

Rida Arif, Aron Weigl, Angela Wieser, Elia Vlachou, Henrik Zipsane, Paraic Mc Quaid, Christine Horn, Aleksandra Uzelac, Sanja Tišma, Suncana Franic, Nicholas Anastasopoulos, Hariklia Hari, Riva Lava, Mauro Baioni

## Towards the SoPHIA model: results from the case studies' analysis

(doi: 10.1446/103682)

Economia della Cultura (ISSN 1122-7885)

Fascicolo Speciale, dicembre 2021

**Ente di afferenza:**

()

Copyright © by Società editrice il Mulino, Bologna. Tutti i diritti sono riservati.

Per altre informazioni si veda <https://www.rivisteweb.it>

### **Licenza d'uso**

L'articolo è messo a disposizione dell'utente in licenza per uso esclusivamente privato e personale, senza scopo di lucro e senza fini direttamente o indirettamente commerciali. Salvo quanto espressamente previsto dalla licenza d'uso Rivisteweb, è fatto divieto di riprodurre, trasmettere, distribuire o altrimenti utilizzare l'articolo, per qualsiasi scopo o fine. Tutti i diritti sono riservati.

# 3. TOWARDS THE SoPHIA MODEL: RESULTS FROM THE CASE STUDIES' ANALYSIS\*

## 3.1 Methodological approach of the empirical research

The SoPHIA model has been developed in three steps.

First, the analysis of existing research, literature and policy programmes within the four domains under consideration (social, cultural, environmental and economic) (SoPHIA, 2020a). Second, the review of good and poor practices of CH impact assessment (SoPHIA, 2021a). Third, the testing of the draft SoPHIA model that was developed based on steps one and two (SoPHIA, 2021c).

The draft SoPHIA model was characterized by the following main features (SoPHIA, 2020c):

- A multi-domain framework, consisting of 9 themes and 46 subthemes to be assessed. In addition, a collection of potentially relevant indicators and a generic understanding of the themes was included in the multi-domain framework. The themes were: Social Capital; Sense of Place; Well-being/Quality of Life; Strong Global Partnerships; Prosperity; Knowledge; Innovation; Protection; Attractiveness<sup>1</sup>.
- People's perspective characterized the draft SoPHIA model. It emphasizes the need for a multi-stakeholder perspective in assessment that underlines the critical role played by the influence and objectives of a diverse group of stakeholders in the development of the cultural intervention. The politics of culture are at play, with varying stakeholders working together to govern the role of culture in the daily lives of a myriad of people from all walks of life. A multi-stakeholder perspective in impact assessments was, therefore, identified as crucial in the steps preceding the testing of the model.

\* While the research is the outcome of the joint effort of SoPHIA Consortium, par. 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 should be attributed to Rida Arif, Aron Weigl, Angela Wieser, par 3.4, 3.5 should be attributed to Elia Vlachou and Henrik Zipsane, par. 3.6 should be attributed to Paraic Mc Quaid and Christine Horn, par 3.7 Aleksandra Uzelac, Sanja Tišma, Suncana Franic, par 3.8, 3.9, should be attributed to Nicholas Anastasopoulos Hariklia Hari and Riva Lava, par. 3.10 should be attributed to Mauro Baioni.

– A longitudinal approach to the assessment process was also highlighted as an important factor to capture the impact of cultural heritage interventions in a holistic manner. Although the testing of the model was, from the beginning, limited in terms of time resources, the longitudinal approach towards assessment was attempted to be included in the testing.

The three components were also reflected in the research questions leading the analysis of two case studies from each partner's country.

To obtain feedback on the consistency of the three-axis model, we asked each partner to identify two case studies within their own countries to evaluate both the structure of the model and its applicability throughout varying contexts across the urban European level. For this purpose, the partners shared:

– a set of three open questions, leaving everyone free to investigate one or more aspects using different data collection methods.

– the selection criteria of the case studies.

The three guiding questions are:

*i.* How is the draft impact assessment model applicable, and how can specific themes and subthemes be researched?

*ii.* How can the stakeholders' perspective be included and researched in the impact assessment of the case?

*iii.* How can the issue of time and longitudinal perspective on the impact of a case be included in the assessment?

The draft SoPHIA model has been tested through a participatory approach, where stakeholders were deeply engaged. These included two groups: main parties to the case studies (contact persons for the case studies who were prepared to co-define the objectives of the assessment and reflect on the course of the impact assessment process) and other relevant stakeholders (including managers, investment advisors and other representatives from the case, cultural associations/entities/beneficiaries involved in the intervention).

Several factors formed the criteria for selecting the case studies<sup>2</sup>.

*i.* Classification of the city: the SoPHIA project specifically aims at developing an impact assessment model for interventions in European historical environment and CH sites at an urban level. Therefore the «cityness» of the case formed an important criterion of sampling, differentiating between the levels of urbanity from 1-3 according to the DE-GURBA classification.

*ii.* Access of researchers to the case: due to the participatory approach of testing the draft SoPHIA model, it was necessary to ensure access of the SoPHIA researchers to the case and case study representatives. Therefore, access to the site was also a criterion of sampling, differentiating between 'good', 'probably good' and 'not so good' access.

*iii.* Data availability: A third criterion to select cases was the availability of

data on the case that was estimated by the consortium partners along the categories 'good', 'probably good', 'not so good' and 'unknown'.

*iv.* Stage of the case: Considering different stages of impact assessments such as ex-ante and ex-post, while also considering the time axis of the draft SoPHIA model, the stage of the case represented a relevant criterion for sampling. The sampling methodology differentiated between cases that have not started yet, ones that are ongoing, and ones that are finished.

*v.* Type of CH: In order to differentiate between the type of CH under investigation in the case studies, following forms were defined as criteria: monument/place of remembrance; architectural; archaeological; historic building; museum/documentary; cultural good or object; intangible; project/programme; landmark.

*vi.* Funding/type of recognition: With regards to the funding of the intervention, the sampling criteria differentiated between funding from the international/global level from the European level, from the national level, from the regional/local level and funding from private sources.

*vii.* Geographic location: the location of the interventions was also considered during the sampling of case studies. Here, it is important to acknowledge that other criteria, such as the type of the intervention and access to the case were prioritized. In terms of location, the sampling grid differentiated between North, West, Central, South, and South-East Europe.

*viii.* Type of initiation: The criterion of who initiated an intervention in CH was divided into policy-driven, civil society-driven and business-driven cases.

*ix.* Physical dimension: Finally, the physical dimension of cases was also considered, with small (max. 1 building), medium (group of buildings) and large (area) of interventions into CH.

The methodology of data collection varied for each partner of the SoPHIA Consortium, depending on the context of each case study. Partners were free to explore various forms of data collection, including workshops, document analysis (incl. statistical analysis), qualitative interviews, focus group discussions, media or discourse analysis, or surveys.

In the next paragraphs (from 3.2 to 3.10), the Consortium partners sum up the main outcomes, reflections, and feedback derived from their case studies analysis. The difference in style and structure are to be considered as a result of the approach chosen by the partners, and of their intention to focus on specific aspects or topics.

The case studies analysis highlighted several challenges that were faced later, for the finalization of the model. To ensure the holistic nature of the three-dimensional model, and its applicability, several recommendations were proposed. These recommendations acted as guidance for further development and improvement of the model and helped to shape its current form, as described in chapter 4.

### 3.2 *The MuseumsQuartier Wien – MQ (Austria)*

The MuseumsQuartier Wien (MQ) is a cultural area located in the heart of Vienna. One end of the area is connected to one of the two main shopping streets in the city centre and on the other end it closes up to the Ringstraße – the pompous street encircling the first district with the main historic buildings of the city. The MQ is also part of the historic city centre in Vienna, that is listed as a UNESCO world heritage site.

The case of the MQ Vienna was interesting for testing the draft SoPHIA model because it was a great cultural area and development project in the heart of Vienna, re-defining and re-constructing built CH. The case was approached via the MQ directorate as the main stakeholder of the case study analysis. It has to be mentioned that the SoPHIA consortium partner EDUCULT from Austria has its premises at the MQ and many contacts to the institutions and initiatives located at the MQ. Therefore, main stakeholders were approached for interviews via the contact of the MQ directorate as well as EDUCULT's own initiative. Apart from qualitative interviews, also a focus group was also implemented with representatives from the MQ cultural institutions. Documents reviewed in the course of the document analysis were provided by the MQ directorate and identified via literature research.

The main complex of the MQ was built in the eighteenth century as Vienna's imperial stables, with a very symmetrical, 355-meter-long facade facing the two main historic museums in Vienna and the Ringstraße (Trenkler 2014). The complex was used as the site of Vienna trade fair until 1995, when the construction of the MQ as it is today began. It became the biggest construction project had Vienna witnessed since the Second World War, with a budget of approximately two billion Euro a total area of 60.000 m<sup>2</sup>, making it «one of the ten largest contemporary cultural complexes in the world» – as is often highlighted in the promotion of the place.

The discussions that accompanied the development of the MQ bear witness to the potential conflicts of the re-adaptation of a historic site. The process of re-developing the MQ had started earlier in the 1970s. Until the decision in 1983 that the area shall be used as a cultural district, other concepts and ideas for the area also foresaw its usage for mainly commercial purposes. The official decision of the Austrian parliament on the establishment of the MQ was taken in 1990. It was preceded by the decision of an international jury on the architectural plan of the project, favouring the design of Ortner & Ortner Baukunst (Trenkler 2014; Waldner 2001). Shortly after, however, a citizens' initiative emerged to campaign against the design of Ortner & Ortner, condemning the invasion of modern architecture into the historic value of the area. The critique relates to the discussion on the usage of CH sites for contemporary purposes that specifically come up in the context of the outstanding universal values of UNESCO world heritage sites.

The citizens' initiative favoured a «gentle renovation and preservation of the historical architecture» with the focus of the critique being the 67-meter high «reading tower» in the middle of the complex. Many voices joined the public discussion initiated by the citizens group that was backed by the right-wing party FPÖ and supported by the most read Austrian newspaper «Kronen Zeitung». The discussions continued until 1998, when finally, a new architectural concept, without the reading tower, was adopted and work on the complex started. Today, MQ's architecture is characterized by the traditional corpus and two main modern buildings in the central yard of the area, often described as a black and white bunker housing the Museum of Modern Art (mumok) and the Leopold Museum respectively. In the external appearance of the MQ, tradition clearly predominates (Wimmer, 2014).

The citizens' initiative and the discussions accompanying the re-development of the sites mainly show how issues of social capital, including participation in decision-making, can play a central role in the initiation process of an intervention. In terms of access to the site, it also must be mentioned the needs of persons with disabilities were not taken into account in the re-construction of the area. After disability representatives condemned major deficiencies in terms of accessibility after the opening of the MQ in 2001, barrier-free access had to be ensured with additional construction work (Der Standard, 2020). Furthermore, the construction and opening of the MQ was accompanied by the fear of independent cultural actors that the MQ would have a negative impact on the independent art scene.

The structure that resulted out of this process and characterizes the MQ today, frames the diverse potential impacts the MQ has or might have. The MQ hosts many cultural institutions, the biggest being the museums Kunsthalle Wien, the mumok and the Leopold Museum, as well as the theatre for children and young people Dschungel Wien, the children's museum Zoom and the centre for architecture in Vienna (AZW). In addition, the Q21 provides workspace for around 50 initiatives and organizations working in the cultural sector. Finally, MQ is managed by its directorate, which is also responsible for the management of the Q21 and the public program in the yards of the area. These institutions, initiatives and organizations represent the broadness and diversity of the stakeholder structure inside the MQ, with all of them having different funding structures. A good example are the three biggest institutions in the main yard of the MQ; the Kunsthalle Wien is funded by the City of Vienna, while the Leopold Museum is a private foundation partially state-financed and the mumok is a federal museum of the Republic of Austria. At the same time, the directorate of the MQ also has a complex funding structure, being financed both by the City of Vienna as well as the Republic of Austria with 3,74 Mill. Euro (Bundesministerium für Kunst, Kultur, öffentlichen Dienst und Sport, Sektion für Kunst und Kultur 2020) in 2019.

*Findings from the Case*

The findings of the case study analysis were manifold and provided an interesting reflection on the draft SoPHIA model. In the following, some of these findings are summarized that later on also impacted the further development of the SoPHIA model. For instance, the analysis of the impact of the MQ showed that the issue of location and reachability via public transport is an important aspect to assess the social capital of a location. The MQ is open to visitors 24/7 and, although it is an (architecturally) enclosed space, it is possible for visitors to pass through the yards of the MQ at any time. The location of the MQ in the city centre increases the potential accessibility of the site strongly. At the same time and as pointed out by a range of representatives from the MQ institutions during the case study research, its central location potentially also raises a challenge in terms of reachability from the outskirts of town.

Furthermore, the case of the MQ also highlighted the importance of the people's perspectives on the quality of a project/program. The MQ, being the home of many museums and cultural institutions, also aims at being a door-opener to the artistic offer provided there. Whether this objective has been achieved has been subject to many discussions over the last 20 years.

There is no statistical data on how visitors of the MQ public space correlate with visitors of the cultural institutions in the MQ. Although the MQ as well as all big cultural institutions regularly implement visitor surveys, this data is only comparable to a limited degree and does not have any significance concerning the question to which degree the public space at the MQ functions as a door opener to art and culture. Here, qualitative surveys in terms of shared characteristics amongst people relating to the site/practice can be helpful in bridging this gap of data and support the assessment of the impact of the MQ.

