



UNCHARTED

**UNCHARTED**

Understanding, Capturing and Fostering the Societal Value of Culture



The UNCHARTED project received funding under the Horizon 2020 Programme of the European Union  
Grant Agreement number: 870793

<b>Deliverable number</b>	D5.2.
<b>Title</b>	Action Plan

<b>Due date</b>	Month 37
<b>Actual date of delivery to EC</b>	28/02/2023

<b>Included (indicate as appropriate)</b>	Executive Summary	<input type="checkbox"/>	Abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>	Table of Contents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------

**Project Coordinator:**

Prof. Arturo Rodriguez Morató  
Universitat de Barcelona  
Email: rodriguez.morato@ub.edu

**Technical Coordinator:**

Antonella Fresa  
Promoter S.r.l.  
Email: fresa@promoter.it

**Project WEB site address:** <http://www.Uncharted-culture.eu>

**Context:**

<b>Partner responsible for deliverable</b>	ELTE
<b>Deliverable author(s)</b>	Eszter György, Gábor Oláh, Gábor Sonkoly (coordinators). UNCHARTED consortium
<b>Deliverable version number</b>	1.0
<b>Dissemination Level</b>	Public

**Statement of originality:**

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	4
2. WP5 workflow plan	6
3. Action plans for experimental demonstrations	14
3.1. Cultural strategic planning of Volterra	14
3.2. Barcelona Model of urban cultural regeneration: moving forward in setting a policy evaluation strategy	16
3.3. The co-construction of new instruments: Survey on Portuguese Cultural Practices	17
4. Interaction schemes of main and control cases	19
4.1 Cultural strategic planning	19
4.2 Culture-led urban regeneration	19
4.3 Cultural information systems	20
5. Promotion and stakeholder engagement strategy	21
6. Conclusions	22
Abbreviations	23
Annexes: Main and control case protocols	24
Annex 1: Main case 1.1. Cultural strategic planning of Volterra	24
Annex 2: Control case 1.2. European Capital of Culture: the case of Portugal	30
Annex 3: Control case 1.3. United Cities and Local Government evaluation of city cultural policies and programmes in Europe	33
Annex 4: Main case 2.1. Barcelona Model of urban cultural regeneration	37
Annex 5: Control case 2.2. Culture-led urban regeneration in in the 8 <sup>th</sup> District of Budapest	46
Annex 6: Control case 2.3. Urban Regeneration and Cultural Values in the city of Porto	51
Annex 7: Main case 3.1. The co-construction of new instruments: Survey on Portuguese Cultural Practices	55
Annex 8: Control case 3.2. Information systems in French national cultural administration	59
Annex 9: Control case 3.3. LUQs – The process of accreditation of regional museums in the Emilia Romagna region	64
Bibliography	67

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The applied dimension of the UNCHARTED project is provided by the experimental demonstration in WP5. These will contribute to assessing how the research outcomes from previous and parallel WPs (1-4) are reflected in real-life experiences and which the actual impact that the theoretical investigation can deliver to policy makers, as the basis for the future exploitation of the project's results.

This deliverable **provides the detailed action plans to be adopted for the execution of the experiments and demonstrations on the field**, which is preceded and followed by a phase:

- **1<sup>st</sup> phase:** Selection of WP5 cases (See [UNCHARTED Deliverable D5.1 Selection of WP5 cases](#));
- **2<sup>nd</sup> phase:** Elaboration of action plans (case methodologies, strategy for promotion);
- **3<sup>rd</sup> phase:** Implementation phase.

Table 1 summarises the duration of the phases and the deadlines for the deliverables:

Phases	Period	Deliverable	Due date
<b>1</b> Case selection	12/2021 – 06/2022	D5.1 Selection of WP5 cases	30/06/2022
<b>2</b> Elaboration of action plans	07/2022 – 02/2023	D5.2 WP5 Action Plan	28/02/2023
<b>3</b> Implementation	03/2023 – 11/2023	D5.3 Assessment report	30/11/2023

Table 1 *Summary of WP5 phases*

The deliverable D5.1 defined the main and control cases<sup>1</sup> that will be carried out in WP5 (*Table 2*).

Axis	Main case	Lead Partner	Control cases	Partners
<b>1.</b> Cultural strategic planning	<b>1.1.</b> Cultural strategic planning of Volterra	PROMOTER	<b>1.2.</b> European Capital of Culture: the case of Portugal  <b>1.3.</b> United Cities and Local Government evaluation of city cultural policies and programmes in Europe	UPORTO  CES
<b>2.</b> Culture-led urban regeneration	<b>2.1.</b> Barcelona Model of urban cultural regeneration	UB	<b>2.2.</b> Culture-led urban regeneration in the 8th District of Budapest  <b>2.3.</b> Urban Regeneration and Cultural Values in the city of Porto	ELTE  UPORTO

<sup>1</sup> During the conceptual and methodological preparation period of the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase, the consortium partners agreed that, despite being referred to as “comparative cases” in the D5.1 deliverable, these cases will henceforth be referred to as “control cases”.

<b>3.</b> Cultural information systems	<b>3.1.</b> The co-construction of new instruments: Survey on Portuguese Cultural Practices	UPORTO	<b>3.2.</b> Information systems in French national cultural administration  <b>3.3.</b> LUQs – The process of accreditation of regional museums in the Emilia Romagna region	CNRS  UNIBO
----------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------

Table 2 Selection of WP5 main and comparative cases

The launch of WP5 was announced at the central event organised by WP3 in London, 12<sup>th</sup> January 2023 (See UNCHARTED Deliverable D3.11 Synthetic summary of the debates at the central event), and, after this, the implementation of experimental demonstrations (Phase 3) has started.

This deliverable includes:

- WP5 workflow plan: WP coordination, common indicators, evaluation, and success criteria (Chapter 2)
- Action plans for experimental demonstrations (3 main cases) (Chapter 3)
- Interaction schemes of main and control cases (Chapter 4)
- Promotion and stakeholder engagement strategy (Chapter 5)

## 2. WP5 WORKFLOW PLAN

After the 1<sup>st</sup> phase (Case selection), an internal collaborative work started through project meetings and workshops to discuss concepts, methodologies, and comparative perspectives. The objective was to establish reference points, shared terminology and common indicators. During these meetings, the consortium decided to develop a **protocol** with multiple purposes:

- to register the cases
- to elaborate an evaluation as part of the co-creative analysis
- to define improvement criteria

The protocol has a role in having an overview of the examined actions, the evaluation of the collaborative methods, especially improvement potentials and the results on involvement of UNCHARTED partners. It concentrates on a specified stakeholder analysis, the drivers and the mechanism of experimental demonstrations, and questions of dynamics of valuation, improvement potentials as some cases consider going beyond demonstration and aim to develop new methodologies.

There is a separate protocol template for the main (see Table 3) and control cases (see Table 4).

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for experimental demonstrations</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	<i>Please provide details on the plurality of actions that involve inclusive methods (participation, co-creation, citizen science, co-managing, etc.)</i>	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	<i>Please provide details on activities where inclusive methods are not or only seemingly implemented</i>	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	<i>Please provide details on the financial and human resources.</i>	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	<i>Please provide details on the resources of the sector.</i>	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● local</li> <li>● inter-organisational</li> <li>● regional</li> <li>● national</li> <li>● international</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	<i>Please provide details on territorial resources, integration, and contribution</i>
	To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?	<i>Please provide details on the European resources and integration of case</i>	
<b>Improvement potential</b>	What are the main characteristics of the existing evaluation methodology?	<i>Please provide details on the degree of formality, rational elaboration, publicity and salience.</i>	

	What types of values are predominantly focused in the existing evaluation methodology?	<i>Please provide details on existing evaluation methodology</i>	
	What kind of improvement is expected?	<i>Please estimate what improvements are expected</i>	
<b>2. Stakeholder analysis</b> <i>Who works together?</i>			
<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● public services</li> <li>● political bodies</li> <li>● civil society, NGOs</li> <li>● academic sphere</li> <li>● professionals</li> <li>● private sector</li> <li>● citizens</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	<i>Please provide details on those who work directly together on the case</i>
	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?		<i>Please provide details on those who indirectly influence the activities of the case</i>
<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	<i>Please provide details on the divisions of tasks</i>	
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	<i>Please provide details on the hierarchy and associated roles among the stakeholders</i>	
<b>3. Mechanism of experimental demonstrations</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>			
<b>Design of the inclusive collaboration</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes</li> <li>● No</li> </ul>	
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bottom-up</li> <li>● Top-down</li> </ul>	<i>Please explain whether you refer to demands or ongoing inclusive processes</i>
	What is your level of involvement as an UNCHARTED team member?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Observer</li> <li>● Initiator</li> <li>● Facilitator</li> <li>● Mediator</li> <li>● Co-creator</li> </ul>	<i>Please provide details</i>
	Are you planning to recruit someone for this task?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes</li> <li>● No</li> </ul>	<i>If yes, please provide details</i>
	Do you have any operational requirements to perform the task?	<i>Please provide details of the specific requirements (logistics, administrative, technical, communication &amp; dissemination, etc.)</i>	

<b>Nature of the observation</b>	How is UNCHARTED getting involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● job-shadowing</li> <li>● interviews</li> <li>● focus group discussion</li> <li>● workshop, local encounter</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	<i>Please provide details of the specific action tools</i>
<b>Calendar</b>	Please provide estimated dates for events that are initiated by UNCHARTED.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>...</li> </ol>	
	Select one occasion when an ELTE team member will attend		
<b>4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods</b> <i>Why is this method used as a way of working together?</i>			
<b>Dynamics of valuation</b>	What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?	<i>Please provide an analysis of dynamics of valuation of the case</i>	
	Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)	<i>Please provide your assessment of the inclusive methods of the case</i>	
	How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?	<i>Please contrast the analysed case with the project's findings, the first and second policy briefs and the case studies in previous WPs (WP2, WP3)</i>	
<b>Impact assessment</b>	What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)	<i>Please provide any potential benefits</i>	



	What are the ways in which UNCHARTED has contributed to improving valuation processes and practices? (i.e., reducing valuation tensions, making more effective use of inclusive methods)	<i>Please provide your assessment on your/the project's contribution, focusing on the process, sufficiencies of inclusive methods, value tensions</i>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Table 3 WP5 protocol for main cases

The control case protocol (see Table 4) is a simplified version of the main case protocol, for which Axis-related questions were formulated by Axis leaders (section 5).

