovery and Resilience Facility is the main instrument focusing on the sustainability and resilience of European economies and societies. It particularly promotes green and digital transitions where cultural heritage may also find its place. To benefit from the support of the Facility, Member States submit their recovery and resilience plans to the European Commission. Each country plans the reforms and investments by the end of 2026 (EC, n.d-c). Funds to be allocated according to the country plans are still not available, but their impact is very important, which is why the SoPHIA model should be introduced and adopted.

Further on, within the MFF, the Digital Europe Programme (2021) makes € 7.5 billion available. Digitisation of heritage started in the previous programming period, while with the pandemic, it spread in practically every area of cultural heritage management. Therefore, it is expected that the heritage sector will make use of these available funds.

Relevant sources for cultural heritage will be available through Horizon Europe ReactEU and InvestEU. Further on, the Creative Europe 2021–2027 programme stays the most relevant stand-alone programme offering opportunities for cultural heritage projects. It falls under the 'Cohesion and values' heading of the 2021–2027 financial framework, and its budget will reach €2.2 billion for 2021–2027, which is a substantial increase compared to the available funds within this instrument in the previous period (€1.46 billion for 2014–2020) (European Film Agency Directors, 2020). Cultural heritage is one of the specific objectives. Except for the long-standing topics of European identity and values, the new ones to be dealt with are participation, societal resilience and education. Cultural heritage projects have a strong say in this.

The increase of around 30% is visible in the new Horizon Europe programme, which also focuses on recovery and resilience. This opens doors for cultural heritage-related projects that will be financed through the 'Inclusive and Secure Society' cluster. Except for the research, additional funds to be used by the heritage sector will be available in the Erasmus+ programme within the education policy.

Alongside the previously mentioned New European Agenda for Culture, two more initiatives are worth mentioning as opportunities for cultural heritage: the 'Rights and Values programme' and the Work Plan for Culture 2019–2022. The first one promotes values of substantial importance for heritage projects as a foundation of European values. The second one stresses the social and economic importance of European culture and heritage (Tišma, Mileusnić Škrtić, Maleković & Jelinčić, 2021).

Thus, a total of €143.4 billion will be available for cultural heritage through the main heritage-related funds, through MFF's headings 'Cohesion, resilience and values', 'Single market, innovation, and digital budget' as well as through NextGenerationEU (European Parliament, 2020).

Table 3. presents the additional planned available funds at disposal for heritage broken down per MFF 2021-2027, the NextGenerationEU, and new own resources.

Having such an array of funding opportunities for heritage within the EU funding framework poses a great remit of opportunities for introducing the SoPHIA model in all policies, programmes and initiatives.

Programmes Relevant for Cultural Heritage	MFF	NGEU	TOP-UPS	TOTAL
Horizon EU	75.5	5	4	84.9
Erasmus+ 21	21.2	-	2.2	23.4
Invest EU	2.8	5.6	1	9.4
Creative Europe	1.6	-	0.6	2.2
Rights and Values	0.8		0.8	1.6
Digital Europe Programme	7.5			7.5

Table 3: EU financing for 2021–2027: the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), the Next Generation EU (NGEU) recovery instrument, and new own resources—programmes relevant for cultural heritage (€ billion, 2018 prices)

Source: European Parliament EU financing for 2021–2027 Political agreement on the 2021–2027 Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), the NextGenerationEU (NGEU) recovery instrument, and new own resources (VLAIO, 2021).

Cultural heritage in EU operational programmes

Operational programmes are detailed plans in which the Member States set out how money from the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) will be spent during the programming period. They can address a specific region or refer to a country-wide thematic goal. Since cooperation is also planned for wider territories, specific cross-border or interregional operational programmes are drawn up.

Member States submit their operational programmes based on their Partnership Agreements. Each operational programme specifies which of the thematic objectives in the focus of the cohesion policy in the programming period will be addressed (EC, n.d.-a). Each country and/or region prepares the programmes, and specific funding is available under each operational programme. In 2014-2020, operational programmes were divided into National programmes (differing for each country and taking either regional or thematic approach) and Cross-border, transnational and interregional cooperation programmes (e.g., Alpine Space, Interreg Europe, Danube, North Sea, Adriatic-Ionian, INTERACT, URBACT, ESPON, IPA CBC, Mediterranean, Baltic Sea, Central Europe, Atlantic Area, Caribbean Area, Black Sea Basin, Balkan-Mediterranean, North-West Europe, etc.).