As a case study the MQ has furthermore shown that once the decision for establishing the MQ was taken, it became a popular public place with its own reputation and contemporary meaning. An example that was highlighted in the course of the case study were the seating possibilities in the yards of the MQ, called Enzies. These are flexible benches that are coloured differently every year. The public is invited to vote for their choice of colour for the Enzies, and a high degree of participation is witnessed. The Enzie has grown to become an urban symbol of Vienna and thereby defined the MQ and its contemporary value as well as its reputation.

Finally, different aspects of the economic impact and its cross-cutting character to other areas of impact were reflected in the MQ case study analysis. For example, the MQ, according to the statements of the directorate, does not have to prove its economic creation of value to the city and has not been planned as a place of commerce and con-

sumption. However, the social and cultural potential of the place still depends on its economic rentability because the income of the MQ directorate from the lease of its premises will support the realization of public events in the yard of the MQ. That means that the public program of the MQ to some degree depends on the financial return that the directorate gets out of leasing the premises. In addition, the danger of gentrification was an issue in the case of the MQ as a huge cultural development project in the middle of an urban area. The district surrounding the area has indeed witnessed a positive economic development in the last 20 years as well as a process of gentrification with the MQ surely being a contributing factor. However, to which degree the MQ as a project was the source of this process was not possible to assess. And although it was expected that the surrounding area will profit not only economically but also by becoming increasingly a place of art and cultural production, but these expectations remained fulfilled.

### *3.3 The Jewish Cemetery Währing (Austria)*

Ten years ago, in December 2010, the fund for the restoration of Jewish cemeteries in Austria was founded. Its establishment was based on the legal obligation of Austria set out in the Washington Agreement to restore and maintain known and unknown Jewish cemeteries in Austria (Fund for the Restoration). Since then, 12 cemeteries across Austria were (partly) restored. The Jewish Cemetery in Vienna's 18th district, called Währing, is a renowned and complicated case that has not yet been tackled by the fund, most likely due to the limited amount of annual funding available for restoration work in Austria. However, in the fall of 2020, Austrian media reported that additional funding was now being made available for the restoration.

In this context, the example of the Jewish Cemetery in Währing was an ex-ante case for testing the draft SoPHIA model whereas the intervention into the Jewish history at the cemetery in form of its restoration has also been tackled before. Although since 2010 the restoration of the cemetery was pushed forward by a citizen's initiative, large parts still remain in poor condition. In 2017 the association «Rettet den Jüdischen Friedhof Währing» (Save the Jewish Cemetery Währing) was formed, under which the volunteering work is now coordinated and the collection of donations for the restoration of the cemetery is organized. This initiative organises volunteering for simple cleaning and restoration work at the cemetery. By these means the cemetery also represents a civil society driven case of intervention of CH. As highlighted by interviewed representatives of the association, the reason for founding the association was the awareness that the Jewish Community of Vienna (IKG) would not have the financial resources to support the restoration

of the cemetery in Währing. 50% of the cost for restoration must be contributed by the property owner – in the case of the Jewish Cemetery Währing, it is the IKG.

In terms of its history, the Jewish Cemetery in Währing is a symbol and place of remembrance for many aspects and eras of Jewish life in the Austrian capital. It was the main burial place for the Jewish community of Vienna from its establishment in 1784 until its closure. In 1878 it was closed due to the opening of the Jewish section at the main central cemetery in Vienna (Zentralfriedhof). Over a period of nearly a hundred years, an estimated number of 30.000 persons were buried at the cemetery, with approximately 9.000 persons identified until now due to preserved gravestones. As described by Tim Corbett (2020, p.196-256), this period of Jewish life in Vienna was an era of emancipation and liberalization for the Jewish community in the context of general modernization processes. Before the desecration during the Shoa, the cemetery represented a complex sociogram of the Jewish community living in Vienna during this period. Many renowned names of Jewish families can be found at the cemetery, serving as a reminder of the contribution of Vienna's Jewish community to the city's history.

The restoration of the cemetery is therefore potentially relevant in many aspects, but first and foremost regarding narratives it tells and challenges about Jewish life in Vienna, the history of how the municipality of Vienna treated its Jewish citizens and about shared heritage of the city. For the SoPHIA project, the Jewish Cemetery Währing represents an important category of heritage as it was the only place of remembrance that was included in the testing of the model.

### *Findings from the Case*

For places of remembrance the issue of education is always an important area of potential impact, and this was also the case with the ex-ante testing of the intervention in the Jewish Cemetery Währing. Although the current financing relates specifically to the restoration of the site, stakeholders emphasize that as soon as access to the site is ensured, educational activities in form of guided tours, arts education projects, perhaps in the form of a museum are envisaged. It became clear that in the case of the Jewish cemetery, education activities were mainly envisaged and interpreted by the interviewed stakeholders as arts education related activities.

In this regard, testing the draft SoPHIA model on the Jewish Cemetery in Währing showed that the question of how the site relates to a specific historic event and how this is reflected in individual and collective memory of the site is also connected to various social and economic issues. For instance, it can be noted that cemeteries are special cases and places of remembrance since, usually, many different persons with various social backgrounds are buried at the same cemetery. In the

case of the Jewish Cemetery Währing various interviewees also mentioned that cemeteries have a lower threshold of access for people with another religious background than, for instance, churches, synagogues, or mosques. As one interviewee emphasized, cemetery tells different life stories of individuals and shows how the Jewish community life was socially differentiated. By making the social differences inside the Jewish community visible and working against prejudice by these means, the issue is also closely related to what alternative narratives about Jewish life and thereby, education can be provided by the site/intervention.

In this context, it was expected by some interviewed stakeholders that efforts of restoring and enabling access to the site would also support a process of shared heritage. By opening it and making it more visible both to the local public, as well as tourists, the cemetery and its history have the potential to contribute to the dialogue between different visitors and the prevention of prejudice. But it also becomes clear that the impact of CH depends on access to it. Currently, access to the cemetery is ensured to the wider public via monthly guided tours that are free of charge. These guided tours are organized regularly since 2018 by the association «Rettet den Jüdischen Friedhof Währing». Prior to this, the cemetery was closed to the public. Due to the prevalent safety issues of the cemetery (such as unsecured trees or open burial vaults) visitors must register and sign a safety disclaimer that they are responsible for their own safety. For children and older people, as well as people with disabilities, visiting is still very difficult due to these safety concerns. However, plans for restoration of the Jewish Cemetery Währing clearly and mainly aim at making the site more accessible.

Other impacts largely depend on accessibility of the site. The case of the Jewish Cemetery Währing shows that access is a crucial theme. Without access, CH is isolated from social, economic and cultural life. However, in ecological terms the prevention of human access to a site might be feasible considering the fragile nature of the site. By these means the case of the Jewish Cemetery Währing also highlights counter-effects in terms of the various impacts that an intervention in CH can have. Whereas access to the site is crucial for various forms of cultural, economic or social impact, the flora and fauna at the cemetery will probably be largely destroyed in the course of restoration. But without the restoration, cultural historic value of the cemetery will be lost. This includes especially its unique character as a Jewish cemetery from the Biedermeier period in the beginning of the 19th century, as pointed out by one of the interviewees, who is a historian. Furthermore, the restoration and accessibility of the site might also enable the usage of the site as a recreational area, as is the case with other cemeteries in the urban context.

Finally, some positive economic impact of the restoration of the Jewish Cemetery Währing can be expected resulting out of regular maintenance, stonemasonry and gardening work that create jobs.

Furthermore, interviewees highlighted that such sites could serve as a place for the training of apprentices as well as for university art students in restoration work.

### 3.4 *National Museum Jamtli (Sweden)*

#### *Case description*

The Jamtli Museum is located in northern Sweden in the regional capital Östersund in the sparsely populated region Jämtland-Härjedalen. The region has geographically the same size as Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxembourg combined, but is only populated by approximately 130.000 people.

Since the 70s, the Jamtli Museum has been a pretty successful touristic attraction. The scale of its success can be illustrated by the fact that the museum – despite the few inhabitants in the region – is one of the largest museums in Scandinavia, counting more than 120 employees per year.

The Jamtli Museum consists of both an indoor museum with permanent and temporary exhibitions on cultural history, archaeology and art, and an open-air museum with more than 140 houses dating from the 18<sup>th</sup> century up to 70s. Moreover, by dedicating the use of living history towards children and young families, it became an even greater success with (approximately) 200 000 visits per year.

The Jamtli museum is organised as a foundation and it is financed by public funding from the national government, the regional council and the city council by (approximately) 50%. While the other 50% it is financed by its own income from entrance fees, shops, and restaurants, and from other commercial activities. This financial composition is exceptional among museums in Scandinavia, where museums are normally 80% financed by public funding.

To improve the offer of culture and art, Jamtli Museum underwent significant changes by becoming a satellite museum for Nationalmuseum. Since 2010 the Nationalmuseum and Jamtli Museum had developed concrete plans for the new building, financing of that building and running costs, division of responsibilities between the museums, management of brand, and contacts to stakeholders nationally and locally as well as public and private partners. In 2014 a competition for architectural design of the new art gallery was arranged and by the end of 2015 the building process began.

The new Jamtli Nationalmuseum was opened on June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018, and a contract between the museums about the formalised collaboration and running cost financing was signed.

From the very beginning, the project had two goals: on one side, it wanted to make the Nationalmuseum present and visible in another

part of Sweden outside Stockholm; on the other, it aimed at strengthening the attraction of the Jamtli Museum in order to:

- establish a satellite art gallery at Jamtli Museum for the Nationalmuseum;
- widen access to the national collections of Nationalmuseum;
- contribute to further strengthen the attraction of the Jamtli Museum complex, the city of Östersund and Jämtland region;
- exploit the pedagogical methods of Jamtli Museum to reach new audiences for fine art.

*People axis (Multi-stakeholder perspective)*

The primary stakeholders express their specific interests and priorities for the intervention as follows:

- *Jamtli Museum* – The Jamtli Foundation board and management expressed from the very beginning that establishing an high-class art gallery would contribute well as a complement to Jamtli beside cultural history, archaeology, and other fields. It would also create an arena for further developing the famous pedagogical methods at Jamtli.
- *Nationalmuseum* – The Nationalmuseum expressed the ambition and need to be visible in more places in the whole country, and especially wanted to be visible in Northern Sweden where there are fewer cultural options. Secondly, the Nationalmuseum wanted to make larger parts of the collections accessible through the intervention.
- *Östersund Municipality (local authority)* – The local authority primarily expressed interest for the possible effect on tourism by the intervention. Moreover, the municipality was interested in the possible general impact on attractiveness by the Nationalmuseum brand.
- *Region Jämtland Härjedalen (regional authority)* – The regional authority expressed the same interest for the initiative as Östersund Municipality with the minor difference that the region expressed even higher hopes for the possible effect of the Nationalmuseum brand.
- *Swedish Government – Ministry of Culture* – The Ministry of Culture had changing ministers during the process from February 2010 to the opening of Nationalmuseum Jamtli in June 2018, nevertheless, the interest from the ministry had not changed.
- *Swedish Arts Council* – The Arts Council expressed special interest in the regional impact of the initiative, and especially the possibility for Nationalmuseum Jamtli to reach out to the population in Jämtland region outside Östersund and beyond.
- *European Union through Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth* – The Agency pointed out in the decision about co-funding, that the initiative creates a new cultural experience which creates new jobs through increased tourism and even stressed the importance of new ways for closer cooperation between the museum and business in the region.

– *Local and regional business* – The business representatives in the city of Östersund and in the larger region expressed interest in the importance of the initiative for tourism. In particular, they stressed and especially stressed the potential of higher visitor numbers as the new art gallery would be open both summer and winter.

– *Local and regional associations*

– *Other expressed interests*, such as the Swedish Postcode Lottery Fund, which express interest in the exceptional collaboration between a government owned museum and a regional museum.

From interviews with people in the region two and a half year after the Jamtli Nationalmuseum was opened, the impression is that «pride» is a covering term for the achievement. When the project was introduced, most representatives from business did not know what the Nationalmuseum was. But when told that there was only one such museum in Sweden and the second one would be there, in Östersund (instead of other more populous cities), the interest grew rapidly.

However, after the opening of Nationalmuseum, Jamtli Foundation has not been as successful as hoped in keeping up the engagement with local and regional businesses to the level created during the project period, due to lack of management and resources.

#### *Challenges and opportunities in interpreting the impact of a case*

During the analysis of the Nationalmuseum Jamtli initiative by using the draft SoPHIA model as a test tool, three areas of relevance had been highlighted.

One such aspect is about the long-term effects claimed in the projects, but clearly not reasonable to assess today. A second aspect is addressing impact on the political environment around the initiative, which in its own way and by its own logic exploited the initiative. Thirdly, the documentation reveals that the new building – its location at the Jamtli estate, the architecture, and the costs – was at the centre of many discussions about the Nationalmuseum Jamtli project. Nevertheless, beside financing and, to some degree, the building's environments' impact, interventions' impact, is not clearly assessable by using the SoPHIA model.