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for examined control case</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	<i>Please provide details on the plurality of actions that involve inclusive methods (participation, co-creation, citizen science, co-managing, etc.)</i>	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	<i>Please provide details on activities where inclusive methods are not or only seemingly implemented</i>	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	<i>Please provide details on the financial and human resources.</i>	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	<i>Please provide details on the resources of the sector.</i>	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● local</li> <li>● inter-organisational</li> <li>● regional</li> <li>● national</li> <li>● international</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	<i>Please provide details on territorial resources, integration, and contribution</i>
	To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?	<i>Please provide details on the European resources and integration of case</i>	

<b>2. Stakeholder analysis</b> <i>Who works together?</i>			
<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● public services</li> <li>● political bodies</li> <li>● civil society, NGOs</li> <li>● academic sphere</li> <li>● professionals</li> <li>● private sector</li> <li>● citizens</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	<i>Please provide details on those who work directly together on the case</i>
	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?		<i>Please provide details on those who indirectly influence the activities of the case</i>
<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	<i>Please provide details on the divisions of tasks</i>	
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	<i>Please provide details on the hierarchy and associated roles among the stakeholders</i>	
<b>3. Mechanism of control case</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>			
<b>Design of the control case</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes</li> <li>● No</li> </ul>	
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bottom-up</li> <li>● Top-down</li> </ul>	<i>Please explain whether you refer to demands or ongoing inclusive processes</i>
<b>Meetings / activities</b>	Do you plan to attend any events / activities related to the control case?		
<b>4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods</b> <i>Why is this method used as a way of working together?</i>			

<b>Dynamics of valuation</b>	What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?	<i>Please provide an analysis of dynamics of valuation of the case</i>
	Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)	<i>Please provide your assessment of the inclusive methods of the case</i>
	How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?	<i>Please contrast the analysed case with the project's findings, the first and second policy briefs and the case studies in previous WPs (WP2, WP3)</i>
<b>Impact assessment</b>	What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)	<i>Please provide any potential benefits</i>
<b>5. Axis-related questions</b> <i>To be filled out by Axis leaders</i>		
<b>Axis 1 Cultural strategic planning</b>	What are the social, economic and political impacts of using cultural values in strategic cultural planning?	
	What is the impact in the cities of Portugal that participated at the national competition for the Capital of Culture?	
	What has been verified by the UCLG study? What are the impacts?	
<b>Axis 2 Culture-led</b>	What values are recognized and promoted by cultural administration in culture-led urban regeneration processes?	

<b>urban regeneration</b>	How regimes of value promoted by local administrations in its (e)valuation methodologies influence cultural institutions and actors (residents, artists, etc.)?
	What is the role accomplished and given by local public administration to urban actors affected and involved in these processes?
	To what extent does these actors' participation shape public administration's methodologies for evaluating urban cultural projects and programs?
	What are the relationships between sociohistorical parameters determined by local urban and cultural policy models (and their implicit hierarchies of values) and studied (e)valuation practices, protocols, and dynamics?
<b>Axis 3 Cultural information systems</b>	What are the criteria (political, administrative, cultural) that underlie the construction of indicators?
	What do they measure? What is missing to be measured?
	What is the decision-making chain in the construction of these indicators?
	What is the degree of participation in the cultural and artistic field?
	How are they disseminated and communicated?
	How do they articulate quantitative and qualitative dimensions?
	What values do they express? What tensions?

Table 4 *WP5 protocol for control cases*

See annexes 1-9 for the first set of completed main and control case protocols. Please note that the completeness of the protocols varies from case to case, as different information is available at this stage before their implementation.

The major challenge of the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of WP5 is to develop the concrete methodologies and workflows of the cases, which are developed independently by each axis (see Chapter 3). As well as being aware of the limits of comparative perspective, it is a practical goal to make methodological links between main and control cases. This will be integrated into the action plans of each axis (see Chapter 4).

The implementation phase consists of continuous evaluation, which is integrated into the co-creative process, and continuously developed. Evaluation by three stages through the protocols and personal participation of WP leader:

- Month 37: February 2023 (The protocols are included in this deliverable, see Annexes 1-9);
- Month 38-41: March-June 2023 (personal participation of WP leader in main cases' events);
- Month 45: October 2023 (Updated protocols to be included in D5.3).

WP leading partner staff will participate in an event organised by each of the main cases between March and June 2023. These trips are expected to take place on the following dates:

- March 2023 in Barcelona,
- May 2023 in Porto,
- June 2023 in Volterra.

The Second UNCHARTED workshop will take place in Barcelona in June 2023. The workshop provides an

opportunity to carry out a first-round evaluation of the WP5 implementation period.

The consortium agreed that each main case will hold a workshop with the stakeholders at the end of the implementation period to evaluate the joint work.

The Policy Seminar will take place in Brussels in October 2023. The Policy Seminar will be the occasion to debate with policy makers, at international, national, and local levels, representatives of the European institutions, as well as national and regional representativeness will be invited, offering the opportunity to discuss and review the policy brief, recommendations and guidelines, on the basis of the actual needs and requirements coming from the territories represented by the participating stakeholders. In addition, a special session will be dedicated to summarising the WP5 experiences and findings, where stakeholders will also participate.

In summary, there are three levels of synthesis of findings which will be the elements of the D5.3 deliverable:

- at the level of main cases, done by the Main case lead partner,
- at the level of axes, done by Axis lead partners,
- and a third-order synthesis between all axes, done by the WP lead partner.

### 3. ACTION PLANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL DEMONSTRATIONS

The realisation of experimental demonstrations within thematically similar but different contexts and situations, as well as the refinement of the methodology, advances the work respected to the main cases:

- Cultural strategic planning of Volterra
- Barcelona Model of urban cultural regeneration
- The co-construction of new instruments: Survey on Portuguese Cultural Practices

This chapter has three objectives:

- to set the main mission of UNCHARTED engagement in the main cases;
- to identify UNCHARTED findings from previous and parallel WPs that can be reflected in real-life experiences;
- to provide a detailed action plan for the main cases.

#### 3.1. Cultural strategic planning of Volterra

During 2020 and 2021, the Municipal Administration nominated Volterra for the title of Italian City of Culture, a competition promoted annually by the Ministry of Culture as of 2015. The occasion allowed the Administration to undertake an important strategic planning path and co-planning involving citizens and stakeholders, culminating in the drafting of a high-quality project application dossier. Although it failed to obtain the title, Volterra was awarded the title of First City of Culture in Tuscany by the Region in 2022. The title was created for the first time to reward the virtuous path of candidacy and to allow the implementation of initiatives and activities conceived according to the theme proposed to the Ministry, namely Human Regeneration.

Within this strategic framework, Volterra presents itself as a city of inclusion, hospitality and human regeneration through its artistic and cultural heritage, consolidating itself as a place of cultural research and experimentation. In addition to representing the method with which we intend to operate in this research, the participation of the local community also represents a transversal issue to be tested and valued in order to verify the adherence of strategic planning in the cultural field with the needs and inputs coming from different categories of the civil society of Volterra. The participatory approach was in fact adopted by the Municipal Administration itself in the construction of the Human Regeneration project for the candidacy of the city and for the structuring of the Volterra program<sup>22</sup>.

The research in the context of Volterra focuses on three precise dimensions:

- SOCIAL - Total institutions (mental hospital and prison)
- ECONOMIC - Traditional economy activities (alabaster craft and saline industry)
- POLICY - Candidature of Volterra for the Italian competition and nomination of First City of Culture in Tuscany

Each of them represents a conceptual pillar corresponding to one of the three areas of research and demonstration studied in the UNCHARTED project (WP1; WP2):

- Cultural participation in live arts and culture
- Cultural production and heritage management
- Cultural administration

The entire field work will follow this correspondence scheme.

Underlying the design of the following action plan and the implementation of the activities it contains is the co-creation approach. This approach was adopted when planning the timeline and the map of actors,

directly involving the staff of the Volterra Councillor for Cultures (who were also guests at the Central Event), i.e., politicians and professionals who followed the entire Volterra First Tuscan City of Culture 2022 process that is the subject of this survey. This made it possible to achieve an excellent level of inclusiveness of those who are the most representative actors of the territory's cultural scene according to the three dimensions in which it is structured, with the aim of being able to reconstruct a comprehensive picture of the assessment of the social values of culture in each field and the impact of cultural strategic planning].

In addition, the co-creation approach will be adopted at all stages of the work by maintaining the involvement of key stakeholders even when designing and organising the various activities.

The field research will make use of a participatory methodology based on active listening to the territory and on opening spaces for dialogue with local communities and stakeholders.

Listening and dialoguing will probe the positioning of the various categories of actors with respect to the innovative proposals coming from the administration.

In addition to representing the method that we intend to adopt in this research, the participation of the local communities and stakeholders also embodies the modalities to verify the adherence of strategic planning in the cultural field with the needs and inputs coming from different categories of the civil society of Volterra.

In fact, the participatory approach was adopted by the Municipal Administration already in the construction of the 'Human Regeneration project' candidacy of the city and for the structuring of the Volterra 22 programme.

During 2023, the work involves carrying out a series of activities divided into the following phases:

1. Survey on territory (February – June 2023);
2. First result presentation and bilingual publication (July – September 2023);
3. Public event in Volterra (October – November 2023);
4. Promoting and disseminating (Transversal).