Reference list and further reading

Agentschap Innoveren & Ondernemen (VLAIO). (2021). *Digital Europe Programme (DIGITAL) and European Digital Innovation Hubs (EDIH).* https://eufundingoverview.be/funding/digital-europe-programme

Astara, O.H. (2014). Culture and the Fouth Piller of Sustainable Development.
http://sdct-journal.com/images/Issues/2015/7.pdf

Duxbury, N. and Jeanotte, M.S. (2010). Culture, Sustainability and Communities: Exploring the Myths.
https://www.ces.uc.pt/publicacoes/oficina/ficheiros/2982_353.pdf

European Commission. (2020a). *Horizon Europe—Commission Welcomes Political Agreement on Horizon Europe, the Next EU Research and Innovation Programme.*
https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_20_2345

European Commission. (2020b). *Recovery Plan for Europe.*
https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/recovery-plan-europe_en

European Film Agency Directors. (2020). *EFAD Welcomes the Increased Budget for Creative Europe.* https://europeanfilmagencies.eu/news-publications/our-press-releases/254-ćefad-welcome-the-increased-budget-for-creative-europe

European Parliament. (2020b). *EU Budget 2021 Approved: Supporting the Recovery. European Parliament News.* https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20201211IPR93640/eu-budget-2021-approved-supporting-the-recovery

European Commission. (2021). *New European Bauhaus*. https://europa.eu/new-european-bauhaus/index_en

European Commission. (n.d.-a). Glossary: Operational programme.
https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/what/glossary/o/operational-programme

European Commission (n.d.-b). *New European Bauhaus: About the Initiative.*
https://europa.eu/new-european-bauhaus/about/about-initiative_en

European Commission (n.d.-c). *Recovery from the coronavirus: Recovery and Resilience Facility.*
https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/recovery-coronavirus/recovery-and-resilience-facility_en#the-facility-and-nextgenerationeu

Hawkes, J. (2001). The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability. Culture's essential role in public planning.
http://www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/community/Downloads/HawkesJon%282001%29TheFourthPillarOfSustainability.pdf

Jelinčić, D. A., & Tišma, S. (2020). Ensuring sustainability of cultural heritage through effective public policies. *Urbani izziv / Urban challenge 31*(2), (pp. 78-87). DOI: 10.5379/urbani-izziv-en-2020-31-02-002

Nova Univerza. (2021). *The Right to Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development: Results of the Participatory Survey.* Manuscript.

Pasikowska-Schnass, M. (2018). *Cultural Heritage in EU Policies.* European Parliament. Retrieved from
https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/621876/EPRS_BRI(2018)621876_EN.pdf
Social Platform for Holistic Heritage Impact Assessment (SoPHIA) Consortium. (2021). *Deliverable D2.3: Final version of the SoPHIA Impact Assessment Model.* Retrieved from
https://sophiaplatform.eu/uploads/sophiaplatform-eu/2021/11/04/aaccb1ae0b65909e6440d545882820c9.pdf

Tišma, S., Mileusnić Škrtić, M., Maleković, S., & Jelinčić, D.A. (2021). Cost–Benefit Analysis in the Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Project Funding. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, *14*, 466. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm14100466

UNWTO. (1996). *What tourism managers need to know: A practical guide to the development and use of indicators of sustainable tourism.* Madrid: UNWTO.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development.* Retrieved from http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf

Project identity

_____

Project title: `SoPHIA – Social Platform for Holistic Heritage Impact Assessment´

Consortium coordinator: Michela Marchiori, Università degli Studi Roma Tre (UNIROMA3), Italy, michela.marchiori@uniroma3.it.

Consortium members: Interarts Foundation for International Cultural Cooperation (INTERARTS), Spain; Stichting European Museum Academy (EMA), the Netherlands; Institute of Cultural Policy and Cultural Management (EDUCULT), Austria; National Technical University of Athens (NTUA), Greece; Dun Laoghaire Institute of Art, Design & Technology (IADT), Ireland; and the Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO), Croatia.

Funding scheme: This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 870954.

Duration: 1 January 2020–31 December 2021

Budget: €1,511,070.00

Website: https://sophiaplatform.eu/en