Establishing the Nationalmuseum Jamtli created political discussions in the regional council where the opposition raised questions about the necessity for opening a gallery or museum for historical art and design. Since the beginning of the project, the discussions in the council had been well covered by local media and it then became one of the main topics discussed in the election campaigns. The critics focused on the funding allocation, claiming that the Nationalmuseum Jamtli was the wrong investment in a region with an already strained economy, and it was said that there are other much more urgent needs. On the other side, those who were in favour of the project, affirmed that this was an investment in regional development which would contribute to attract new citizens and tourists. As a

result of the debate, it became necessary to lower the expectation of public funding to the project and increase the work to attract private investments. Originally, it was planned to have a division of funding for the project to establish the Nationalmuseum Jamtli where the regional and local council would contribute with approximately 30/40% funding and private funding with approximately 10%. After the elections in 2014, that was changed to approximately 25% public and 25% private funding. In the 2018 elections, as the political majorities in both local and regional council changed, the opposition became the group that would follow the final negotiations about the financing of running costs. After almost two years after the elections and one and a half year after negotiations resulted in a contract between the Jamtli Foundation and Nationalmuseum, it was clear that the status of the Jamtli Foundation within the local and regional authorities had been strengthened.

The political impact of such a project is probably best measured in changing political positions. Is that important? Yes, as changed political positions have an impact in coming policies and decisions.

The building Nationalmuseum Jamtli created many discussions before and during the project time, as stated in the available documentation. The public procurement created financial challenges as the project was processed during a time with high pressure on the building industry in Sweden and in the Jämtland-Härjedalen region. There were many discussions in media about the selected architecture. The public discussions through media were intense and divided into approximately 50% in favour of the chosen modern type of building and approximately 50% against.

The time perspective and a reasonable determination of the gains for key stakeholders were possible to discuss for this case, even though the time aspect is difficult as the project only ended two years ago. The assessment report seems to give a reasonable and realistic impression of the impact of the project even though there are impacts which are not addressed. Other perspectives have overlapped each other – like prosperity and attractiveness or social capital, well-being, and knowledge – in this project, but that is probably inevitable. As mentioned above, the impact of the project on the political environment does not really fit in to any of the mentioned perspectives in the proposed model. Nonetheless, there is little doubt that the impact is there and it is of local, regional, and (probably) national importance, as what was considered by major political parties an unrealistic and unwanted museums' collaboration, became a model.

### 3.5 *BlueMed (Greece)*

#### *Case description*

*BlueMed: Plan/test/coordinate Underwater Museums, Diving Parks and Knowledge Awareness Centres in order to support sustainable and respon-*

*sible tourism development and promote blue growth in coastal areas and islands of the Mediterranean* (<https://bluemed.interreg-med.eu/> (Home-MedDive ([meddiveinthepast.eu](http://meddiveinthepast.eu))) is a European Interreg-Mediterranean project, co-funded by the European Regional Development Fund project aiming to protect and boost/to the protection and valorization of the underwater natural and CH.

The project involves 14 partners from 5 countries, opening up to the public seven Accessible Underwater Archaeological Sites (AUAS), and establishing four coastal Knowledge Awareness Centres (KACs) nearby, while ensuring at the same time the protection of the environment and biodiversity of the Mediterranean.

BlueMed adopts a holistic approach, considering various cultural, environmental, and socio-economic parameters:

- i.* Cultural: to monitor, protect and highlight the CH and its values
- ii.* Environmental: to not degrade the environment because of the intervention
- iii.* Economic: to ensure positive impact on the local economy (circular economy in tourism)
- iv.* Social: to engage all stakeholders and exercise positive impact on the local societies.

The expected results concern:

- A network of AUAS across the Mediterranean.
- A network of KACs, offering dry-dive experiences in a virtual environment.
- Differentiated management models to operate the sites & KACs.
- An Augmented Reality (AR) Diving System to advance diver's experience.
- A Virtual Reality (VR) Diving System to attract non-divers.
- Environmental sensors placed to monitor the sea.

The BlueMed case study had been assessed by using the draft SoPHIA model. To gather data, we organized one information meeting with representatives of the Greek partners, and we held three focus group meetings (Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports – Ephorate of Underwater Antiquities, Region of Thessaly, Atlantis Consulting) and four interviews, in order to assess the SoPHIA model.

*Analysing the relevance of the holistic impact assessment model*

*Multi-domain axis*

*Social capital* One of the most important aspects of BlueMed is that it gave access to CH sites till then inaccessible, in two ways: by opening up for the first time to the public (divers) seven AUAS and by implementing four KACs and making large use of innovative Information & Communication Technologies (ICT) tools, allowing non-divers and people with disabilities to dry-visit the UAS. Inclusion of all categories

of visitors was a challenge of BlueMed, since AUAS and KACs operate complementarily in a way that any possible obstacles to the visit of the UAS is compensated by the possibilities offered by the KACs (free entrance, full accessibility, information material in many languages).

The project itself did not have a direct effect on social cohesion, but it could be mentioned that during the implementation, it brought together various local stakeholders who united forces in order to ensure its success. Moreover, it helped them gain conscience of their cultural identity.

BlueMed is a best-practice case of Public-Private Partnerships (PPP), as it can be seen from the number and variety of stakeholders identified since the beginning of the project and regularly consulted during its implementation. Therefore, the project is an interesting case of mixed top-down/bottom-up governance approach (i.e., Hellenic Ministries, Municipalities, diving centers, etc. were involved in its design and deployment). Furthermore, many of the activities in the implementation phase and for the opening of the two KACs and the first AUAS in Greece were carried out or supported by engaging local volunteers.

*Sense of place* The cultural-heritage sites targeted by BlueMed correspond fully to the notion of «cultural landscape», since they include human and natural elements considered as valuable heritage to be preserved, protected and documented. The seven AUAS were already widely recognized by the scientific community at national and international level. Media coverage was huge, and the project won several awards and best-practice recognitions.

In further detail, Peristera, the first ancient shipwreck that opened to the public in Greece is a rare archaeological finding of high scientific importance. The Regional Governor named it «Parthenon of the shipwrecks», which proved up to be a very «catchy» title for the (social) media. While the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C. shipwreck isn't directly connected to the identity of modern inhabitants of the island, it has somehow become part of their collective memories since it has been discovered by a local fisherman. The visit of the ancient shipwreck offers a thrilling experience by its uniqueness and by the beauty of the underwater environment. The KAC offers an alternative hi-tech/highly immersive substitute of the experience with the use of VR headsets.

Finally, as the project led to the opening of the first AUAS in Greece, this might lead to the creation of a new theme for the diving community.

*Quality of life* Local communities depend heavily on tourism, thus the project could have an impact on their livelihood. One of BlueMed's aim is to set the framework for the operation of high-quality KACs and diving centers, while ensuring at the same time the protection of biodiversity.

*Knowledge* BlueMed has a very important educational aspect, taking various forms and including different categories: educational kits for school groups, training of staff and professional divers, Virtual Museum, etc. The scientific dimension of the project is of prime importance and involves various disciplines: archaeology, marine biology, ICT. Many scientific

publications stemmed up from BlueMed, as well as two International Conferences<sup>6</sup>, while significant ongoing progress can be assessed in the relevant fields.

The initiative of opening up UAS to the public fosters the understanding of CH as a common good; moreover, the day-to-day operation of the sites and the KACs by the local community (local entrepreneurs, local authorities, civil society, volunteers...) raises awareness on environmental and cultural-heritage protection issues.

*Strong EU & Global Partnerships* BlueMed is by its very nature a project of cooperation, since it's an Interreg-Med project involving fourteen partners from five countries (Greece, Italy, Cyprus, Croatia, Spain). Moreover, its ambition is to develop a network of Underwater Cultural and Natural Routes in the Mediterranean. The project draws inspiration from the 2001 UNESCO World Convention on Underwater Heritage. Its implementation in Greece involves at least three Ministries of Culture & Sports, of Shipping & Island policy and of the Environment, as well as a new Law 4688/2020.

*Prosperity and Attractiveness* BlueMed aims to promote innovation in the diving industry, services and technologies and to attract an important part of the increasing number of people who choose diving tourism.

Local production and entrepreneurial activities, as well, could benefit indirectly from the project, (via tourism development), which is really important for these usually remote areas with few permanent residents.

*Protection* The intervention is highly oriented towards the protection of the environment and biodiversity. The impact checklists developed in the framework of BlueMed included also indicators on climate change. Moreover, AUAS are high-valued sites of CH. So, when planning their opening up to the public, special attention was given to the definition of measures for their protection and conservation.

*Innovation* BlueMed produced innovative ICT tools for the diving industry as well as interesting dry-dive ICT applications for the KACs and the virtual museum (3D immersive visualization). Moreover, within the framework of the project, many of the findings of the UAS have been digitized, while the ICT tools at the service of underwater archaeology and monitoring of natural and CH are constantly evolving.

#### *People axis (Multi-stakeholder perspective)*

BlueMed consortium adopted from the beginning a multi-stakeholder approach. Apart from the project's fourteen partners, the following target groups have been identified:

- Local public authority
- Regional public authority
- National public authority
- International organization, European Economic Interest Grouping (EEIG)

- Higher education and research
- Interest groups including NGOs
- General public
- Small & Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs)
- Enterprise except SME
- Education/training centre and school
- Business support organization
- Project consortium

*Time axis (longitudinal perspectives)*

As mentioned above, it wasn't always easy to adopt a longitudinal perspective, since BlueMed was recently completed and the two KACs and one AUAS in Greece haven't yet completed a whole year of operation (to this, we should also add the operational limitations due to the Covid-19 pandemic).

The main interest of the draft SoPHIA model, according to the stakeholders interviewed, is the possibility to select criteria and indicators in view of the planning of future projects building upon BlueMed.

*Challenges and opportunities in interpreting the impact of a case through the SoPHIA model*

In order to understand the relevance and applicability of the different criteria, we created a simple matrix including two parameters:

- i.* Relevance (High/Medium/Low – No): measuring how relevant is each *criterion* proposed by the SoPHIA model for this particular case.
- ii.* Applicability/Application: measuring if the relevant *criterion* can be/has already been applied to BlueMed. If already applied, at what stage of the project it was first applied.

Overall, the SoPHIA model has been assessed as interesting and useful by all stakeholders. All nine themes were considered as relevant: as for the subthemes, twenty-nine have been assessed as highly relevant, nine medium and eight irrelevant.

Themes	High	Medium	Low / No
1 Social capital	7	1	
2 Sense of place	4		2
3 Quality of life	2	1	1
4 Knowledge	4	1	
5 Partnerships	4		
6 Prosperity	1	3	2
7 Attractiveness	1	2	
8 Protection	3	1	1
9 Innovation	3		2

The overlapping between sub-categories, and particularly between indicators, is natural, since the same data can be used for analysis from different points of view, but when considering the SoPHIA model as a whole, repetitions have been criticised as tiring.

Nevertheless, some categories were seen as over-analysed and some others as under-analysed. The main issues to be further analyzed were the following:

- heritage interpretation
- heritage & politics
- climate adaptation needs
- circular economy in tourism.

Moreover, a generalized practical difficulty of collecting reliable qualitative data has been highlighted.

Consequently, further refinement of the model should be:

1. Simplification of the SoPHIA model, which has been judged as too complex, too difficult to use.
2. Attention to the «design» of the SoPHIA model, so that it becomes more user-friendly, versatile and flexible.
3. Particular attention to the possibility to use the SoPHIA model at the planning phase of a project (in relation to E.U. priorities).
4. A step-by-step guide on how to use the SoPHIA model, presenting the methodology and the tools.

### *3.6 Temple Bar Cultural Quarter and Galway European Capital of Culture (Ireland)*

#### *Temple Bar Cultural Quarter: case description*

The case study of Temple Bar Cultural Quarter in Dublin provides an example of an intervention that has had, and continues to have impacts on economic, social, cultural and environmental dimensions. Temple Bar is well known internationally as an example of culture-led urban regeneration. A major part of the architectural success of the regenerations project has been the careful consideration of the built heritage of the neighbourhood. While the infrastructural intervention of the redevelopment of Temple Bar Cultural Quarter occurred in the 1990s and early 2000s, there is potential for the applicability of the draft SoPHIA model to evaluate long-term impacts. There have been a number of scholarly evaluations of the intervention (mainly John Montgomery), but these studies relate to the period just after infrastructural development. There have also been studies of festivals and events in the area. Remarkably, there has been no impact analysis of the area since the physical development was completed in 2001. This case study investigates the viability of the SoPHIA model draft to the context of an urban regeneration project.

The Temple Bar urban quarter covers an area of 28-acres and is located in the city centre of Ireland's capital city, Dublin. The heritage of the site dates back to the time of the Vikings and includes sections of the walls of the medieval city. The area was strategically regenerated as a cultural quarter during the 1990s. The plan was carried out in two main building phases: 1991-96 and 1996-1999. The development was managed by Temple Bar Properties Ltd, a state-owned development company. The company set about delivering the framework plan through property purchase, renewal and management of fixed rents. The regeneration plan maintained a strong emphasis on the subsidising of arts and cultural projects. Between 1991 and 2001 there was an overall investment of IR£200m including IR£40.6m of public funding (mainly through capital grants for the cultural buildings), IR£60m loan, and IR£100m in private funding (Montgomery, 2010.) The company's role related to ensuring that the future development of Temple Bar was led by cultural planning, urban stewardship, mixed use planning and urban design principles. Most of the building works were completed by 2001 and the company managed a portfolio of close to 50 properties, half of which were commercial and half cultural. Since 2006, a shift occurred towards a stronger emphasis on cultural programming rather than on building regeneration. The reformed Temple Bar Cultural Trust (formerly Temple Bar Properties Ltd.) co-commissioned a programme of cultural works, as well as 250 free outdoor events each year. It is worth noting the extent of the cultural clustering in the area with between 10% and 15% of the Arts Council national funding in the early 2000's going into arts organisations in Temple Bar on an annual basis. In 2013 this company was wound down and the process of bringing the area under the stewardship of Dublin City Council began. To date this process is still ongoing and has not been fully completed.