For each phase, the following action plan (Table 5) is therefore envisaged, which will be implemented progressively starting from the start of the field work, and the relative success criteria with respect to the results to be obtained:

PHASES	ACTIVITIES	SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES	SUCCESS CRITERIA
<b>1. Survey on territory</b>	desk research	Creation of the map of the local actors Coordination meeting Management and organisation activities	N° actors identified
	semi-structured interviews with local stakeholders	Interview track processing Recruitment and engagement by e-mail/telephone number Realisation of interviews	N° stakeholder respondents
	online questionnaire to citizens	Design and definition of questionnaire structure Questionnaire dissemination (web site, email, social, etc.)	N° questionnaire replies
	finalisation of survey	Analysis and reporting results	Survey of priority

	and reporting	(interviews and questionnaire)	themes
<b>2. First result presentation and bilingual publication</b>	meeting WP Leader and local stakeholders	Organization of one meeting with WP Leader and main stakeholders for share the first step of results	N° stakeholders participants
	drafting of a bi-lingual publication (booklet)	Coordination meetings with the municipal administration (offices and administrators) Writing contents	N° booklet realised
<b>3. Public event in Volterra</b>	public event	Coordination meetings with the municipal administration Drafting of the list of participants Logistical organisation and line-up definition Realisation of the event	N° public event participants N° speakers public event
<b>T. Promoting and disseminating</b>	promotion and disseminations	Drafting and dissemination of press releases	N° press releases N° post on the Project blog (Digitalmeetsculture)

Table 5 Action plan for main case 1.1 - Cultural strategic planning of Volterra

### 3.2. Barcelona Model of urban cultural regeneration: moving forward in setting a policy evaluation strategy

Based on previous co-creative and participatory processes developed by the Institute of Culture of Barcelona (ICUB) in the last decade, the UB identified (WP2 and WP3) that they raised awareness of the common principles and goals of the Fàbriques de Creació (Creation Factories/CF) program. After two years, these developments also gave place to the standardisation process leading to the quantitative tool used to measure the program performance since 2014. Moreover, according to the stakeholders, including CFs responsible, users and ICUB officials, these processes dynamized the program governance, provided a taxonomy of each CF orientation and exposed main conflicts related to the qualitative justification of each facility policy remaining up-to-date.

The UB-ICUB and factories collaboration is expected further to reduce the above-mentioned tensions within the CFs program. These are embodied in divergences between CFs, between specific CFs and the ICUB and also concern the internal dynamics associated with artists and community members interacting with the evaluation instruments. This UNCHARTED goal is expected to be reached by finding better collaborative and co-creative strategies between these actors to identify and enhance existing evaluation tools and produce a more aligned and stable quantitative-qualitative evaluation scheme.

Work conducted as part of CF analysis in WP5 will nourish from and relate to research done as part of WPs 1, 2 and 3. In particular, these interrelations and connections can be classified as follows:

- WP1: We will exploit analyses carried out in this WP on the uses and values of culture in contemporary urban development strategies (D1.2), its dynamics and contradictions, and examinations devoted to changes in the valuation of culture concerning the rising diversity of contemporary societies (D1.1). Such texts provide theoretical background and context for interpreting CF as a study object.
- WP2: Results from WP2 on Barcelona's cultural policies model, orientation and overall value configuration will serve as another contextual basis for WP5 work. This examination contributed to



framing urban regeneration and cultural policies, mainly through D2.5, "Mapping of the values of culture in cultural policy objectives" (this study also explored the CFs case, which provided initial knowledge of its specifics), as well as through D2.1 and D2.2.

- WP3: Finally, focusing on value practices and entering into details of the CF program evaluation methodology (as part of D3.1 about "Urban regeneration in Spain"), WP3 addressed the above four same CF to be part of the WP5 co-creative process. This was achieved with the scrutiny of its subcase A) Fàbriques de Creació (Creation Factories) (D3.4). Other cases studied in WP3, such as those of Venice (case D2.1) or Liverpool (case D2.2), also served as a reference point.

The case will involve three working phases aimed at assessing existing public evaluation methodologies applied to culture-led urban regeneration in Barcelona through the case of the Fàbriques de Creació (Creation Factories/CF) program:

- **Phase 1** (December 22 - May 2023): Meta-analysis of the evaluation experience of the Fàbriques program (2013-2023). Actors involved: ICUB-UB. The role of the ICUB would focus on the contribution of elements of experience and information.
- **Phase 2** (May 2023 - July 2023): Independent and co-creative exploration of the experiences evaluative and evaluative of the actors directly or indirectly linked to four Factories. Actors involved: Neighbours, actors from the cultural world, journalists, artists, residents, and managers of the Fàbriques. Work carried out by UB and verified by ICUB.
- **Phase 3** (September 2023 - November 2023): Assembling the evaluations, starting from relating the processes evaluations carried out by the ICUB (phase 1), other evaluations and assessments (phase 2) and Porto/Budapest experiences of urban cultural regeneration. Actors involved: UB/ICUB. Work in charge of the UB.

After the first documentary-based phase, where a co-analysis of the program evaluation methodology will be implemented between the UB and the Institute of Culture of Barcelona (ICUB), the second process will involve fieldwork (interviews, focus groups, participatory observation) and collaborative fieldwork. This way, it will integrate other actors interacting with four of these Creation Factories (CF), including neighbours, spaces' managers, artists, and journalists. Furthermore, the approach aims to co-assess and co-configure an efficient methodological strategy for better aligning the CF evaluation methodology with its represented plurality of values, which should be well adapted to the different stakeholder's characteristics, needs and interests. Finally, the last phase of the co-creation process aims to contrast and assemble results from the initial analysis with lessons learned in the validation process.

This information is provided because the above process entails evident limitations in terms of the kind of participatory and bottom-up intervention to be achieved by various CF actors during the entire research/co-creation process. The restricted participation of CF's stakeholders (neighbours, spaces' managers, artists, and journalists), who are the main targets of the process, is explained by the already completed development of several participatory processes in the last decade. They counted on the intervention of the local administration as well as external consultancy companies, and researchers. In line with UNCHARTED goals in WP5, these activities also addressed and improved the whole programme evaluation methodology. In this scenario, in agreement with the ICUB project collaborators, it was decided to limit forms of participation in our co-creation process by taking advantage of already co-built results and expanding them through contrasting and validation processes conducted in phase II.

### 3.3. The co-construction of new instruments: Survey on Portuguese Cultural Practices

In our main case, on the one hand, we have worked together with the Office of Cultural Strategy, Planning and Evaluation (GEPAC) and National Statistics Institute (INE) in order to co-create a survey on cultural practices that has already been applied to a sample of 10000 people. On the other hand, we are working with a group of stakeholders from the cultural sectors to evaluate and reflect on the existing cultural

information system and to reimagine an information system more adequate to their needs.

This experimental case relates to previous results from UNCHARTED. It relates to the tensions found in WP2 between hierarchical administrations and inclusive participation. It relates to WP3, as we have mentioned, and the tensions found in the use of a quantitative approach to cultural information systems. Finally, it relates with WP4 and the grammars of evaluation, which is a core concept in a co-creative process of an inclusive cultural information system.

We aim to explore how the process of co-creation of a cultural information system can help mitigate the tensions between central authorities and the cultural field actors (managers, producers). We expect that the impacts of our guidelines reach various levels of governance, informing decision and policy makers.

1. June 2022: Meetings and co-creation process with the Office of Cultural Strategy, Planning and Evaluation (GEPAC) and National Statistics Institute (INE);
2. 29<sup>th</sup> of November 2022 - Workshop with key actors and stakeholders from the Portuguese cultural sector;
3. December – January 2023: Application of a survey *Lifelong Learning and Cultural practices* by the INE;
4. February – May 2023: Analysis of the workshop data;
5. May 2023: Meeting with key actors and stakeholders from the portuguese cultural sector to present and discuss the results;
6. June – July 2023: Analysis of the survey data;
7. August – November 2023: Synthetic analysis from our case study and the comparative case studies.

## 4. INTERACTION SCHEMES OF MAIN AND CONTROL CASES

Although in different contexts and with different methods and toolkits, the main case leaders (PROMOTER, UB, UPORTO) reach the practice-based objectives of WP5 through an experimental and demonstrative process of co-creation. The control cases - on a smaller scale and with less practical involvement with stakeholders - complement this by providing participatory observation-based analyses of cultural practices with thematically similar but different contexts and situations, and reflections on the methodology, which will advance the work respected to the main cases.

The mission of this chapter is to integrate control cases in the axes by elaborating axis-specific objectives and action plans. The interactions between control and main cases are structured by axis-related questions.

### 4.1 Cultural strategic planning

Axis 1 aims to achieve a review of the impact of cultural strategic planning to the social and economic territorial development.

The link between the main case and two control cases can be found in the territorial scale within which the value of culture is investigated; the analysis of the stakeholders to be involved will follow the same classification: three levels local/regional, national, European. The case is articulated in three complementary layers, i.e.: local/regional (Volterra), national (Portugal), European (UCLG). In the main case 1.1 (Promoter) the scale of the survey is regional, since the effects that will be analysed derive from the appointment of Volterra as 'Prima Città della Cultura Toscana', thanks to which in 2022 the city is the scene of a review full of events that starting from the values of culture range from the social to the economic dimension. In the control case 1.2 (UPORTO), the scale of analysis is instead national, having as its objective to verify the impact that the national competition for the European Capital of Culture has produced in Portugal. In the control case 1.3 (CES), the work has as its range of action the city of Coimbra having the objective of verifying how the strategic cultural planning of local administrations can benefit from the experience carried out by United Cities and Local Government (UCLG) in the evaluation of citizen programs in Europe. Therefore, the work will have a scale of citizen analysis.

In the main case, for each of the three areas of demonstration of UNCHARTED (Cultural participation in live arts and culture, Cultural production and heritage management, Cultural administration) specific types of actors will be involved in order to focus the interviews on what are the values that have emerged in each area (administrations, economic activities, civic action groups/associations, cultural sector, etc.)

In Axis 1, interaction is facilitated along the following questions:

- What are the social, economic, and political impacts of using cultural values in strategic cultural planning?
- What is the impact in the cities of Portugal that participated at the national competition for the Capital of Culture?
- What has been verified by the UCLG study? What are the impacts?

### 4.2 Culture-led urban regeneration

In axis 2, the main (Barcelona) and control cases (Oporto and Budapest) will be interrelated according to two main objectives as follows:

1. Control cases to be used to differentiate the general and idiosyncratic aspects of the relationship between:
  - The administrative evaluation and the dynamics of evaluative co-creation- focusing on comprehensiveness and value integration capacity), and,

- The diversity of contexts and traditions of intervention and participation (i.e., national policy models, social demands, etc.).
- 2. It will help identify the general conditions and applicable principles for improving the evaluation methodologies in a pluralistic and participatory sense.

In line with the above goals, interaction is facilitated along the following questions:

- Considering local administrations' different urban (Barcelona, Budapest, and Porto) and state traditions, what is cultural policies' relative capacity of influence over cultural institutions through their official evaluation approaches and mechanisms?
- How does valuation promoted by local administrations in its (e)valuation methodologies influence cultural institutions and actors (residents, artists, etc.)?
- How continuity and change in local political conditions, as well as context-specific sociohistorical variables, are connected to micro-level evaluation processes and dynamics in each urban domain?