In relation to heritage preservation, the Temple Bar urban regeneration project preserved and refurbished many buildings within the area of listed historical interest despite there being no conservation planning requirement to do so at the time of development. The project features an innovative architectural approach with new buildings being commissioned and older ones refurbished, with respect for the urban grain and context. Care was taken to hold on to key heritage elements such as the cobblestone streets.

There have been increasing pressures on the area from over tourism and commercialisation. Tensions remain between building an authentic and sustainable sense of place for the people of Dublin and the development of a contrasting branding of place to attract tourists. The area has gained press notoriety for excessive late night pub culture and related anti-social behaviour. However there remains a successful cultural sector with 14 nationally significant cultural institutions such as Project Arts Centre, the Ark Cultural Centre for Children, the Irish Film Institute or the National Photographic Archive. The Temple Bar farmers market attracts many local shoppers.

*Galway European Capital of Culture: case description*

Galway European Capital of Culture (ECoC) 2020 is our second case. This case looks at the current impact assessment model of the EU programme and explores the applicability of the draft SoPHIA model to this context. Heritage has been strategically prominent in the programming of Galway ECoC 2020 (John Gerrard's Mirror Pavilion, Sea Tamagotchi: Foclóir Farraige, Small Towns Big Ideas). Even the original bid emphasised Galway's peripheral landscape and its history of cultural movements as an inspiration for cultural production (Collins, 2020).

From its establishment in 1985, the already explained, can be reported as ECoC Programme selects two European cities each year to host a year-long calendar of artistic and cultural events, to boost tourism, increase reputation and improve quality of life for citizens and act as a catalyst for further local, national and private investment. The ECoC designation is seen as very prestigious and attracts a lot of competition from cities across Europe (Collins, 2020). The circa euro 1.5m prize associated with the nomination comes with a set of conditions including the requirement of an ex-post evaluation of the intervention to be carried out and reported back to the EU. This formal evaluation represents a clear example of an impact assessment (IA) model of EU intervention with clearly stated criteria. These include multi-domain approach and multi-stakeholder perspective. The case study presented here mainly explores this ECoC evaluation process relative to the draft SoPHIA model.

The Covid-19 pandemic has led to challenging times for the ECoC management team as well as arts organisation partners with most events being adapted for online viewing instead of in person.

*Findings from the case studies*

The case studies explore and evaluate the applicability of the draft SoPHIA model to the contexts of Temple Bar Cultural Quarter and Galway European Capital of Culture. Particular focus was given to gaining feedback on:

- The suitability of the model in assessing the impact of the interventions on the economic, cultural, environmental and social dimensions, including possible synergies and countereffects.
- The relevance of the themes of the model towards the impact assessment of each intervention including the balance and priority of the different themes and any missing or overlooked elements.
- Stakeholder involvement.
- Time relevance of the impact assessments process and longitudinal applicability.
- Exploring ways to capture data relevant to the draft SoPHIA model.

To explore these issues in the context of the Temple Bar and ECoC Galway case studies a qualitative participatory approach was taken using in-

depth semi-structured interviews with expert stakeholders. This interview approach was complemented with document analysis. The document analysis provided valuable background information, and results are included in the case study descriptions. Those interviewed included senior academics with expertise in impact evaluation of large-scale interventions, senior managers of cultural organisations and a leader of a business representative organisation local authority officers with expertise in this area.

#### *Multi-domain axis*

The interviewees agreed that the four-domain approach of the model has potential to include most possible impacts of an intervention. One potential weakness of the four-domain approach is seen in the possibility that the assessment may not capture the synergies between domains. Furthermore, leading an assessment at the level of these broad domains can cause segmentation, where each of the domains are approached by assessing whole sectors related to each domain. In this regard, one of our interviewees' perspective on Temple Bar is that the cultural and economic visions for the project continued to be pursued in parallel but were never fully aligned in a holistic way. When the effects of over tourism began to impact on the area in the early 2000s, the attempts to retrofit a solution by proactively limiting the tourist trade in the area merely stemmed the flow. The necessity to assess such synergies and countereffects between domains is seen as essential.

One interviewee pointed out that Heritage is often assessed under the domain of 'culture.' In the case of Temple Bar Cultural Quarter its unique built heritage was critical to character of the area, but this is almost forgotten within the interpretation of the space as a cultural quarter.

A similar problem was highlighted in relation to the 'social' domain in the case of Galway ECoC 2020. More-often Health and Wellbeing are seen as increasingly more important in ECoC evaluation, with more emphasis on the former yet they tend to be subsumed under the social domain. It is felt that too often within current impact assessments health and wellbeing are not given adequate attention under the domain of 'social' and deserve separate attention, which is something the SoPHIA model addresses in its themes. From another perspective, the social and economic domains are seen as inextricably linked. With the case of Temple Bar, if you are only evaluating economic impact from visitors then assessment is straightforward, but if you add the other perspectives such as wellbeing impacts on local residents, then it becomes more complex but also more holistic. 'Wellbeing' in this regard acts as a cross-cutting theme coming from economic and social.

Interviewees reflected that the environment domain is often overlooked or undervalued in terms of impact assessment relative to other domains. This came up in relation to the adaption of buildings within the Temple Bar Cultural Quarter development. While reflected on as a good example of adaptive reuse of existing building stock at the time

of development, the methods of adaption have advanced significantly since the time of the intervention. The environment has been assessed for small sections of Temple Bar through localised Environmental Impact Assessments (EIS) but there has been no EIS conducted for the whole cultural quarter. The very visible environmental concerns such as waste management are periodically monitored and addressed. Within impact assessments, the ‘environment’ as a domain is considered in relation to how the surrounding environment impacts on a person’s ‘quality of life’, but there is very little focus on the bigger picture of environment relating to climate action mitigation. For example, understanding of the need to better make use of existing building stock within the city centre is evident but there is no joined up thinking at legislative or regulatory levels. There is a need for more holistic thinking across departments of government (local and national) responsible for planning so that there is a balanced reflection on the former use of buildings without objectifying them.

Over both cases the multi-domain approach the SoPHIA model was seen as relevant to capturing multiple perspectives. The themes of the SoPHIA model were seen as a viable holistic and integrated approach to impact assessment.

*People axis (Multi-stakeholder perspective)*

All interviewees agree with the people-centred approach of the SoPHIA model. The idea of involving multiple stakeholders in the assessment process is seen as very important by all participants. Ensuring that all stakeholders get a chance to voice their concerns is seen as a requirement of a successful holistic assessment. Co-design was emphasised with a particular focus on engaging the wider community. In the case of Galway ECoC, one of the things that emerged from an ex-ante wider stakeholder engagement was the desire to increase the visibility of the places to visit east of the city. This then fed into the programme design. ‘People and Place’ is one of three broad sections of the Galway ECoC evaluation, which is all about the community involvement and the impact for people and for the place. Stakeholder engagement is multi-layered. Key stakeholders for Galway ECoC have included artists, communities, local government, European funders and visitors. Co-designing is important in informing the structure of the assessment. Stakeholder engagement needs to be flexible in its language and form to be sensitive to different stakeholder groups. This involves a lot of partnership work that acknowledges that people are coming together from different sectors to follow or drive the intervention. The participants felt that engagement with stakeholders needs to be a continued activity. If a dialogue is opened up, then there is a responsibility to respect that relationship. More often because of a lack of resourcing, engagement is attentive for a period of time but disappears.

The issue of the sensitivity of the engagement with stakeholders was raised. The language and communication and context of engagement needs to be respectful. More innovative ways of engagement are required other than surveys and focus groups. People work together out of a sense of sharing a common goal. There should be agreed principles up front. The process of consultation through methods such as focus groups can be intimidating for participants. Many people feel ill-equipped to answer questions that are geared towards experts. The communication needs to be sensitive to the local context. It was noted that the autonomousness of the stakeholder engagement is important.

Most participants agreed that the most important people to reach in an impact assessment are the people who live within the area of the intervention: both people who have their residence in the area and people who engage with the area as part of their daily lives (to work, commute, eat, meet friends, go the theatre or cinema etc.) The stakeholder engagement in Temple Bar began with a grass roots group of locals. Temple Bar Development Council, formed in 1989, was a network of local organisations that lobbied for the halting of the proposed CIE development and for the area to be retained and developed as a cultural quarter. This group emerged from a shared recognition by these local stakeholders that the area had an already unique mix of cultural organisations and businesses, and heritage that was different to other areas. Then Temple Bar 91 was a group of young businesspeople, architects and cultural entrepreneurs. The stakeholder engagement at the pre-building phase and throughout the building phase was strong and demonstrated that stakeholders shared a collective vision for the area. The dominant voices in these early stakeholder groups were those of cultural organisations, artists, local businesses. While there were few residents (circa 300) in the initial development phase there are now close to 3000. There are a number of residents unhappy with noise levels of nighttime activity. There is no shared vision on how to tackle over tourism amongst stakeholders.

While the media have heightened the perception of Temple Bar as having problems of antisocial behaviour, these issues faced by Temple Bar are largely the same as issues faced by the whole inner city. As noted by one interviewee, if we reduce the number of people living within the inner city, then the civic stewardship goes into decline. A holistic approach to planning involving a multi stakeholder perspective would allow for the tackling of environmental climate action and issues of maladaptation and underutilisation of adaptive reuse of existing buildings, while also tackling social issues.

*Time Axis (longitudinal perspectives)*

Those interviewed about Temple Bar Cultural Quarter suggested that in-depth planning in advance of an intervention, including stakeholder mapping and meaningful stakeholder engagement, should help to negate future negative impacts less. In this regard, one of the

interviewees referred to the importance of being aware of potential risks as the best way to avoid them. This perspective highlights the importance of the quality and depth of ex-ante assessment as a prerequisite for intervention. Ex-ante assessments identified that there was a pre-existing vibrant local network of small-scale cultural enterprises as well as a few key cutting-edge cultural institutions. When Urban Culture was commissioned to imagine a plan for the revitalisation of Temple Bar, these cultural enterprises and publicly funded cultural institutions were seen as key to the area's development. There were some informal follow up ex-post evaluations conducted in 1996 and in 2001 but no formal assessment other than the evaluation report required by the European Regional Development Fund which was focused narrowly on the infrastructural development. Interviewees emphasised that on-going monitoring and evaluation is an essential component of urban regeneration interventions. It helps to assess whether the vision, the strategy and the objectives set out at the start of the initiative are still valid and to develop and adapt accordingly. Regular evaluation can also help to maintain stakeholder engagement and to re-evaluate risks and balance stakeholder interests. This will then enable adjustments in response to changing circumstances. Temple Bar provides a clear case of how some stakeholder groups lost out because of a lack of periodic monitoring ex-post. The impact of over tourism had become evident by the early 2000s and there was a consolidated effort made by commercial and cultural stakeholders to address this at that time. But still there was no formal holistic assessment of the overall development to monitor impacts on local residents. Participants highlighted that there is a predominant focus on ex-post evaluation happening immediately after the intervention as a formal reporting exercise and signing off exercise. There is a lack of focus on the long-term impacts of large-scale interventions. Participants also noted that under the current criteria of EU funded interventions, funding must be spent within a very limited period of time, which limits the timeframe of the impact assessment period.

Regeneration projects such as Temple Bar need to identify clear long-term goals. Such a long-term vision needs to be accompanied by long-term allocation of resources in order to bring about lasting change according to those interviewed. Participants also highlighted the need for long-term leadership to maintain long-term multi-stakeholder engagement and balance between different stakeholder interests. In Temple Bar there has been a lack of stewardship of the project since 2013, with the wind down of Temple Bar Cultural Trust (TBCT.) Even before this date the attempts made by TBCT to proactively limit tourism and commerce were too late. The importance of managing potential negative impacts at the planning stage and ensure that all stakeholders interests are taken into account was emphasised by our participants. It was felt that once the commercial interests were allowed to come to the

forefront they are protected over all other concerns. Anticipation of this problem is seen as paramount as well as continuous monitoring of the balance of development. As noted by one of the participants, Temple Bar is still often called a 'project' with a specific start and end date, but it needs to be seen as a real living area that continues to evolve with time.