### 4.3 Cultural information systems

The co-creation of a new cultural information system that mitigates the tensions raised from a quantitative and top-bottom approach is the main goal of our experimentation in the third axis of WP5. Therefore, the comparative cases serve as a background for comparison with our main case. On the one hand, the dense and complex information system in the first comparative case can offer us a detailed perspective on the strengths that such a system offers for longitudinal analysis. On the other hand, the second comparative case demonstrates how the inclusion and participation of all the stakeholders is important to mitigate tensions in measuring, evaluation, and in the decision-making process.

Therefore, in Axis 3, the interaction between the three cases is facilitated along the following questions:

- What are the criteria (political, administrative, cultural) that underlie the construction of indicators?
- What do they measure? What is missing to be measured?
- What is the decision-making chain in the construction of these indicators?
- What is the degree of participation in the cultural and artistic field?
- How are they disseminated and communicated?
- How do they articulate quantitative and qualitative dimensions?
- What values do they express? What tensions?

## 5. PROMOTION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

This deliverable includes a strategy for stakeholder engagement and promotion. The main goal is to identify ways to reach more stakeholders and eventually think about the possibility of results in similar projects. The communication tools of the UNCHARTED project (official website, blog, social media, mailing list, etc.) will be made available to the activities of WP5, giving resonance to the activities that will be carried out in the various phases, so as to improve communication with the stakeholders involved in the case studies of the three axes and promote the homogeneous dissemination of the project to a wider audience.

The strategy of promotion and stakeholder engagement allows disseminate the activities of WP5 also thanks to the processing of information material (flyer) disseminated during the Central Event in London to partners and stakeholders and also thanks to the dissemination of the work material produced in the project stages such as the section Poster Gallery contained in the official website.

As regards the work to be carried out in the three axes described in this document, the promotion strategy provides that in each of the three axes a communication action is activated between the main case leaders and the respective territorial areas studied in order to ensure the effective engagement of citizens and stakeholders. The activities and results that will be progressively carried out in the three axes will be disseminated and communicated on the dedicated communication channels and using the communication tools of the project.

The following paragraphs provide a synthesis of the promotion and stakeholder engagement strategies put in place for each of the main cases in Axis 1, Axis 2, and Axis 3.

For the main cases, various communication means have been chosen, namely: news on the local press; mail to map of local actors; post and news on social media; content on official website and dissemination on institutional website; informative material to be distributed at public event (flyer, brochure,); publication of booklet; etc. Overall, the field research will make use of a particular participatory methodology, based on active listening to the territory and on the opening of a space for constant dialogue with the local community, public administration, stakeholders, and citizens, in order to probe the positioning of the various categories of actors with respect to the innovative proposals of stakeholders.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

This deliverable aims to create a three-level action plan for the WP5 implementation phase which will take place between March and November 2023 (corresponding to months 38 and 46 of the UNCHARTED project). Starting the 3rd phase, the Implementation phase, in March which will result in an assessment report in November.

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of WP5, a protocol has been developed to support both the development of case methodologies and action plan, the joint work of the consortium and the subsequent impact assessment. Accordingly, the protocol has several objectives: registers the contexts of the cases, facilitates their continuous evaluation and creates the collaborative framework for the improvement of cultural evaluation dynamics. This deliverable contains the first round of completions, reflecting the status prior to the implementation phase, which are planned to be updated towards the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of WP5.

The first level of implementation and analysis will be on the main cases, more precisely the cultural strategic planning of Volterra, the Barcelona Model of urban cultural regeneration and the co-construction of new instruments: survey on Portuguese cultural practices. Main case leaders (PROMOTER, UB, UPORTO), performing applied and participatory research, are involved in various roles in the co-creative processes, whether it is improving, observing, or analysing cases. These cases implement the experimental demonstrations of the UNCHARTED project, which build on the theoretical and practical findings of the project. Exploiting the links with previous and parallel WPs was an important starting point for the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of WP5, on which the design of the main case was built. The applied research approach requires continuous collaborative working and monitoring methodologies.

The second level analysis will be on the three axes: cultural strategic planning, culture-led urban regeneration, and cultural information systems. Control cases perform a participatory observation-based analysis with a different involvement and focus than the main cases that carry out the experimental demonstrations. The difficulties of analysis and comparability are primarily due to the different contexts approached by the main and control cases. Establishing methodological links between the cases belonging to the same axis is one of the main challenges of this deliverable. This therefore implies an active dialogue between the main and control cases, with a framework initially facilitated by Axis-focused questions.

The third level will be an overall synthetic analysis at the WP level, which aims to assess impacts of the methodologies used and explore further research directions of the three broad fields, or axes. The WP leader will participate in one of the main cases' events, which will facilitate coordination between partners and the overall impact analysis. Transparency of the implementation phase will be ensured through project events and a public engagement and promotion toolkit for the whole phase.

## ABBREVIATIONS

**CF** Creation Factories (*Fàbriques de Creació*)

**DEPS** Department of Prospective Studies and Statistics (*Département des études de la prospective et des statistiques*)

**ECOC** European Capital of Culture

**GEPAC** Office of Cultural Strategy, Planning and Evaluation (*Gabinete de Estratégia, Planeamento e Avaliação Culturais*)

**ICUB** Institute of Culture of Barcelona (*Institut de Cultura de Barcelona*)

**INE** National Statistics Institute (*Instituto Nacional de Estadística*)

**LUQs** Uniform Quality Level for museums (*Livelli Uniformi di Qualità per i musei*)

**SPC** Emilia Romagna Region Cultural heritage agency (*Servizio Patrimonio Culturale*)

**UCLG** United Cities and Local Governments

## ANNEXES: MAIN AND CONTROL CASE PROTOCOLS

### Annex 1: Main case 1.1. Cultural strategic planning of Volterra

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for experimental demonstrations</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	<p>The field research will make use of a particular participatory methodology, based on active listening to the territory and on the opening of a space for constant dialogue with the local community (public administration, stakeholders and citizens), in order to probe the positioning of the various categories of actors with respect to the innovative proposals of the Municipality of Volterra.</p> <p>In particular, the research will see the articulation of a set of activities in the field, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● semi-structured interviews with local stakeholders;</li> <li>● focus group with main stakeholders;</li> <li>● online questionnaires to citizens;</li> <li>● bilingual publication relating to the study;</li> <li>● public event open to citizens;</li> <li>● promotion and dissemination of activities in the press (website and project blog; social media; newspaper)</li> </ul>	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	<p>As initial considerations, we can foresee the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Difficulty in intercepting the expected actors</li> <li>● Difficulty to the dissemination of the questionnaire</li> </ul>	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	<p>Human resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Knowledge of territory</li> <li>● Relationships with categories of main stakeholders con categorie di stakeholders</li> <li>● Skills about participatory methodologies</li> <li>● Expertise in communication, dissemination and organisation public event</li> </ul>	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	See above	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● local</li> <li>● regional</li> </ul>	



	<p>To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● participation in the European cultural initiatives, such as the European Capital of Culture</li> <li>● national competition V/S regional acknowledgement</li> <li>● European assessment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Improvement potential</b></p>	<p>What are the main characteristics of the existing evaluation methodology?</p>	<p>The evaluation methodology is mainly characterised by qualitative criteria obtained from the dialogue with the territory that will be carried out with the field activities. We will adopt the method and techniques of “active listening” of the territory, an approach that is based on the polyphonic observation of reality, allowing us to adopt an exploratory perspective capable of enhancing the richness of the points of view of all those who live, work or have interests in a territory. Having selected a wide range of actors, we will evaluate their positioning in relation to the object of the investigation and their subjective perception in order to reconstruct the impact of the use of cultural values in cultural strategic planning. The evaluation will also use data and quantitative elements that can be provided by the institutional actors, useful to reconstruct the overall framework.</p>
	<p>What types of values are predominantly focused in the existing evaluation methodology?</p>	<p>The case study is articulated in three conceptual pillars, each addressed respectively to the three areas of demonstration of the Uncharted project. It is therefore hypothesised to focus the evaluation methodology on the values that, respectively, can be traced back to these spheres, namely: economic, social and policy.</p>
	<p>What kind of improvement is expected?</p>	<p>Thanks to the use of this evaluation methodology, it is expected to take the full voice of the territory involving a heterogeneous and extensive cluster of stakeholders, such as to represent the multiple categories of actors that operate with the artistic and cultural sector directly or indirectly.</p> <p>The participatory approach and co-creation methodologies that will be used during meetings with representatives of the administration, stakeholders and citizens can trigger virtuous mechanisms capable of generating positive effects. In general, we expect that a more positive attitude on the part of the public towards the policies of the administration can be developed through improvements such as: the policies of the administration can be more receptive to the needs expressed by the citizens; interest groups will feel more listened to and there will be more opportunities for involvement; economic activities can represent their needs more punctually.</p>

2. Stakeholder analysis <i>Who works together?</i>			
<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● public services</li> <li>● political bodies</li> <li>● civil society, NGOs</li> <li>● academic sphere</li> <li>● professionals</li> <li>● private sector</li> <li>● citizens</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	Municipal administration and staff members of Volterra 22 (political bodies, public services, etc.)
	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Operators in the artistic and cultural field</li> <li>● Museum institutions</li> <li>● Economic activities involved in the production of cultural heritage</li> <li>● Citizens</li> </ul>
<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	<p>For each of the three areas of demonstration of UNCHARTED, specific types of actors will be involved in order to focus the interviews on what are the values that have emerged in each area. The types of actors that it is proposed to involve, including a first selection of local realities are described in the following table. The total number of stakeholders to be interviewed is about 10 people. Instead, with the questionnaire and the public event it is intended to reach a higher number of citizens: about 100 people for the first run and about 30/50 for the second one.</p>	
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	<p>The Municipality is the main actor with which the experimental demonstration work will interface. In addition to representing a specific category of investigation, it will be the subject with which the actions on the territory will be coordinated (focus groups, public events, etc.).</p> <p>Hierarchy scheme: Municipality Social, cultural, economic stakeholders Citizens</p>	
3. Mechanism of experimental demonstrations <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>			
<b>Design of the inclusive collaboration</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes</li> </ul>	