For Galway 2020, participants emphasised the importance of good baseline measurements as a starting point for measuring short- and long-term impacts. The timing of the ex-ante assessment to gather baseline data has been affected, in the case of Galway 2020, by the timing of the contracting of the agency responsible for the assessment. The audience agency was contracted to undertake the assessment quite close to the start of the programme. It was suggested that in theory two baseline assessments should be done: one after the winning of the ECoC bid (four years out) and the second just before the start of the ECoC designation. Regular monitoring during the programme year should be followed up by monitoring every few years after the designation. It was agreed by our participants that this length of time (circa 5 years) is necessary to see any changes in underlying cultural participation or engagement. There is very little change seen within the short timeframe of one year. True change requires more time. For this reason, the longitudinal issue is seen as crucial in the case of ECoC evaluation. It is easy to claim success of the intervention on a number of carefully selected indicators in an ex-post evaluation immediately after the programme has been completed but ignore what the intervention has done to change the underlying social conditions of the city. If you do not change the underlying socio-economic conditions, then any possible impacts generated by the intervention will be short lived. Long-term evaluation is of benefit to local governments but also the EU and future ECoC cities in better understanding the medium-term and long-term impacts of the ECoC programme. This long-term approach requires key stakeholders to take this form of longitudinal assessment seriously at the early resource allocation stage of the intervention and set aside financial and human resources to achieve this. It was suggested that the current capstone evaluation at the end of the programme should remain. But there should be a separate longitudinal assessment operating autonomously from the ECoC team. Projected assumptions about long-term impacts directly after the intervention are meaningless without a legacy plan to sustain the impacts over time and a longitudinal assessment plan to measure the real impacts.

Overall, participants agreed that long term impacts are very important in understanding the true and lasting impact of interventions. As well as regular periodic assessments every few years after a project are a great opportunity to align the long-term vision and to avoid imbalances in beneficial impacts and therefore maximise long-term impacts. In practice such longitudinal assessment strategies measuring real long-term impact will require appropriate funding.

### *3.7 Buzet – Integrated Built Heritage Revitalization Plan of the Historic Town Centre and Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales (Croatia)*

#### *Introduction*

The Croatian case studies selected for testing the draft SoPHIA model were the Integrated Built Heritage Revitalization Plan of the Buzet Historic Town Centre (IBHRP) in Istria County and Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales Visitor Centre (IKB/IHF) in the city of Ogulin. The analysed cases differ by their type and nature.

The first case relates to the strategic intervention implemented by the local government in the urban complex of Buzet’s old town core, a place where people live and work. The second case, IHF, is a newly set up cultural institution.

Both analysed case studies are of local as well as regional importance and represent important resources for boosting local development.

Assessing the usefulness of the draft SoPHIA model for the evaluation of the two case studies was carried out in the period of December 2020 to February 2021. As the first step, all relevant documents and research studies concerning the two selected cases have been collected and analysed, as well as the available secondary (statistical) data. As the second step, the key stakeholders from both cases have been identified, contacted and consulted either through online interviews or e-mail questionnaires. The third step consisted of processing the findings and writing the case studies report.

#### *Buzet – Integrated Built Heritage Revitalization Plan of the Historic Town Centre: case description*

Buzet is one of the largest, and historically most important towns in the region of Central Istria, Croatia. The archaeological evidence shows that this area has been inhabited since prehistoric times. Today’s old town of Buzet, as one of a series of fortified hillforts in the interior of Istria, with the remains of its ramparts, squares, palaces and churches, is a valuable, centuries-old urban fabric that has preserved its architectural authenticity and continuity of life. As such, the old urban core of Buzet has the status of a protected cultural asset of the Republic of Croatia (Ivandić et. al., 2017).

In 2015, the City of Buzet prepared the Development Strategy of the City of Buzet for the 2016 to 2020 period - an essential strategic and planning document that recognized the quality of life of residents, the protection of natural and CH and the increase of economic competitiveness as its main principles and values. In the process of drafting the above-mentioned development strategy, the local government realized the actual development potential of the town - and in 2017 the Integrated Revitalization Plan of the Buzet Historic Town Centre (IBHRP) was drafted for the 2017-2025 period. Within the framework of the IBHRP, a broad consultation process with stakehol-

ders, residents, investors, etc. was held, analysing the local situation, and identifying key projects that would improve the lives of residents and draw more tourists and entrepreneurs in the town.

As a case study for the draft SoPHIA model testing, the implementation of the IBHRP revealed a significant interrelation between CH and sustainable development in an ongoing cultural intervention. Assessing the IBHRP by applying the draft SoPHIA model revealed the importance of the process of stakeholders' engagement in working towards a common vision of the city, not only to improve the lives of the old town's residents, but to make it an attractive location both for tourists and for local entrepreneurs. While drawing up the IBHRP, the extensive and broad consultations with stakeholders helped to define the vision of the development of Buzet's historical core, which was based on two pillars; (a) environmental, social and economic sustainability, and (b) touristic attractiveness, and was planned through the implementation of 18 interconnected programs. The impact analysis of Buzet's activities related to the IBHRP revealed the complexities of striking a balance between developing a site for tourism, while also remaining mindful of it being a site where people live and work, as well as of the process of managing diverse opinions and objectives of a multitude of stakeholders.

#### *Managers, Stakeholders and the Three-Axis model*

The management of the old town of Buzet is the responsibility of the local government, which takes care of, invests in and develops the old town in cooperation with the local population and other relevant stakeholders. The implementation of the IBHRP implied the direct involvement and cooperation of a number of stakeholders from both the public and private sectors in the Buzet area.

The SoPHIA's impact analysis of the IBHRP represented a mid-term assessment, as the envisaged period for the implementation of the IBHRP is from 2017 to 2025. As a part of this analysis, it has been essential to identify and consult relevant institutions, associations and/or individuals having interest in the process of revitalizing the old town. Thus, different stakeholders who were previously engaged in the preparation, elaboration and implementation of the IBHRP have been consulted in the draft SoPHIA model testing process:

- The local government representatives of the City of Buzet are the key actors in the process of revitalization of the old historic centre of Buzet. As development actors immersed in the problems of the local community, they are best acquainted with its aspirations.
- The second key stakeholder is the Tourist Board of the City of Buzet that is institutionally responsible for improving the tourism development conditions, for an organized and systematic promotion of local touristic products, raising the quality of tourist services, etc.
- The next important stakeholder is the Istria County Tourist Board

whose task is to ensure an appropriate presentation of the City of Buzet and its historic core in promotional activities at the county level.

– Furthermore, the experts from the Institute of Tourism in Croatia had a crucial role in creating the IBHRP as they are its authors who defined its main objectives.

The majority of invited stakeholders agreed to participate in the draft SoPHIA model testing, thereby showing the sense of responsibility for its implementation and for the achievement of the planned results.

During the desk analysis of the IBHRP-related documentation, the findings and recommendations of the IBHRP's ex-ante evaluation were examined. Its conclusions and recommendations concern effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability, as well as the participative approach to the elaboration of the IBHRP – indicating that the successful implementation of the IBHRP implies the establishment of a permanent working group in charge of monitoring and supporting its execution. Thus, through the SoPHIA's mid-term evaluation it was possible to build on the initial ex-ante evaluation and review if the project development is on the right track.

The SoPHIA model testing was focused on the assessment of themes, subthemes and indicators proposed by the model. The main questions were: if and how were the planned actions carried out; if the planned resources were used; which changes in the environment occurred that should be addressed in the IBHRP; and which ones of these changes could reduce or slow down the expected results. Through the insight into the results of the ex-ante evaluation it has been established that most of the indicators proposed by the draft SoPHIA model were not used for the ex-ante evaluation at the time. This may suggest that the SoPHIA model is certainly rich in relevant indicators that are to be incorporated in future successful monitoring appraisals. The interviewed stakeholders considered all indicators marked as longitudinal in the draft SoPHIA model as useful. However, this exercise made it clear that most quantitative indicators are not monitored and collected neither on the level of the IBHRP implementation monitoring nor on the level of the City of Buzet. The draft SoPHIA model testing exercise was, therefore, the first step taken towards collecting and assessing quantitative and qualitative indicators through time. The stakeholders involved in the draft SoPHIA model testing positively assessed the testing exercise, pointing out that such a mid-term evaluation is a good opportunity to plan future actions on the preservation and sustainable use of CH of the old town core, which would further ensure the attractiveness of the old town for the residents, tourists, visitors and potential investors.

#### *Findings from the IBHRP case*

Based on the desk research and the communication with the stakeholders that participated in the development of the IBHRP - the relevance of the proposed draft SoPHIA model themes, related subthemes, and indicators has been assessed.

While the themes and subthemes were deemed as relevant by the interviewed stakeholders, the encountered issues in the application of the draft SoPHIA model for the IBHRP primarily concern a lack of quantitative data. In cases where data sources are available, the challenge lies in the impossibility to separate the impacts of the implemented actions in the old town from the development indicators of the entire city of Buzet. For example, the old town of Buzet is a historical urban inhabited neighbourhood that can be visited free of charge, which makes it difficult to monitor the exact number of visits, which is one of the indicators in the draft SoPHIA model. Thus, it was not possible to make a precise assessment of individual variables in the model by means of secondary data - e.g., the number of visitors, employment data, investments in culture, tourism, etc. For this reason, the participation of stakeholders in the analysis of impact is of particular importance, as stakeholders were the source of information that could not be found by searching through statistical databases. Therefore, the stakeholders' insights and views of particular topics can subsequently lead to certain general conclusions.

SoPHIA's testing of the IBHRP was carried out at the right moment when an actual mid-term evaluation could have taken place. On top of that, there was a great willingness of the local government and stakeholders to participate in the SoPHIA testing exercise. Thus, it provided a possibility for the local government and key stakeholders to check the progress of the implementation of planned actions. The exercise of testing the draft SoPHIA model offered a new perspective on the IBHRP implementation, as stakeholders became aware of counter-effects as well as some missing elements in the IBHRP that are important for the development of the old town and started considering changes that could contribute to the harmonization of the further work on the implementation of the plan. For instance, the IBHRP did not place emphasis on environmental protection, climate change or safety aspects, which have emerged as central themes in the present time. In particular, it would be productive to see how to connect projects of renewal of CH with natural heritage – parks and gardens surrounding the old town core. These cross-cutting issues have not been accentuated in the IBHRP, nor did the stakeholders highlight them during the conducted interviews. However, they do represent a relevant issue for a project focusing on built heritage revitalization such as the IBHRP, and there is certainly space for changes in the future.

The testing had twofold results.

Firstly, it was reaffirmed that the IBHRP represents an improvement in managing the city of Buzet, because by following a broad consultative process, IBHRP presented pivotal actions for the progress of the old town. Moreover, new challenges that were not included in the IBHRP have been identified. Secondly, the testing results revealed the SoPHIA model's complexity and unavailability of data sources for

quantitative indicators on the local level. Furthermore, the broadness of the model opened up, through its themes and sub-themes, an excellent possibility for choosing relevant evaluation and development themes beneficial for the city of Buzet, and the use of the draft SoPHIA model made it possible to view the IBHRP from a holistic aspect through cross-cutting issues.

#### *Ivana's House of Fairy Tales – IHF: case description*

The second Croatian case study selected for testing the draft SoPHIA model was Ivana's House of Fairy Tales (IKB/IHF) – a public multimedia and interdisciplinary visitor centre – established in 2013 by the City of Ogulin. The project was financed by the European Regional Development Fund, the Ministry of Culture of Croatia, the City of Ogulin and the Tourist Board of the city of Ogulin. The IHF project sought to strengthen the town's branding as «Ogulin – the Homeland of Fairy Tales» that is based on the intangible CH of Ogulin, and its association with the popular Croatian fairy tale writer from the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century – Ivana Brlic-Mazuranic. Her fairy tales bear traces of the natural beauties of Ogulin and its intangible heritage – local tales and legends. Therefore, Ivana Brlic-Mazuranic's fairy tales have been identified as the leading heritage story on the basis of which the recognizability of Ogulin as the homeland of the fairy tale has been built. Based on developing such a brand, the project's purpose was to position Ogulin on the tourist map as a desirable experience destination. The specific goals of the project were to increase tourism revenue, support entrepreneurial activities, develop new sustainable tourism products and increase employment.

To ensure the sustainable management of IHF, that opened its doors to the public in 2013, the Strategy of the Development of the Centre for the period 2013-2020 was prepared. The implementation of the said strategy was the subject matter of testing the draft SoPHIA model as an ex-post evaluation exercise. This case study was selected on the account of IHF being a unique intervention, successful in preserving intangible CH, which was a result of a larger strategic framework aiming to strengthen the cultural and touristic offer of the Karlovac County and town of Ogulin.

SoPHIA's assessment exercise of Ivana's House of Fairy Tales underlined the importance of strategically planned cultural interventions in contributing to a town's prosperity and increasing the local residents' sense of pride and sense of ownership of their heritage.

#### *Managers, Stakeholders and the Three-Axis Model*

From its very beginning, the work on shaping the concept of IHF included a broad spectrum of stakeholders - its main partners, users and promoters. The idea for IHF first came about in 2006, when the Tourist Board of the city of Ogulin prepared a study of cultural tou-

rism development: «Ogulin – the Homeland of Fairy Tales». It was a part of a larger project for the development of cultural tourism in the Karlovac County. The Karlovac County offered to largely finance cultural tourism strategies to those towns and municipalities that were interested in developing cultural tourism in their area. The background study with the main idea was prepared by Muses Ltd., a Zagreb-based company for consulting and managing of projects in culture and tourism. The Muses team developed a strategy whose main goal was to grasp the heritage potential of the town and its surroundings, and to choose the heritage segment that will have a strong local, national and European dimension.

Various stakeholders from the initial project development phase (conceptualisation, preparation) as well as those from the second phase (implementation), such as the Head of IHF and the mayor of Ogulin, were invited to participate in the ex-post evaluation exercise. They largely accepted to participate and considered such an ex-post evaluation as an opportunity for reviewing project results that would allow identifying some deviations from the initially planned actions; reinforcing the progress achieved on branding Ogulin as the town of fairy tales; and advocating new initiatives concerning the further development of the Visitor Centre.

The Strategic Plan of the Visitor Centre for the 2014-2020 period listed the performance indicators and envisaged their monitoring. Most of the indicators listed in the Strategic Plan are relevant for the draft SoPHIA model themes and subthemes and the stakeholders found them appropriate and applicable in the assessment of IHF's impact. However, the analysis showed that it is difficult to collect most of the quantitative indicators that are supposed to be monitored through the years of the project and Strategy implementation. The exception are the data that are multi-dimensional, which are collected on the municipal level and are related to prosperity – such as data on economic growth and development, employment, arrival of tourists and visits in general, openings of new business subjects, etc., on the level of the city of Ogulin.

Qualitative indicators have been collected through the interviews with the managers of IHF, key stakeholders and local authorities. They are also collected through the book of impressions of the visitors of IHF and through the visitors' impressions that have been shared with a wider public on social networks during the initial years of the project's implementation. Such an approach was also pursued in the Strategic Plan of IHF.

Stakeholders formerly and currently involved with IHF were included in the draft SoPHIA model testing process. They found the exercise useful and assessed the model as a complex tool, nonetheless valuable for monitoring the implementation of the Strategy. The interviewed stakeholders considered the SoPHIA model as well suited for ex-post evaluation, but they pointed out the issue of the lack of available data

sources for quantitative indicators at the level of the project/Strategy.  
*Findings from the IHF case*

While assessing the Visitor Centre Ivana's House of Fairy Tales through the draft SoPHIA model, fewer issues and difficulties have been encountered in comparison to the case of the IBHRP. The stakeholders estimated the model to be appropriate for the evaluation of the IHF's Strategy implementation. Indicators in the draft SoPHIA model have been considered suitable and relevant for IHF, particularly those concerning the themes of: Social capital, Sense of place, Well-being/Quality of life, Knowledge, Prosperity and Attractiveness. However, while data for some of the indicators specified by the draft SoPHIA model are publicly available and relatively easy to find (such as data concerning employment and tourist arrivals), finding data for others turned out to be more challenging (ex. data on energy efficiency). Besides quantitative data, within the evaluation of the IHF Visitor Centre qualitative data was obtained through interviews with the stakeholders. As this analysis took place seven years after the project had started (ex-post), the interviewed stakeholders pointed out the favourable impact the project and its Development Strategy have had so far on the local community, since the increased numbers of local visitors and tourists in Ogulin contribute to the prosperity of the town and there is an increasing feeling of pride among the local residents. Thus, they consider the project as having positive long-term effects on the economy and community development in Ogulin, whereas its Development Strategy's measures and actions use successfully and efficiently IHF's potential as a development resource of the city of Ogulin.

In testing this case study, it has also been demonstrated that the draft SoPHIA model proved to be a noteworthy framework for evaluating CH interventions - in this case through ex-post evaluation. The model provides sufficient broadness through themes, subthemes and a number of proposed indicators to assess investment sustainability. Nevertheless, the problem lies in the quantitative indicators which are difficult to collect and evaluate if not proposed in the application phase of investment planning. Qualitative indicators have proven to be a simpler and more usable element through surveys and interviews with key stakeholders. It is essential to emphasize that through the testing of the draft SoPHIA model, a range of useful information was collected for stakeholders and local authorities. Particularly important is the countereffect pointed out by the stakeholders, which is the concern that despite of the fact that some new employment opportunities have arisen in the area, there is no adequate labour force available for maintaining the whole IHF venture. In addition, there is also a need for a stronger support by the local government. An identified cross-cutting issue is that environmental sustainability is not in the focus of the Strategy. Neither have there been additional advances related to energy efficiency of the object housing IHF, nor have there been any similar

impact assessments made related to climate change, ecological production of local products, etc. – thus IHF does not place a particular emphasis on these matters. Another issue is that the process of testing the draft SoPHIA model revealed that the branding of the city through fairy tales was abandoned in the new city development strategy. However, it would be beneficial to rethink the branding and ensure its sustainability and continuation – which is a vital message to development decision-makers, which emerged through the model testing.

### *Conclusions*

Two projects were analysed by applying the draft SoPHIA model – the IBHRP as an example of a mid-term evaluation of the integrated development plan of the old town of Buzet; and IHF as an example of a project and strategy for the development of a visitor centre, which was an ex-post evaluation. In both cases, methods of desk analysis and interviews with stakeholders were used, and due to the Covid-19 outbreak, the planned focus groups were not conducted.

The principal differences in the usability of the draft SoPHIA model depend on the very nature, content and cost-effectiveness of the particular case study. This is especially visible through the multi-criteria axis when analysing the applicability of all themes and subthemes in both of the examined cases. Nonetheless, it is apparent that their relevance and importance are dissimilar.

As the issue of lack of quantitative indicators permeates both case studies, most elements have been assessed by qualitative methods, interviews and questionnaires. Thereby, the issue of a possible bias when interpreting the evidence gathered needs to be recognized. This exercise demonstrated that the preferences and interests of researchers and stakeholders participating in the assessment processes have an impact on the way the model is used and consequently on the results obtained by the draft SoPHIA model analysis. The possibility of biased approaches, where those stakeholders in a position of power can steer evaluation in a direction that suits their interests, should be kept in mind.

Despite the challenges faced during the testing of the draft model, it could be concluded that it is certainly well-suited for the assessment of various projects and programs related to CH which are expected to have sustainable results and a high level of benefit for the local community. The proposed draft SoPHIA model themes were recognized as relevant and significant for monitoring.

Some stakeholders critiqued the fact that the draft SoPHIA model is very lengthy and detailed. Carrying out the analyses that include the collection and processing of all proposed indicators would be a long and costly process, which is not adequate for most CH projects and development programs. However, if the model was viewed as a meta-model from which a range of possible themes and subthemes can be filtered down – depending on which particular areas are of importance

for the development of the local community and the preservation and sustainability of the CH project in question - it could be considered as a useful tool for decision-makers that provides them with a relevant background for the assessment of the impact that heritage has on the well-being of local communities and global cultural survival. The stakeholders recognized the draft SoPHIA model as a greatly helpful tool for decision-makers and potential investors as well as for the local community that takes part in participative processes of decision-making and management. Even so, it has been emphasized that if the role of the draft SoPHIA model to ensure a holistic impact assessment was taken into account, it would be vital to define the *core* elements that need to be considered in every analysis, while the rest of the elements could be used by selecting those that are appropriate for a particular case in question.

Lastly, the general recommendation while developing future local development projects and programs of this type, especially strategic development plans, is that it would be important to clearly accentuate key result indicators and the obligation of their regular collecting. In that way, the long-term sustainability of investments in CH could be assessed, whether it was the matter of ex-ante evaluation, ex-post or the longitudinal dimension.

### 3.8 *Filopappou Hill (Greece)*

Filopappou Hill is an emblematic landscape located next to the Acropolis, with layers of several attributes coexisting to form a natural and cultural landmark for the city of Athens. The hill today is a popular destination for Athenians and tourists, a place where both physical monuments as well as significant immaterial cultural attributes of different periods coexist. Together with the Hill of the Muses, and the Hill of the Nymphs, they compose what is possibly one of the most significant man-made landscapes not only because of its archeological importance both classical and Roman, but also for what is world widely acknowledged as one of the most appreciated contemporary interventions in historical environments by architect Dimitris Pikionis. Pikionis designed and implemented a unifying landscape intervention, the first major work of landscape architecture design in Greece, and a major example and reference for architects, historians and theorists worldwide (Architectural Association, 1989; Ferlenga, 1999). Pikionis conceived an extensive network of pathways and designing resting areas which appear to be born out of the ground and seamlessly engage in dialogue with the pre-existing archaeological remains and natural rock formations. These take the form of assemblages of heterogeneous elements which include ancient fragments, pieced together with debris from the demolitions of the Athenian neoclassical houses taking place at the time of

Pikionis' interventions, in 1957, and intertwined with the in-situ rocks. Pikionis introduced an extensive planting scheme based entirely in indigenous plants bringing the nature of Attica and its landscape into focus. The palpable presence of history visible in the archaeological evidence everywhere, the man-made, handcrafted interventions and the landscape design combine into what forms Filopappou Hill (Tsiambaos, 2018).

The hill is also home to The National Observatory of Athens, designed by Danish architect Theophilus Hansen (1842). The Observatory, that registers as a monument itself is built in close proximity to the site of the 5th century BC observatory of Meton. The hill remains to this day a lung of oxygen, a thriving open space in the center of the city which serves as an easy escape to nature for citizens and visitors alike, with rich biodiversity in an otherwise densely built and populated city; it consists of 700 acres that host indigenous birds, including the Athenian owl and the peregrine falcon, and it serves as an important stop-over for many migratory birds, amounting to a total of about 94 different species. It also has a community of land tortoises, bats and a large variety of plant species. In 2015 the Council of State pronounced the Hill as a site with a dual function, characterised both as an archaeological site and as a public green place of recreation; a place of «well-being» in which citizens walk, exercise a variety of sports and keep active while they are also given the chance to appreciate a historically and culturally dense natural site. The challenge today is the management of its diverse CH and emblematic landscape that would combine both openness and protection. It is essential to establish its identity for what it is. A complex entity to be understood as one, rich in both natural and CH attributes.

#### *Multi-domain axis*

*Social Capital.* Access. People feel the site is open to all, and the site itself offers an inclusive environment for exercise, socialising, dog-walking, sports, national holiday celebrations and traditions but residential movements feel excluded from decision-making processes. The site promotes the feeling of being part of the community. It is the neighbourhood's reference point and for all who grew there. Voluntary participation is the cleaning of the hill from garbage and the maintenance of the green takes place.

*Sense of Place.* The site is a palimpsest of monuments and archaeological landscapes and is registered as an organized archaeological site. World known landscape interventions by Pikionis are characterized as Unesco CH monuments. There are many sites on the hill, and practices, historically related to the community. People go to the hill to visit Pnyx, Filopappos monument and Loubardiaris church. The space plays an important role to the residents' sense of place, as it is embedded in their lives and memories through everyday life practices and rituals related to the theatre and the church, and they feel very strongly about its condition

*Well-Being.* People believe that the site contributes to their well-being and everyday life. The site is safe, as any public space in Athens. As a recommendation it was suggested that there should be a planning process to help benefit the local society, residents, and the local economy. On the downside there are no services other than municipal cleaning, and the processes regarding decision-making and management of the site are not open nor transparent.

*Education.* The hill provides the context for many educational programs that include the city, history, biodiversity, justice or architecture. People consider the site to be inspiring. It is important to develop educational media from innovative thematic and experiential approaches.

*EU/global partnerships* exist regarding Filopappou hill at the moment, but there is the need to create networks, and cultivate opportunities perhaps by linking it to comparable sites elsewhere and to exchange experiences and know-how regarding their management. The sense of competitiveness could be seen in this context vis-a-vis other comparable sites and a way of assessing their performance.

*Attractiveness.* The hill is situated in a coveted place in the centre of Athens, that leads to a continuous demand on real estate for living and businesses, Airbnb, etc. The visitors assess the site as an excellent location in all regards (easily accessible, with view, beautiful landscape, history). The place exceeds expectations, as it provides multiple levels of reading and entertainment, and people find it attractive. Local entrepreneurs understand that the hill serves as a magnet for their business.

*Protection.* The hill is legally protected as an archaeological site. However, Pikionis work is not adequately protected from damage. The maintenance and protection of the space need to be dealt with in a more sustainable manner so as to ensure the enjoyment of the space by future generations. The hill contributes to the microclimate of the area. Residents and visitors seek for coolness during the summer.

*Innovation.* There is no use yet of any innovative technology, and the use of simple technologies as «QR» is missing. «Dipylon» created an application of digitization of maps and routes.

### 3.9 Santorini (Greece)

The insular complex of Santorini comprising Santorini (or Thira) and Thirasia – is a top-ranked tourist destination. Santorini is a site of unique natural beauty and geological interest. Internationally, it features the only volcanic crater which is accessible by sea; it is the most modern land globally, as its last volcanic island emerged in 1950 (Vougioukalakis, 2016); Santorini has the oldest vineyard on earth, which has given its grapes and wine over centuries without disruption. The heritage of the insular complex of Santorini or Thira and Thirasia, the smaller island on the other side of the volcano crater, is tangible and intangible and it includes archaeology

since the prehistoric age, traditional and modern architecture, landscapes of unique beauty and geological interest, as well as products, cultivation methods, local cuisine, and folklore. The island has attracted heavy flows of tourism during the last two decades. Due to a lack of a comprehensive preservation framework, the place's natural environment and manmade habitat fall prey to heavy touristic inflows that threaten to eat up its core natural and cultural values. Metropolitan features, such as Aegean style Chinatowns and the new peripheral highway belt emerge. Hybrid cultures overwrite landscapes of exquisite beauty, like the Vlyhada beach. Excess supplants necessity; scale is lost; the landscape is being jeopardized by metropolitan expansion (Lava, 2020).

The challenge is the establishment of a local heritage community and the protection of the cultural riches of the insular complex from over-tourism. Meetings were arranged with the stakeholders for both case studies. The IA tool was made available to stakeholders in the form of a bi-lingual (Greek, English) working sheet with themes, subthemes, quantitative and qualitative indicators. It was up to each stakeholder to choose which categories to refer to, regarding their intentions and identities. A participatory approach for both case studies was implemented with stakeholders providing relevant documents and information<sup>3</sup>.