	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	N/A	
	What is your level of involvement as an UNCHARTED team member?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Observer</li> <li>● Initiator</li> <li>● Facilitator</li> <li>● Mediator</li> <li>● Co-creator</li> </ul>	Coordinator of the Axis 1 and organiser of the study in Volterra.
	Are you planning to recruit someone for this task?	A person is dedicated to the study, Giulia Fiorentini <a href="mailto:fiorentini@promoter.it">fiorentini@promoter.it</a>	
	Do you have any operational requirements to perform the task?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● collaboration with the Municipality</li> <li>● exploitation of the existing contacts with the stakeholders groups who participated in the candidature of Volterra</li> <li>● communication &amp; dissemination: production of a booklet in English and Italian + organisation of a public event in Volterra in Q4 2023</li> </ul>	
<b>Nature of the observation</b>	How is UNCHARTED getting involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● desk research;</li> <li>● semi-structured interviews with local stakeholders;</li> <li>● online questionnaires to citizens;</li> <li>● bilingual publication relating to the study;</li> <li>● public event open to citizens;</li> <li>● promotion and dissemination of activities in the press (website and project blog; social media; newspaper)</li> <li>● focus group meeting</li> <li>● local encounters</li> </ul>	
<b>Calendar</b>	Please provide estimated dates for events that are initiated by UNCHARTED.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>February - April 2023</b> first work on the field (focus group, interviews and online questionnaire)</li> <li>2. <b>May - July 2023</b> research and bilingual publication</li> <li>3. <b>September - November 2023</b> second work on the field (public event in Volterra)</li> <li>4. <b>February - November 2023</b> desk research; promoting and disseminating</li> </ol>	
	Select one occasion when an ELTE team member will attend	On the occasion of public event in Volterra (Q4 2023)	

**4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods**

*Why is this method used as a way of working together?*

<p><b>Dynamics of valuation</b></p>	<p>What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?</p>	<p>All the categories of stakeholders follow the correspondence scheme with three demonstration areas of the UNCHARTED project.</p> <p>(see the table n° 2 about document “Action Plan meeting – Promoter proposal” 27/09/2022 )</p>
	<p>Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)</p>	<p>Yes, because the observed case “Volterra 22” as First Tuscan City of culture was made by a long participatory and inclusive process too.</p> <p>The participatory approach was in fact adopted by the Municipal Administration itself in the construction of the Human Regeneration project for the candidacy of the city and for the structuring of the Volterra program<sup>22</sup>. The candidacy dossier was in fact built by the citizens of Volterra on the basis of shared strategic lines, through the implementation of a series of activities open to the public, including: a call to action for the preparation of project ideas, a call to action dedicated to 21 young people with whom to discuss and build the main program schedule of the candidacy; a town meeting for the definition of shared projects</p>
	<p>How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?</p>	<p>The research in the context of Volterra focuses on three precise dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SOCIAL - Total institutions (mental hospital and prison)</li> <li>2. ECONOMIC - Traditional economy activities (alabaster craft and saline industry)</li> <li>3. POLICY - Candidature of Volterra for the Italian competition and nomination of First City of Culture in Tuscany</li> </ol> <p>Each of them represents a conceptual pillar corresponding to one of the three areas of research and demonstration studied in the UNCHARTED project (WP1; WP2):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cultural participation in live arts and culture</li> <li>2. Cultural production and heritage management</li> <li>3. Cultural administration</li> </ol> <p>The entire work in the field will follow this correspondence scheme.</p>

<p><b>Impact assessment</b></p>	<p>What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)</p>	<p>The use of inclusive and participatory methods will bring important benefits to the area under investigation. First of all, continuity will be given to the path previously initiated by the municipal administration which, on the occasion of the candidature for the national competition and the assignment of the regional title of city of culture, has adopted a participatory and inclusive approach that has allowed to take the needs and inputs from stakeholders and citizens, developing local tangible and intangible assets.</p> <p>More specifically, the participatory techniques and co-creation methodology described in the action plan, will improve the municipal administration’s capacity to listen by bringing it closer to the demands of stakeholders and citizens. The increased dialogue between institutions and the local community will also strengthen the sense of citizenship and allow, in the future, strategic planning even more closely to the needs of the territory.</p> <p>The work on the territory will be accompanied by communication and dissemination actions; for this the involvement of local media, by means of press releases and news, combined with the use of the appropriate communication tools (social media, mailing lists, booklet, flyers, public events, etc.), will increase public attention on the subject under investigation.</p> <p>Finally, the deepening of the innovative practices present in the territory, such as the experience of theatre in prison, namely Compagnia della Fortezza, that we have chosen to investigate in the case study, will encourage the development of a wider reflection that links territory, prison and culture and that is able to generate wide-ranging benefits in terms of social cohesion.</p>
	<p>What are the ways in which UNCHARTED has contributed to improving valuation processes and practices? (i.e., reducing valuation tensions, making more effective use of inclusive methods)</p>	<p>The main impact expected in the case study of Volterra, following the conclusion of WP5, is to make future policy choices of cultural strategic planning more conscious and inclusive. The study of Uncharted will help to detect any tensions and conflicts in the cultural social values but also to bring out resources and potential to be exploited and developed in the future; the framework that will emerge from WP5 may constitute a guideline on which to base future decisions on the theme of cultural strategic planning in Volterra.</p>

## Annex 2: Control case 1.2. European Capital of Culture: the case of Portugal

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for examined control case</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	The applications for ECOC demand a cooperative effort from the local government authorities and the cultural sector organisations and key actors.	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	Not yet.	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	The resources for these cases will be the four charters of each one of the four applicants to ECOC2027, the European directives for applications and the official final evaluation report.	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	N/A	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● local</li> <li>● inter-organisational</li> <li>● regional</li> <li>● national</li> <li>● international</li> </ul>	The case shows articulation between all levels of interaction.
	To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?	It focuses on the application process for the European Capital of Culture and their long term impacts of this programme.	
<b>2. Stakeholder analysis</b> <i>Who works together?</i>			
<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● public services</li> <li>● political bodies</li> <li>● civil society, NGOs</li> <li>● academic</li> </ul>	Local government, national government and European institutions.

	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?	<p>sphere</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● professionals</li> <li>● private sector</li> <li>● citizens</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	The municipalities of Évora, Ponta Delgada, Aveiro, and Braga. The Portuguese Ministry of Culture. European institutions (Council, Parliament, Commission and the Committee of the Regions).
<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	UP will not distribute tasks.	
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	N/A	
<p><b>3. Mechanism of control case</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i></p>			
<b>Design of the control case</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	No	
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	N/A	
<b>Meetings / activities</b>	Do you plan to attend any events / activities related to the control case?	No	
<p><b>4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods</b> <i>Why is this method used as a way of working together?</i></p>			

<b>Dynamics of valuation</b>	What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?	N/A
	Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)	N/A
	How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?	<b>D3.3.</b> Interim Report on the technologies of evaluation in cultural production and heritage management <b>D3.4.</b> Interim Report on the influence of public administration evaluation methodologies on cultural production and heritage management.
<b>Impact assessment</b>	What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)	N/A
<b>5. Axis-related questions</b>		
<b>Axis 1 Cultural strategic planning</b>	What are the social, economic and political impacts of using cultural values in strategic cultural planning?	N/A
	What is the impact in the cities of Portugal that participated at the national competition for the Capital of Culture?	N/A



### Annex 3: Control case 1.3. United Cities and Local Government evaluation of city cultural policies and programmes in Europe

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for examined control case</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	<p>The key individuals involved in designing and leading the UCLG programmes to be examined will be available for discussions relating to this research, which will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) checking multiple perspectives on possible uses and impacts of the research - at the beginning of the research, we will discuss intents and possible uses and benefits of the research with the UCLG Culture Committee secretariat to articulate and aim to integrate aspects of value to the UCLG and its member municipalities</li> <li>2) ongoing communication - we will be discussing research intentions, preliminary analyses, and other findings at regular intervals during the research process</li> <li>3) research findings will be co-reviewed in discussion to gain analytical interpretations from the UCLG</li> <li>4) findings will be delivered in format(s) useful to the UCLG culture committee and its member municipalities, with two main uses in mind: 1) informing the planning of future programmes in the line of the ones analysed, 2) to communicate findings with municipalities to inform their own strategic cultural planning processes (other may emerge in discussions with the UCLG)</li> </ol>	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	<p>We plan to work with the UCLG Culture Committee secretariat. If possible, it would be ideal to also work with its municipal members and the cities that previously participated in the programmes analysed. However, geographic diversity and the number of different municipalities involved prevents this.</p>	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	<p>The programmes examined were financed through the UCLG and the participating municipalities. (We will investigate the balance of financing as part of the research.) The key individuals involved in designing and leading the programmes will be available for discussions with members of the CES team.</p>	

	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	The UCLG Culture Committee and secretariat have a track record of actions to support strategic cultural planning at the local level, building leadership and a base of trust with its municipal members. The continuity of the secretariat’s staff is also valuable for their ‘corporate memory’ and close involvement in the development of the programs examined.	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● local</li> <li>● inter-organisational</li> <li>● regional</li> <li>● international</li> </ul>	The programmes have European and international dimensions, with focus of work at the local/city level. Our research will focus on the European programmes and the cities involved in them.
	To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?	Our case is planned and conducted at the European scale.	
<b>2. Stakeholder analysis</b> <i>Who works together?</i>			
<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● cultural administrations in different cities of Europe</li> </ul>	UCLG Culture Committee secretariat and other designers of UCLG programmes.
	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?		The municipalities involved and how they act in the process of participating in the programmes. Citizens and cultural-sector participants in discussions and other participatory actions at the local level while the programme was implemented within each city. The municipal leads (chairs, vice-chairs, etc.) of the UCLG Culture Committee.
<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	UCLG has established the cultural strategic guidelines and offers technical assistance to Municipalities’ process of self-evaluation (i.e., Culture 21 Actions). Once cities complete the Pilot city programme, some assume the role of Leading cities to share their experiences with other Pilot cities that need to improve their cultural policies.	

	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	UCLG programmes are intended to provide "a platform of collaboration, dialogue, cooperation, and knowledge-sharing", fostering peer learning. Therefore, there is no competence or commanding between cities (no hierarchical relations between Leading and Pilot cities).	
<b>3. Mechanism of control case</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>			
<b>Design of the control case</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> </ul>	
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bottom-up</li> </ul>	It was through bottom-up participatory processes that Agenda 21 statements were agreed upon internationally. UCLG programmes are based on inclusive processes at the local level to produce meaningful demands and recommendations that can be translated into local cultural policies.
<b>Meetings / activities</b>	Do you plan to attend any events / activities related to the control case?	We hope to be able to meet with the UCLG culture committee secretariat in Barcelona in June 2023.	
<b>4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods</b> <i>Why is this method used as a way of working together?</i>			
<b>Dynamics of valuation</b>	What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?	The values fostered by Culture 21 Actions summarise the commitment and aspirations of local governments to integrate culture into sustainable development, both locally and globally. These values are grouped in three axes: Culture, Rights and Citizenship; Cultural Factors of Sustainable Development; and Specific Responsibilities of Local Governments.	

	<p>Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)</p>	<p>At the city level, the evaluation process developed by the UCLG asks the local city to develop participatory approaches within the evaluation, involving local cultural actors and other key stakeholders. We will examine in the documentation the degree to which inclusive strategies and actions are evident. In particular, the city of Lisbon was involved in the UCLG programmes and has developed extensive documentation of their evaluation processes and findings, within which we will be able to examine their approach to inclusive involvement of cultural actors and others. We do not know at this time whether other aspects will be evident.</p>
	<p>How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?</p>	<p>This case may provide complementary observations to previous cases relating to cultural administrations.</p>
<p><b>Impact assessment</b></p>	<p>What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)</p>	<p>Clarity of perspectives of different actors, enabling more robust evaluation and interpretation stages, and the provision of research findings and outcomes that can be aligned with the needs of different participating actors.</p>
<p><b>5. Axis-related questions</b></p>		
<p><b>Axis 1 Cultural strategic planning</b></p>	<p>What has been verified by the UCLG study? What are the impacts?</p>	<p>Through the Agenda 21 for culture and the Culture 21 Actions, UCLG has reinforced the role of culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable development, as well as its relevance in the international debate on cultural rights. More specifically, the appearance of these documents has coincided with i) personal processes of reflection or research on cultural policies in local development; ii) an increased interest in urban development model (international debates); iii) the strengthening of local cultural policies on the basis of a document of international scope.</p>

### Annex 4: Main case 2.1. Barcelona Model of urban cultural regeneration

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/ REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for experimental demonstrations</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	The case will involve three working phases aimed at analysing and enhancing existing public evaluation methodologies applied to culture-led urban regeneration in Barcelona through the case of the <i>Fàbriques de Creació</i> (Creation Factories) program. After the first documentary-based phase, where a co-analysis of the program evaluation methodology will be implemented between the UB and the Institute of Culture of Barcelona (ICUB), the second process will involve <b>fieldwork</b> (interviews, focus groups, participatory observation) and collaborative fieldwork <sup>2[1]</sup> . This way, it will integrate other actors interacting with four of these Creation Factories (CF), including neighbours, spaces' managers, artists and journalists. On this basis, the approach aims to co-assess and co-configure an efficient methodological strategy for better aligning the CF evaluation methodology with its represented plurality of values, which should be well adapted to the different stakeholder's characteristics, needs and interests. Finally, the last phase of the co-creation process aims to contrast and assemble results from the initial analysis with lessons learned in the validation process.	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	The above process entails evident limitations in terms of the kind of participatory and bottom-up intervention to be achieved by various CF actors during the entire research/co-creation process. The restricted participation of CF' stakeholders (neighbours, spaces' managers, artists and journalists), who are the main targets of this development, is explained by the already completed implementation of several participatory projects and dynamics with a similar purpose (building a common evaluation frame) in the last decade. They counted on the intervention of the local administration as well as external consultancy companies, and researchers. In line with UNCHARTED goals in WP5, these activities also addressed and improved the whole programme evaluation methodology. In this scenario, in agreement with the ICUB project collaborators, it was decided to restrict forms of participation in our co-creation process by taking advantage of already achieved co-built results and expanding them through <b>contrasting and validation processes conducted in phase II</b> (see below in section 4).	

<sup>2</sup> This might include a collaborative event ethnography / CEE. See: Gray, Corson, Campbell, Wilshusen, Gruby & Hagerman, 2020.

<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	Resources under observation include <b>infrastructure</b> (buildings, facilities, etc.) and <b>teams</b> belonging to four units of the CF program, namely Sala Beckett, Hangar, Fabra i Coats and Ateneu Popular Nou Barris. These resources correspond to policies in the fields of visual and experimental arts, cirque and dramaturgy. They also involve significant financial resources from the local administration: more than 2,5 million euros of direct and indirect (grants) overall for all the 11 CFs taking part in the program during 2021. In terms of physical infrastructure, the program involves a total of 24000 m2 dedicated to creation. The four selected buildings are Sala Beckett, 2653 m2; Fabra i coats, 7440 m2; Ateneu Popular, 2618 m2; and Hangar, 2600 m2.	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	Overall, the program involves about 720 creative projects and 415 artistic residencies annually. Moreover, 548 training activities with 10.438 attendants in 2021. Sectoral resources correspond to the <b>disciplinary domain</b> to which each Factory belongs. In this regard, there is considerable inequality in public investment assigned to each of the four studied facilities. By Facility, budgetary resources (2021) are distributed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Hangar</b>, dedicated to visual and digital arts, counted with 750.000 euros annual budget in 2021; 260.000 from the ICUB,</li> <li>● <b>Sala Beckett</b>, dedicated to performing arts, had 1.9 million euros; with 500.000 euros of the ICUB,</li> <li>● <b>Ateneu Popular Nou Barris</b>, dedicated to Circus, had a total budget of 900.000 euros, with 110.000 provided by ICUB, and</li> <li>● <b>Fabra i Coats</b>, working in several artistic categories, had 850.000 of public funding only.</li> </ul>	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	● <b>local</b>	The main territorial level of impact is at the local, urban level. However, given the characteristics of Barcelona as an international cultural node and the role of CFs beyond their proximity area of influence, the case also has several implications for regional and international cultural policies and involved actors' capital. For instance, through artistic residencies connecting national producers and artists with circus or visual arts global networks. Moreover, a series of multilevel policies converge in CF' activity, such as deploying EU or transnational projects within these spaces.

	<p>To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?</p>	<p>The analysis of the European scope in relation to CFs evaluation methodologies and practices is <b>limited</b>. Still, it will be indirectly considered when studying the importance and characteristics of specific variables and practices related to economic, aesthetic or social values for the overall evaluation methodology. For instance, based on work done in WPs 2 and 3, we will consider the role and importance of EU artistic mobility as a performance indicator for CF performance assessment.</p>
<p><b>Improvement potential</b></p>	<p>What are the main characteristics of the existing evaluation methodology?</p>	<p>The evaluation methodology is characterised by <b>broad evaluation criteria</b> and methods focusing on <b>quantitative indicators</b> in order to allow flexibility in internal CF policies reporting to the administration. This approach also favours CFs' alignment with the socio-territorial characteristics of each neighbourhood where they operate. At the same time, this flexible evaluative framework entails open qualitative justification by each organisation in the network through informal practices such as network calls, driving and mediating policy influence. In this regard, both formal and informal evaluation processes show persuasive capacity in terms of their power to shape entities' internal policies and practices. Therefore, CFs managers' pivotal character and mediation tasks become central to this process.</p>
	<p>What types of values are predominantly focused in the existing evaluation methodology?</p>	<p>The centrality of <b>social value-focused and pro-bottom-up governance</b> components characterises the ICUB-led evaluation methodology. Therefore, quantitative, and qualitative indicators tend to positively consider the inclusion and participation of broader groups in society in the production, consumption and circulation processes CFs foster. Protected groups (disabled, immigrants, elderly, women, etc.) and collaborative dynamics are specially considered in this context. In addition, axiological tensions between promoted social values and other values, such as aesthetic characteristics of artistic productions developed within CFs, have been identified as part of the valuation practices. Moreover, another associated tension relates to the overall capacity of the evaluation system to capture contrasts between standardisation and heterogenization. This means grasping commonalities and differences in the breakdown analyses applied to each facility.</p>

	<p>What kind of improvement is expected?</p>	<p>With the horizon of enhancing the plurality of values captured by the valuation system in place, it is expected to better grasp three intersecting dimensions within the qualitative evaluation system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Firstly, to further represent and integrate the characteristics of <b>each organisation</b> in the program, including values embedded in their different philosophies of action, activities, and relations to various types of stakeholders belonging to the artistic field and surrounding communities.</li> <li>- Secondly, and in line with the previous point, we expect to achieve an improvement in terms of <b>expanding the range of actors</b> (beyond the CF themselves) whose value perspectives are taken into account. This will be achieved through strategies ranging from the actual awareness raising about the lack of consideration of certain voices to the actual reformulation of governance schemes and dynamics limiting participation.</li> <li>- Thirdly, and along the previous lines, we plan to enhance those mechanisms related to the <b>procedural-methodological dimension</b> of the evaluation process, which could be reformulated in a more participatory and deliberative sense.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, this trilateral methodology strategy addresses the above axiological tensions between social- aesthetic and standardisation-heterogenization values.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**2. Stakeholder analysis**

*Who works together?*

<p><b>Plurality of actors</b></p>	<p>Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>public services</b></li> <li>● <b>civil society, NGOs</b></li> <li>● <b>professionals</b></li> <li>● <b>private sector</b></li> <li>● <b>citizens</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>a. Local cultural administration</b> (ICUB or Santiago CC) supporting, coordinating, and monitoring facilities and administering one of them (Fabra i Coats). Public officials.</p> <p><b>b. Third Sector</b> (Civil Society Associations, Foundations, and other non-profit organisations) taking part in the management model and space coordination (in publicly-owned facilities provided by the ICUB). With internal boards. <b>b.1 Facilities Managers</b> coordinating activities and services and reporting on performance to the administration.</p>
	<p>Who can be identified as external stakeholders?</p>		<p><b>c. Users</b> of the spaces, including artists, producers.</p> <p><b>d. Surrounding communities</b> and local entities involved in the space activities.</p>