#### *Multi-domain axis*

*Social Capital:* Such figures as the number of visits to museums as well as the free access available for locals or the number of events staged during 2014-2019 describe social capital. Yet citizens' movements do not have a place to meet. The population number of Santorini has been doubled the last 10 years, due to the increasing numbers of the tourism, the effect of it, brings more business activities in the area, so more migrant labour.

*The sense of place* heavily rests on the geological landscape and substrata of Santorini, which is the original reason the island was visited by experts during the 18th and 19th centuries and on a remarkable tradition of Thira and Thirasia is the vineyards providing the culture of wine and a characteristic landscape.

*Well-Being* today is linked to improved healthcare programs compared to the past. Where traditional forms of well-being are concerned, an old tradition that holds on until today the «Veggera», where people are gathering in a place every day in a certain hour to chat and drink coffee. The unique beauty of its landscape enhances the quality of life and programs are meant to protect its biodiversity and the ecosystem.

*Prosperity* Despite the prosperity it brings, people feel overwhelmed by tourism, though they are willing to live with the consequences in order to maintain their business; Local production is blooming with 18 wineries, 1 tomato factory, 2 producers of local products. Local institutions like the Gizi Mansion, Dappos and the Municipality of Thira provide the funds for CH, offering the space for their concerts. It is found that people are not willing to pay for CH.

*Education* 5 to 6 research programs on an academic level are conducted in Santorini annually. Since 2013, the National Conservatory of Thira collaborates with Academy Music and Fine Arts of Vienna. Not all such resources are available to people. ‘SoPHIA’ and ‘The assessment of the carrying capacity of Santorini’ are two recent programs where Santorinians participated. In addition, there are activity programs for inhabitants for free.

*Strong EU and Global Partnerships:* 2 to 3 transnational active programs are put together per year (ISMOSAV). The cooperation across disciplines usually creates competence that brings out benefits for the place. So, the quality and the quantity are inversely proportional, because major profit means more constructions and less natural landscapes. Many concerns for the campaign SAVE VLYHADDA has been manifested by other associations, and lot of support, for the remaining of the one and only last piece of pure protected nature in Santorini. The European program PEATS is active for preserving the traditional method of building construction with local raw materials.

*Attractiveness* The main element of attractiveness in the island is the geomorphology of the caldera, the volcanic cliffs of Santorini. In addition, there are cultural spaces such as five museums. Yet, there is no theatre, as the Ancient Thira theatre is not accessible. The Boutari’s winery offers a cultural space with an amphitheater, the Feast House (Panigirospito) is a cultural space part of the church of Saint George and the Bellonio Foundation avails a central cultural space with a stage. Inside the Bellonio Foundation there is a library. There are 2 cinemas for summer and winter and a cinematographic club with members, inside the Boutaris winery.

*Protection* A key element for Santorini is the volcanic-seismic danger that concerns all socio-economic activities, values and capitals. This has been taken into further consideration in recent years, but it is necessary to integrate citizen protection plans into the daily life and social functions and authorities. Actions are taken for controlling the human imprints on nature. The institute for volcanic protection ISMOSAV is in charge. Alternative ways for attracting tourists, are realized by organizing initiatives for the protection of the landscape such as Save Vlyhada, and cultural events focused on history and architecture participating in European programs such as Open Mansions. People are not willing to enjoy a greener economy (SAF). People are willing to protect but previously should be informed and become aware of it.

*Innovation* An increasing number of people are positive about digitization (SAF). The SAF museum has a visiting guide tour concerning the old machines and the process of the tomato, and a long-term plan is the digital upgrading of it. (AR-VR). Innovation also pertains to renovated public space areas (Asimis Mansion in Exo Gonia is renovated for a new, geological museum), and studies like the Cincinnati project for Thira-Thirasia 2004-2007 for preserving the geological

environment as well as private projects funding Akrotiri and the Thirasia excavations and the Santorini archive project, with 20000 photos from 1860-1960.

In both case studies we conducted interviews and referred to existing research material, as well as pertinent bibliography. Furthermore, we used statistics published by national agencies and collected a wide array data from our local stakeholders, including figures on population, land, legal frameworks, but also more specified information on the activity and purposes of cultural agencies as well as literature, legal instruments, community posters, media, statistics, expert evaluations. For both cases, interviews with the stakeholders followed the same steps:

- i.* presentations of SoPHIA methodology, the IA Tool and these studies as test models.
- ii.* discussion on their relation to CH, Filopappou/Santorini discussion on the IA tool indicators.
- iii.* Collaboration on filling the quantitative indicators, and feedback on statistics for the quantitative indicators of the Impact Assessment Framework worksheet during the interviews (through consecutive zoom sessions, but also in situ meetings).

Two plenary meetings (December 2020, January 2021) were held for the Santorini case study with all stakeholders, very much in the format of a workshop with press coverage. In the first on-line meeting, the SoPHIA project was introduced, inviting stakeholders to become part of it; the cultural intervention of listing the Santorini 'caldera', the medieval castles and the archaeological sites of Akrotiri and Ancient Thira in the UNESCO World Heritage list was discussed and found consensus. We presented the Faro Convention's main aims and elaborated on the meaning of the «community of inheritance», stressing our wish to build it bottom-up. We handed out our IA tool in both languages, Greek and English, with guidelines. Between the first and the second on-line meeting (January, 2021) there were questions addressed mainly by mail, but also by phone. During the second and closing on-line meeting we shared the first conclusions and defined future perspectives. Over-tourism and modern life have left their mark on the natural and manmade environment of Thira and Thirasia, a fact that led much of the discussion to the present shape of Santorini. In order to have tangible and intangible heritage listed with UNESCO it is important to establish consensus about what must be protected and how. As our two cultural interventions converged towards the same result - namely to be enlisted on UNESCO's World Heritage list- the present cultural continuum on Santorini was of utter concern for both researchers and stakeholders.

The workshop on Filopappou Hill, entitled FH2031 took the form of a focus group that took place twice on two Saturdays (February 6th and April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021, on the zoom and miro platforms). More than ten stakeholders participated altogether, coming from the institutional, and the non-governmental sectors, as well as from citizen initiatives. The workshop

process was organized loosely on the steps of the Future Workshop technique, the purpose of which is to gather information from all stakeholders, highlighting the strong and weak points, and the positive and negative aspects of a particular case at hand and to actively imagine an ideal state, and future scenario. For the workshop an arbitrary date set in 2031, ten years away, brought together for the first time various stakeholders and offered an opportunity for exchange and discussion which began addressing the fragmentation with which the site has been treated.

In the Santorini case study, the holistic IA tool clearly paved the way to a ‘community of inheritance’: as the SoPHIA project primarily aims towards the creation of a social platform in accordance with the Faro Convention, it is important that the IA tool fosters the building of such a community. The creation of such a community of inheritance evidently would outnumber those who took the initiative and submitted the application to Greek Ministry of Culture. We came to realize through the application of our IA tool that, although there is no objection to the aim and outcome of this cultural intervention, the group of people who put together the application lacked the support and input of the larger community. During the two plenary sessions and the exposure of all stakeholders to the IA tool, a common denominator was established; this created a framework for everybody’s participation in CH issues, discussions, debates and decisions.

In both case studies it was stated that there had never been a public discussion on the cultural intervention. Cross categories and common areas in the IA tool can help a sense of common ground and community. As expressed during the second plenary session of the Santorini case study session, the ‘community of inheritance’ is yet to be formed. CH now is subject to separate groups and is rather managed top-down. Local groups involved with CH need support, financially and otherwise.

Crucial questions on impact assessment are the questions ‘Who does it? For whom is it done?’ In inviting citizens and the community to become active players in the CH decision making process, the SoPHIA project clearly proposes a bottom-up approach and the creation of the ‘community of inheritance’.

As part of the Thirean insular complex, Thirasia preserves the geomorphology of the volcanic landscape and should be included effectively in the community of inheritance. Its ambiance elicits memories of Santorini from some years ago, as it has been saved from the construction and the authenticity of the locals provides a sharp contrast to the new reality of Santorini. The architectural elements narrate their history and everyday life clearly. The religious buildings of Thirasia are necessary for the inhabitants, as they are a place for gathering and socializing. Abandoned settlements need preservation before Thirasia’s heritage disappears. A social platform could raise awareness among the locals to avoid the path of hyper-tourism and urban sprawl.

### *Conclusions*

The first form of a worksheet with the compilation of the SoPHIA themes, subthemes and quantitative and qualitative indicators proved to be too complex for the stakeholders, at least at a first glance. As a result, some stakeholders who took part in the two sessions did not send their input through the excel sheet but opted for simpler forms like word documents or phone interviews. The multitude of choices and questions make it difficult for stakeholders to find their niche within the first layout of the tool. The IA tool in its first form was sophisticated and easier accessible to experts in the CH field, but not mainstream stakeholders. We proposed that our IA tool be 'tailor-made' to the case study at hand, remaining open and flexible at the same time. Our tool needs to become user friendly without missing out on its scope. In that direction, the terms and the language used should be clear to every member of the community of inheritance.

The holistic IA tool proved to be a multifaceted framework for a systematic approach to the cultural map of an area or entity, as it avails a wide range of themes and subthemes for assessment; furthermore, these themes are updated according to recent bibliography in Europe and elsewhere. The holistic IA tool should remain an open and flexible source, as each case study may require its own set of themes and subthemes; in that regard, some themes and subthemes may need to be removed, and new ones may need to be introduced. Issues pertaining to the protection of the environment and ecosystem have a high priority in Santorini, as the island is not only endangered by over tourism, but also by the pollution of its sea waters, the sunken cruise ship «Sea Diamond» remains in the sea bottom, off its shores, and presents a toxic bomb since 2007. Possible new subthemes/indicators for the Protection theme could be the protection from wreckages, earthquakes and volcanoes, as natural disasters.

The Covid-19 pandemic also has brought some blessings in disguise, especially where a cultural intervention (winemaking/ intangible heritage/UNESCO) in Santorini was concerned: due to the lack of tourism, many people of Santorini returned to their vineyards and got involved with winemaking and vine culture again.

Getting our research project known by engaging stakeholders one way or another seems to be the very essence of SoPHIA's tenets, of addressing the four Domains, together with the People and Time axes.

#### 3.10 *Polo del '900 and Officine Culturali (Italy)*

##### *A quick overview of the two cases and their impact*

Roma Tre team analysed two case studies, with different characteristics, dimensions and location. *Polo del '900* is an institutional initia-

tive, promoted by the municipal administration of Turin, the Piedmont Region and the Compagnia di San Paolo Foundation, one of the main banking foundations in Italy. *Officine Culturali* is a small non-profit association of young professionals in cultural management and communication, based in Catania (Sicily). It is engaged in a successful valorisation of a huge historical complex, located in a neighbourhood with relevant social and economic problems.

*Polo del '900* is a non-profit foundation with the purpose of safeguarding the values of the Resistance and the Italian Constitution, democracy and freedom. Unlike other realities, it is a multi-level entity, encompassing 22 local organizations. The initial idea was to merge the archives of several cultural institutions located in the town, but it has been transformed into a larger initiative, shifting the focus from archiving to providing public services. *Polo del '900* became officially operational in 2017, when its organizational, managerial and identity structure were established. In less than 3 years, it has promoted a wide range of activities and projects, becoming a point of reference in the historical field of the twentieth century (research, meetings and cultural activities, digitization of the archives), including also socio-educational activities for children and families. Despite its name, directly referred to the past, it can be considered as an innovation hub, since the 22 participating partners implement cultural programming through co-planning and a constant exchange of ideas and skills among them. This collaboration takes place on three different levels:

- *functional*: the foundation implements coordination activities for the benefit of all associations/ partners, with their direct collaboration (library and archive, communication, enhancement, teaching, fundraising, monitoring, facility management).
- *planning*: elaboration of integrated projects: the cultural programming is defined through collective and shared project initiatives between the Foundation and associations/partners.
- *operational*: the staff of partner organizations is embedded in the organizational structure of the foundation, to encourage the processes of strengthening skills and collaboration.

*«Polo del '900 is not a start-ups' accelerator, but rather an entity (that is) able to compensate for the delay of a sector that has been static for too long. It is capable of setting winning processes in motion: internal organization (as the practice of human resources exchange create osmosis of skills), growth of competencies, and growth of managerial skills. Culture of organization and the economics of organization, information, innovation: our focus was not only on cultural design, but also on the hardware that is able to support it»<sup>4</sup>.*

*Polo del '900* is located in two historical buildings (about 8,000 sqm), part of an early 18th-century military complex designed by Filippo Juvarra, restored by the municipal administration after being vacant for a long period. The two buildings host a cultural centre, with a museum, exhibition and performance spaces, a library, classrooms for

teaching, a children's area, conference rooms, an outdoor cinema, and a mini cinema. The complex is located at the border of the city-centre: a neighbourhood relatively less affected by gentrification and redevelopment processes, with a lower degree of economic growth rates and more social mixite as compared to the city core.