<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	The main activity advanced by local administration (a) is general coordination, resource provision and evaluation of the corresponding CF network. Instead, CFs' teams and internal organisations (b) are in charge of managing cultural offerings and actions while giving a general artistic/cultural orientation to the space, fitting the administration's overall philosophy of the program. Finally, users (c) and (d) communities act as creators, producers, mediators and employers of these public spaces, following either a rationale more linked to the art world or the surrounding socio-cultural sphere where the building is inscribed.	
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	The whole system's leading power position is in the hands of the <b>local administration</b> , which owns facilities' buildings and ensures a significant part of regular resource allocation. However, each organisation's important level of administrative <b>autonomy</b> and independent income achievement gives each CF' administrator an important capacity for negotiation. Moreover, these variables highly depend on each space's governance type: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Sala Becket</b> is a public-associative organisation co-managed between the City Council and the Foundation "Fundación Sala Beckett", Obrador Internacional de Dramaturgia – Patronage with 12 experts,</li> <li>2. <b>Fabra i Coats</b> is publicly managed– led by ICUB Agency/MACBA and a curators board,</li> <li>3. <b>Ateneu Popular Nou Barris</b> is public-associative organization co-managed between the City Council and the grassroots organization "Associació Bidó de Nou Barris", and</li> <li>4. <b>Hangar</b> is a public-associative organisation co-managed between the City Council and the Foundation "Fundacio Privada AAVC Corporate".</li> </ol>	
<b>3. Mechanism of experimental demonstrations</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>			
<b>Design of the inclusive collaboration</b>	Are you observing an institution/ process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	● <b>Yes</b>	
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	● <b>Bottom-up</b>	Governance dynamics fostered by the local administration promote bottom-up participation, although often limited to the intervention of each CF's internal team in the evaluation (re)design and implementation together with the ICUB and others responsible for CFs. Overall, this dynamic depends on the nature of each CF's internal governance and relative autonomy.

	What is your level of involvement as an UNCHARTED team member?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Observer</b></li> <li>● <b>Facilitator</b></li> <li>● <b>Mediator</b></li> <li>● <b>Co-creator</b></li> </ul>	The UB team will be involved as co-creator of the new methodological strategy in its ongoing relations to ICUB and as mediator /observer and co-creator in its fieldwork activities involving CF' stakeholders.
	Are you planning to recruit someone for this task?	No	
	Do you have any operational requirements to perform the task?	No specific operational requirements are identified for the task. In phase II, the UB team will be distributed into four subteams addressing each studied facility. The process will not involve specific resources beyond researchers' intervention in fieldwork tasks and existing tools such as the UB/UNCHARTED Zoom account.	
<b>Nature of the observation</b>	How is UNCHARTED getting involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● focus group discussion</li> <li>● participant observation</li> <li>● interviews</li> </ul>	The UNCHARTED team is involved in all the activities pointed out in the left column. Observations (non-participant) and focus groups will be the leading forms of involving actors targeted by public evaluation in the co-creation process.
<b>Calendar</b>	Please provide estimated dates for events that are initiated by UNCHARTED.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Phase 1 (December 22 - May 2023):</b> Meta-analysis of the evaluation experience of the Fàbriques program (2013-2023). <u>Actors involved:</u> ICUB-UB. The role of the ICUB would focus on the contribution of elements of experience and information</li> <li>● <b>Phase 2 (May 2023 - July 2023):</b> Independent and co-creative exploration of the experiences evaluative and evaluative of the actors directly or indirectly linked to four Factories. <u>Actors involved:</u> Neighbours, actors from the cultural world, journalists, artists, residents and managers of the Fàbriques. Work carried out by UB and verified by ICUB</li> <li>● <b>Phase 3 (September 2023 - November 2023):</b> Assembling the evaluations, starting from relating the processes evaluations carried out by the ICUB (phase 1), other evaluations and assessments (phase 2) and Porto/Budapest experiences of urban cultural regeneration. <u>Actors involved:</u> UB/ICUB. Work in charge of the UB.</li> </ul>	
	Select one occasion when an ELTE team member will attend	An ELTE team member will be involved in initial activities conducted as part of <b>PHASE 1</b> . It is expected to carry out visits to studied Factories and meetings with the ICUB responsible as part of this process.	

**4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods**

*Why is this method used as a way of working together?*

<p><b>Dynamics of valuation</b></p>	<p>What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?</p>	<p>Most stakeholders identify <b>social values</b> associated with arts democratisation, gender justice and redistribution of cultural capital as core principles of local administration policy since 2015 concerning CFs. These values emerge in analysing the evolution of quantitative cultural indicators developed by the administration and from negotiations between the ICUB and CF managers. They also arise in the justification process carried out by each Factory when reporting their activity to the administration. In this regard, while the city council promotes this value regime, some CF<sup>1</sup> managers, artists and producers often boost and represent more aesthetic or economic-driven value systems. Therefore, the institutionalisation of the core regime of value is based on ongoing negotiation between the above actors and consensus reached in different collaborative phases to co-create the shared evaluation methodology.</p>
	<p>Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)</p>	<p>The observed case reveals the design and implementation of inclusive policies by incorporating and boosting <b>democratising, equity-related and grassroots-oriented variables and indicators</b> in the official evaluation methodology. In addition, the evaluation system implicitly or explicitly entails requirements such as fostering residents' participation or considering gender parity, which boosts diversified residents' involvement. However, the relative influence of the program-level evaluation methodology in the actual capacity of each CF to promote or assume the above values especially depends on specific organisation-related factors. For instance, it relates to the nature of the discipline/activity developed by each entity. In this regard, specific CFs, such as Ateneu Popular Nou Barrios, manifested to be more "naturally" aligned with this inclusive official project. Instead, others, which, for instance, develop dramaturgy activity, deem to have more elitist qualities (Sala Beckett).</p>

	<p>How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?</p>	<p>Work conducted as part of CF analysis in WP5 will nourish from and relate to research done as part of <b>WPs 1, 2 and 3</b>. In particular, these interrelations and connections can be classified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>WP1:</b> We will exploit analyses carried out in this WP on the uses and values of culture in contemporary urban development strategies (D1.2), its dynamics and contradictions, and examinations devoted to changes in the valuation of culture concerning the rising diversity of contemporary societies (D1.1). Such texts provide <b>theoretical background and context</b> for interpreting CF as a study object.</li> <li>● <b>WP2:</b> Results from WP2 on Barcelona's <b>cultural policies model</b>, orientation and overall value configuration will serve as another contextual basis for WP5 work. This examination contributed to framing urban regeneration and cultural policies, mainly through D2.5, "Mapping of the values of culture in cultural policy objectives" (this study also explored the CFs case, which provided initial knowledge of its specifics), as well as through D2.1 and D2.2.</li> <li>● <b>WP3:</b> Finally, focusing on <b>value practices and entering into details of the CF</b> program evaluation methodology (as part of D3.1 about "Urban regeneration in Spain"), WP3 addressed the above four same CF to be part of the WP5 co-creative process. This was achieved with the scrutiny of its subcase A) Fàbriques de Creació (Creation Factories) (D3.4). Other cases studied in WP3, such as those of Venice (case D2.1) or Liverpool (case D2.2), also served as a reference point.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Impact assessment</b></p>	<p>What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)</p>	<p>Based on previous co-creative and participatory processes developed by the ICUB in the last decade<sup>3</sup>, the UB identified (WP2 and WP3) that they raised awareness of the <b>common principles and goals</b> of the CF' program. After two years, these developments also gave place to the standardisation process leading to the quantitative tool used to measure the program performance since 2014. Moreover, according to the stakeholders, including CFs responsible, users and ICUB officials, these processes dynamized the program governance, provided a taxonomy of each CF orientation and exposed main conflicts related to the qualitative justification of each facility policy remaining up-to-date.</p>

<sup>3</sup> See full report of the last collaborative process in: Colombo & Font, 2020.

	<p>What are the ways in which UNCHARTED has contributed to improving valuation processes and practices? (i.e., reducing valuation tensions, making more effective use of inclusive methods)</p>	<p>The UB-ICUB and factories collaboration is expected further to reduce the above-mentioned tensions within the CFs program. These are embodied in divergences between CFs, between specific CFs and the ICUB and also concern the internal dynamics associated with artists and community members interacting with the evaluation instruments. This UNCHARTED goal is expected to be reached by finding better collaborative and co-creative strategies between these actors to identify and enhance existing evaluation tools and produce a more aligned and stable quantitative-qualitative evaluation scheme.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Annex 5: Control case 2.2. Culture-led urban regeneration in in the 8<sup>th</sup> District of Budapest

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for examined control case</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	Since 2019, the local municipality of the 8th district comprehends a Community Participation Office, that is responsible for the coordination and professional supervision of the participation programmes of the Municipality of Józsefváros, the organisation of the Municipality's community programmes, certain customer service tasks and the organisation of related communication tasks. Their various programmes include participatory budget, regular community greeting hours and citizens' forum, consultations, and meetings with local NGOs.	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	In a post-socialist political context, there is no long tradition of community planning so it can be assumed that the municipality might struggle with community involvement, mostly when it concerns marginalised, more disadvantageous social groups	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	There are seven staff members working in the Community Participation Office	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	Budapest has a two-level municipal system: Budapest Metropolitan Municipality and 23 district municipality. The Metropolitan Municipality is not superior to the district municipalities; the law clearly defines the competences of each of them.	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● local</li> <li>● inter-organisational</li> <li>● regional</li> <li>● national</li> <li>● international</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	Our case focuses mainly on the local level but as the municipality has several links to other districts and to the Budapest Metropolitan Municipality as well, a wider level may also be analysed in some respect.
	To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?	During the last decades, the 8th district was one of the main sites of the EU-funded social urban regeneration in Budapest, with the Magdolna Neighbourhood Program, running since 2005 and other, smaller scale urban projects.	