As for the impact, an annual *social report* outlines the initiatives and their main outcomes, with respect to the following objectives, set by the board of directors:

Operating model	Developing and testing models of collaboration and project integration between associations/ partners and Fondazione Polo del '900
Organization	Implementation and empowerment of the organizational structure
Use and function of spaces	Functional interventions to improve users' experience
Cultural vision	Identity strengthening and cultural positioning of the heritage valorisation.
Involvement of the public	Implementation of Audience Development and Audience Engagement projects
Economic management	Creation of partnerships, sustainability models and economic networks

The main areas of impact can be summarized as follows:

- Reactivation/reuse of a heritage site, with the recovery of abandoned buildings, their re-functionalization, the opening of open spaces as a space for events.
- Valorisation of the documentary heritage through the integration of libraries and archival resources of individual entities, arrangement of spaces for reading and research, digitization, and dissemination of contents.
- New cultural proposals: meetings, exhibitions, conferences, film reviews, debates, and performances. The organization of the agenda of events is based on the new citizenship, democracy, and contemporary history.
- Educational activities, such as school-work alternation, laboratories, visits, educational projects for schools, long-life education for adults.
- Building partnerships with neighbourhood communities, city, and regional cultural foundations.

The total annual budget has exceeded 2,3 million euro in 2019, 80% of which financed by the three founders.

*Officine Culturali* is a small Sicilian social enterprise, founded in 2009 by a group of former students, with 10 full-time employees, along with other active members<sup>5</sup>. The association deals with cultural fruition and mediation activities in several cultural sites in Catania. the main attraction being the *Monastero dei Benedettini*, a late baroque monument and one of the biggest Benedictine monasteries in Europe, inclu-

ded in the UNESCO World Heritage Site of Sicilian Late Baroque Towns of the Val di Noto and Catania.

*Officine Culturali* promotes CH as a common good. Its mission, as stated in the official website, is «to entertain, move and educate, making CH vital also as a place of employment and professionalization». Heritage spaces are seen as places for «cognitive experiences», where people can develop curiosity, ability to see, creativity and can stimulate the desire for knowledge of one's own history through play, narration, and the senses.

In 2010, the University of Catania – the owner of the Monastery – entrusted *Officine Culturali* with the task of managing the site as a place to visit and enjoy, especially for the inhabitants of the surrounding district «Antico corso». Despite being the place where *Katane*, the first Greek city, was located, the district can be considered as a social periphery within the city centre, because of its high rate of organized crime, lack of services, high school dropout levels, and poverty. Currently, the public-private partnership agreement includes other assets of the finest cultural and museum heritage of the University of Catania, providing a whole series of activities, based on audience development and public engagement plans, effectiveness education, social inclusion, and customer satisfaction.

In a short period of time, visitors to the building have grown from a few hundred to about 70,000 a year overall. Moreover, about 100,000 children and teenagers have been involved in museums and monuments activities, strengthening their knowledge and their sense of belonging to those places.

*«The Benedictine Monastery has become a common good for school students, citizens and travellers; it is a building that explains to people the complicated history of the city of Catania and at the same time it is a pleasant and accessible place. The college student community sees it as a common home»<sup>6</sup>.*

In 2019, the total annual production value of the activities carried on by *Officine Culturali* was about 400,000 euro, half of which derived from the guided tour of the Monastery<sup>7</sup>.

#### *Analysing the applicability of the draft SoPHIA model*

The case study analysis was grounded on the interaction with two relevant groups. Staff members of *Officine Culturali* and *Polo del '900* were engaged, through interviews, in critical re-reading of the model, to validate the list of themes and subthemes and to define a checklist of «relevant questions» associated with the subthemes. Further, for each case study, Roma Tre mapped the most relevant stakeholders and – among them – selected the list of people to whom a questionnaire was submitted. The answers were commented during semi-structured interviews, focussed on the most relevant impacts to be assessed, with respect to their specific perceptions.

*The multi-domain axis: A new emerging glossary across sectors*

Since the beginning, the interviews gave us several inputs for reflecting on the glossary. On one side, moving from generic sectors of impact (social capital, economic well-being, etc.) to more circumstantial areas brought out the need for a more «explicit» and less cold terminology, to reveal a more vivid spectrum of impacts related to the field of cultural goods and activities. This implies enrichment and complexification of terms. On the other side, the specializations and subdivisions of themes and subthemes should have been questioned. A holistic perspective does not coincide with a juxtaposition of a wide spectrum of impacts. It also requires trespassing between the domains and sectors, to grasp interconnections, interdependencies, unforeseen side-effects, counter-effects. In this perspective, rather than a hierarchical structuring (domains-themes-subthemes), it seems preferable to consider the «subthemes» as areas of attention and make efforts to describe which trajectories of change are potentially triggered by interventions on CH. Here some powerful and inspirational words are reported, as emerged in our conversation with the stakeholders.

*Intergenerationality.* The transmission from the past to the present implies a specific attitude towards access, engagement, memories, education, experimentation and innovation of languages. Cultural activities have different types of users, and a real challenge is to work on contamination and osmosis of audiences and ages.

«Interaction, active fruition as a way to engage young people through languages and activities close to them. A young student who gets engaged in these activities, may eventually participate in some institutional events, such as conferences»<sup>8</sup>.

Youngsters' active participation can be considered as a specific measure related to this issue.

*Porosity.* The relationships between the places of culture and citizens, associations, institutions, businesses that operate in the proximity should play a crucial role.

«I have the perception, but I have no data on what we can do with our neighbours... Why should I decide to go and see what is happening at the Polo? We're not quite hooked yet. The Polo must go to other people's homes... There have been some experiments, but it is hard to keep them in the long run»<sup>9</sup>.

CH is always located in a specific context, but this obvious fact doesn't result in a strong connection without a dedicated effort. Considering this, a bi-directional exchange should be promoted: cultural places can offer those who live and work in the surroundings significant opportunities to meet, train, and work. At the same time, they can obtain – back from the context – wealth, memories, commitment, and knowledge. Some measures of these flows should be considered.

*Generativity.* Budding initiatives, building partnerships, exchange of expertise in different areas with all their reflections in social terms, the

welfare of people, economic, enlargement and strengthening of networks, from similar and close to the most distant geographically and for the look, posture, interests: cultural activities should give rise to other projects. On the same line, the reopening of abandoned spaces and structures, making them vital again, is a relevant issue to be considered.

*Citizenship.* Cultural activities and spaces have a civic role, building forms of coexistence through institutions; they can be organized so that they fully express the function of public space, i.e., meeting place, laboratory of education and recognition.

«If we agree and share the idea that culture forms better citizens, then we can decline cultural work in this way. Consciousness is to keep open the debate, the exchange, the circulation of the word»<sup>10</sup>.

A degree of citizenship can't be measured, but the results in terms of social capital, quality of life and identity of a place could be interpreted under this lens.

*Side-effects and counter-effects: Could be the change undesirable or harmful to anyone?*

Widening the spectrum of themes and subthemes makes more visible some potential contradictions between goals and approaches of the interventions. Throughout the interviews, stakeholders highlighted the contrast between the enhancement of free access and the goal of ensuring economic self-sustainability of the initiatives, this latter leading to an implicit marketization of cultural activities. Similarly, volunteering can be considered under a positive lens, as a marker of active participation, or – on the opposite side – as a substitute of regular work (Demartini et al., 2021). During the interviews, some contraindications of regeneration (gentrification, reduction of social diversity) have been highlighted, even if both Turin and Catania have not experienced over tourism pressure.

«Identity» is an even more complex aspect: the difficulty of composing shared memories and the need for make room to conflicting feelings were repeatedly reported. Lastly, the drive towards *innovation* itself has been criticized, especially if intended as a criterion of evaluation «per se» and not as a means for stabilization, resilience, and robustness of cultural and social activities.

More generally, the theme of counter-effects challenges the SoPHIA Consortium on how it can be an instrument capable to offer a critical look, albeit from a perspective that supports the potential for change.

*People and Time axis: different goals of the assessment*

The connection between project design and impact can be considered as obvious. If a broader spectrum of assessment criteria is assumed in a formalized evaluation, the design of initiatives will consequently be adapted, in terms of complexity, elements of attention and caution, exploration of potential, consideration of potential risks. This is main Sophia's commitment.

On top of that, our interlocutors focused on the possibility of using a multi-domain approach also as a reference for ongoing evaluation activities.

The draft SoPHIA model appeared to be very effective as a tool of self-evaluation, for both institutions and small organizations, allowing reflections on the internal organization and the management of the activities.

*«Part of the internal debate was related to the difference between what we set as a relevant issue and what could then be applied as a consecutive practice. For instance, is inclusion something we have considered? If so, what has been done in favour of this? We used this tool as a dashboard, to understand where we are in our action, what are the paths that open up and on which we could make reflections, on which we can carry out actions and maybe then measure them»<sup>11</sup>.*

*«Regarding the adequacy of means and ends, what are the tools that we put in place? How many surveys do we do, how many interviews do we conduct, how many actions of active involvement in the construction of an event with the public do we manage to do? Every now and then it happens that for an initiative we ask the public to express their opinion on the subject. In my opinion, draft-model is suitable to make mechanisms, means, and investments explicit»<sup>12</sup>.*

Improving the organizational aspects and the management of CH through a self-assessment was unanimously recognized as a key aspect. In other words, the internal impact of initiatives (on the organizations, on the managers, on the direct beneficiaries) is considered crucial in order to amplify social benefits. In simple terms, if we want to broaden the spectrum of change, we need to pay attention to structures.

Our interlocutors also suggested paying specific attention to social reporting. Since 2017, Italian third-sector organizations are required to make a «social report», to describe the strategies and behaviours adopted to achieve the statutory purposes, the results achieved, and any impact on the community in general.

Sophia's model could be an effective reference to address periodical reporting on the activities, boosting process innovation

*«The conception of specific accompanying paths and the setting of tools based on collective intelligence for the assessment of impacts (for example, platforms such as the one proposed by SoPHIA, as well as forum for sharing good practices and models) can have an enzymatic effect on the growth of design quality and the consequent implementation» (Asselle, 2021).*

Finally, the ex-post evaluation should also be considered as a key moment for the application of the SoPHIA model. It is not just a reflection on the activities carried out, but rather an additional request for evaluation, expressed by other subjects, external to the financiers and to the organizations directly involved.

The draft-model can also be useful:

- as an advocacy tool by citizens, especially to judge the profile of interventions supported by public funds or formally authorized by public institutions.
- as a tool for external monitoring/evaluation carried on by third parties; Our interlocutors mentioned, for example, the National Agency

for the evaluation of University and Research and the regional «Cultural observatory of Piedmont».

*Complexity, operability, versatility: considerations for the finalizing phase*  
*«I may wonder if the reopening of a cultural site has achieved a result in terms of increased access or range of services offered. If I wonder if a person, once s/he crosses that threshold, s/he feels better, learns more, changes her/his decisions and her/his life undergoes a significant change, or if her/his life will remain absolutely the same, s/he will simply be a little richer culturally, I can open the SoPHIA folder, and I can decide what elements/ingredients I need»<sup>13</sup>.*

If we assume that the draft SoPHIA model serves as an enabling device, capable to address interventions in order to increase the quality of interventions, then «relevant issues», «cross-cutting» aspects and «countereffects» should be carefully considered in the assessment process. Tackling these critical factors means opening connections, eliminating barriers, inserting connectors. Thus, all the subthemes of the model can be interpreted in terms of possibilities of change and opportunities for action. The complexity of the model, therefore, is a distinctive feature of its adequacy to grasp what is needed. Cultural activities are not standardized services. Therefore, issues not always predictable, related to the way in which things are done and in which they are embraced by people, need to be brought out.

At the same time, the operationalization of the model requires a dedicated effort. Assessment practices are influenced by propensity, resources, means and constraints of each case.

*«Applying the model is very tiring and very intriguing at the same time. This is a thing that we bring up to you for the future: applying the model is very time consuming since there are a lot and diverse indicators. It is a very intriguing thing though: fatigue does not have to be negative».*

In this perspective, the model should not be considered as a ready-to-use evaluation tool. Indeed, its versatility lies in the possibility to balance the depth of the assessment with the limits related to the contextual factors, the resources and the scope of the evaluation. In a nutshell, the conceptual model should be always tailored before being applied to a specific case. In order to capitalize this versatility, some help needs to be given especially to small organisations, as suggested by Francesco Mannino:

*«... So, the first thing is not to build different versions of the model, but to facilitate its use... may be with the help of someone who can support organizations».*

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The final version of the model is illustrated in chapter 4, fig. 3 and 4.

<sup>2</sup> For further details please refer to deliverable D2.2 (SoPHIA, 2021b).

<sup>3</sup> The research on the Santorini case study was assisted by Lenia Linaki, Architect NTUA, PhD and Maria Theodosi, Architect.

<sup>4</sup> Interview to Sandra Aloia, January 27, 2021.

<sup>5</sup> According to the Italian law, social enterprises are private entities carrying out a business activity of general interest, non-profit, on a stable and principal basis (Leg. Decree no. 155/2006).

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.universityheritage.eu/il-partenariato-tra-officine-culturali-e-luniversita-di-catania/>

<sup>7</sup> *Officine Culturali*, Social reporting, p.19.

<sup>8</sup> Interview to Generattiva, February 18, 2021.

<sup>9</sup> Interview to Matteo D'Ambrosio, February 23, 2021.

<sup>10</sup> Interview to Polo Board, February 10, 2020.

<sup>11</sup> Interview to Officine Culturali, January 11, 2021.

<sup>12</sup> Interview to Polo Staff, November 23, 2020.

<sup>13</sup> Interview to Officine Culturali, January 11, 2021.