<b>2. Stakeholder analysis</b> <i>Who works together?</i>			
<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● public services</li> <li>● political bodies</li> <li>● civil society, NGOs</li> <li>● citizens</li> </ul>	The Community Participation Office is a public body, collaborating regularly with civil organisations, citizens
	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?		
<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	Local policymaking and programmes related to cultural urban regeneration are initiated by the municipality, while several sub-tasks are run by civil organs or private companies, having a contractual relationship with the municipality.	
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	Although the municipality and the participation office signify a higher level in the hierarchy, there are several attempts to compensate the inequalities in the relationship with other actors (sharing roles in decision-, policy-making)	
<b>3. Mechanism of control case</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>			
<b>Design of the control case</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes</li> </ul>	
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bottom-up</li> <li>● Top-down</li> </ul>	An exceptionally important emphasis on the community participation of the district (also in comparison with other districts in Budapest)
<b>Meetings / activities</b>	Do you plan to attend any events / activities related to the control case?	Yes, if there are local forums during Spring 2023.	
<b>4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods</b> <i>Why is this method used as a way of working together?</i>			

<b>Dynamics of valuation</b>	What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?	Democracy, social inclusion are surely values that are very strongly articulated in the work of the Community Participation Office. They appear in a lot of programmes and forums organised and managed by the Office: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Democratic expression of opinion and decision-making in the district’s monument protection listing (participatory urban heritage management)</li> <li>• Participatory elaboration of the local strategy for a child friendly Józsefváros</li> </ul>
	Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)	As explained above, this type of collaborative governance and emphasis on community participation in local decision-making is very rare in the Hungarian political sphere and also among the local municipalities of Budapest. Moreover, as the 8th district disposes of several neighbourhoods with severe social-economic disadvantages, the aspect of social inclusion (through the participation of marginalised / minority communities in local urban projects) is very much highlighted.
	How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?	In WP1, the ELTE team was working together with UPorto on an article on recent urban development trends, including dynamics of gentrification, touristification, segregation and their implications for the preservation of urban heritage so it may be used as a theoretical framework for our control case.
<b>Impact assessment</b>	What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)	Beyond the advantages of increasing the presence of innovative methods, using inclusive methods and participatory techniques have also a role in setting examples to the socio-political public sphere and discourses.
<b>5. Axis-related questions</b>		
<b>Axis 2 Culture-led urban regeneration</b>	What values are recognized and promoted by cultural administration in culture-led urban regeneration processes?	Similarly to the main case in Barcelona of the axis, the local municipality of the 8th district of Budapest is also putting into focus several social values and encourages pro-bottom-up governance components. Moreover, we may also detect here a specific focus toward fragile and protected groups (Roma, immigrants like refugees from Ukraine, elderly, women, etc.) and collaborative dynamics that are fostered through several local initiatives and programmes of either the Community Participation Office, or of other branches and offices of the local



		municipality.
	How regimes of value promoted by local administrations in its (e)valuation methodologies influence cultural institutions and actors (residents, artists, etc.)?	The municipality has developed its cultural products and services primarily around social inclusion (e.g. organising fundraising and charity actions, Children's Book Stop), democratisation of and access to culture (e.g. free cultural programmes in public spaces or institutions, discounted theatre tickets for local residents), preservation of cultural diversity (e.g. fellowship program for early career artists) and promotion of gender equality (e.g. public spaces named after women and public artworks that pay tribute to women). The extent of the impact can be assessed both quantitatively and qualitatively.
	What is the role accomplished and given by local public administration to urban actors affected and involved in these processes?	There are several programmes and initiatives under the label of “Civic participation” in the district where various urban actors and local inhabitants may be involved in decision making. For instance, in 2023, the municipality creates a participatory budget, in which the 8th district residents will have the choice to spend HUF 150 million (400.000 EUR). Furthermore, all the results of the programmes and of forums, questionnaires are transparently published on the municipality’s website.
	To what extent does these actors' participation shape public administration's methodologies for evaluating urban cultural projects and programs?	These methodologies still have to be observed and analysed by the ELTE team but as of now, it seems that the specifically great emphasis put on public participation should be followed by evaluative processes which form and eventually modify the realisation of communal programs and cultural events.
	What are the relationships between sociohistorical parameters determined by local urban and cultural policy models (and their implicit hierarchies of values) and studied (e)valuation practices, protocols, and dynamics?	There are specific socio-historical characteristics that influence large cities in Central and Eastern Europe, including Budapest. In contrast to North America and Western Europe where community planning has been able to develop and spread in essentially democratic states, in our region and in our country, with the legacy of the state socialist period, it is a much more difficult process. As Hungarian sociologists noted, in highly centralised, paternalistic systems such as socialism, the culture of creating and institutionalising spontaneous interest groups and the practice of gaining influence on certain issues in opposition to the bureaucratic power structure is essentially absent. Therefore, in Hungary, few participatory or socially based urban regeneration projects have been implemented in recent decades.

		<p>The Budapest Urban Rehabilitation Programme was completed in 1997, and in the same year the 'crisis areas' of the capital were identified, which (including some neighbourhoods of the 8th district) were also an important part of the rehabilitation plans in order to avoid ghettoization and total segregation. In 2003, the concept of social rehabilitation was introduced in the extended Urban Rehabilitation Programme: the main elements of a complex intervention: for a sustainable society, the programme should include a situation assessment, a detailed rehabilitation plan and a monitoring programme, and ensure the involvement of the local population, the owners involved in the different programmes and local NGOs. Finally, the above-analysed practices of the local municipality are aiming to be long-term results of these socio-historically delayed participatory policies.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Annex 6: Control case 2.3. Urban Regeneration and Cultural Values in the city of Porto

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for examined control case</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	N/A.	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	N/A.	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	Local government documents of their evaluation and decision-making process.	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	N/A.	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● local</li> <li>● inter-organisational</li> </ul>	
	To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?	This study has multilevel articulation – more so when integrated with the main case. Heritage-led urban regeneration is a transversal topic in all European countries.	
<b>2. Stakeholder analysis</b> <i>Who works together?</i>			
<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● public services</li> <li>● political bodies</li> <li>● civil society, NGOs</li> <li>● academic sphere</li> <li>● professionals</li> <li>● private sector</li> <li>● citizens</li> </ul>	UP
	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?		Câmara Municipal do Porto and Cinema Batalha

<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	UP will not distribute tasks.	
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	N/A.	
<b>3. Mechanism of control case</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>			
<b>Design of the control case</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	No	
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bottom-up</li> <li>● Top-down</li> </ul>	N/A
<b>Meetings / activities</b>	Do you plan to attend any events / activities related to the control case?	No	
<b>4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods</b> <i>Why is this method used as a way of working together?</i>			
<b>Dynamics of valuation</b>	What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?	Our goal is to understand the process of evaluation (and valuations) of Porto's local governance about the regeneration of Cinema Batalha.	
	Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity	N/A	

	to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)	
	How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?	<p><b>D1.2.</b> Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture</p> <p><b>D1.4.</b> Analysis of the influence of neo-liberalism in the configuration of the values of culture</p> <p><b>D2.2.</b> Report on the emergence of values in cultural participation and engagement</p> <p><b>D2.4.</b> Report on the emergence of values in cultural production and heritage</p> <p><b>D2.5.</b> Mapping of the values of culture in cultural policy objectives</p> <p><b>D3.3.</b> Interim Report on the technologies of evaluation in cultural production and heritage management</p> <p><b>D3.4.</b> Interim Report on the influence of public administration evaluation methodologies on cultural production and heritage management</p>
<b>Impact assessment</b>	What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)	N/A
<p><b>5. Axis-related questions</b>  <i>To be filled out by Axis leaders</i></p>		
<b>Axis 2 Culture-led urban regeneration</b>	What values are recognized and promoted by cultural administration in culture-led urban regeneration processes?	N/A
	How regimes of value promoted by local administrations in its (e)valuation methodologies influence cultural institutions and actors (residents, artists, etc.)?	N/A

	<p>What is the role accomplished and given by local public administration to urban actors affected and involved in these processes?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>To what extent does these actors' participation shape public administration's methodologies for evaluating urban cultural projects and programs?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>What are the relationships between sociohistorical parameters determined by local urban and cultural policy models (and their implicit hierarchies of values) and studied (e)valuation practices, protocols and dynamics?</p>	<p>N/A</p>

### Annex 7: Main case 3.1. The co-construction of new instruments: Survey on Portuguese Cultural Practices

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for experimental demonstrations</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	In our main case, on the one hand, we have worked together with GEPAC and INE in order to co-create a survey on cultural practices that has already been applied to a sample of 10000 people. On the other hand, we are working with a group of stakeholders from the cultural sectors to evaluate and reflect on the existing cultural information system and to reimagine an information system more adequate to their needs.	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	We have selected the key actors with the help of expert insiders. Inclusivity was considered when we were selecting the stakeholders, gathering an heterogeneous group from different cultural activities and positions within the organisations.	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	Axis 1 – Prof. Natália Aevodo Axis 2 – Prof. Ligia Ferro Axis 3 – Prof. João Teixeira Lopes WP5 Support – José Ricardo	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	N/A	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● local</li> <li>● inter-organisational</li> <li>● regional</li> <li>● national</li> <li>● international</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	Our case has a multilevel articulation. We work with stakeholders from different territorial levels. From GEPAC and INE – central and national entities –, to administrators and cultural producers from local cultural institutions.
	To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?	We aim to produce a policy brief or a framework of guidelines to inform policy makers - from local to European level.	

<b>Improvement potential</b>	What are the main characteristics of the existing evaluation methodology?	Economic value and quantitative data	
	What types of values are predominantly focused in the existing evaluation methodology?	The quantitative approach on cultural information systems is not suited to grasp more qualitative values from the cultural field.	
	What kind of improvement is expected?	It is expected to mitigate the tensions that rise from the inadequacy of a quantitative information system and the needs and values of cultural actors.	
<b>2. Stakeholder analysis</b> <i>Who works together?</i>			
<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● public services</li> <li>● political bodies</li> <li>● civil society, NGOs</li> <li>● academic sphere</li> <li>● professionals</li> <li>● private sector</li> <li>● citizens</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	ISUP; GEPAC; Plateia
	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?		INE; various cultural actors from different associations and companies.
<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	N/A	
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	N/A	
<b>3. Mechanism of experimental demonstrations</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>			
<b>Design of the inclusive collaboration</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	Yes	
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bottom-up</li> <li>● Top-down</li> </ul>	There are two moments in our experimental case. 1 – A Top-Down survey created directly with central institutions. 2 – A Bottom-Up co-creation process with local and regional



			cultural stakeholders.
	What is your level of involvement as an UNCHARTED team member?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Observer</li> <li>● Initiator</li> <li>● Facilitator</li> <li>● Mediator</li> <li>● Co-creator</li> </ul>	We are involved in every level of this process.
	Are you planning to recruit someone for this task?	No	
	Do you have any operational requirements to perform the task?		
<b>Nature of the observation</b>	How is UNCHARTED getting involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● workshops</li> <li>● inclusive co-creation methods</li> <li>● local encounters</li> <li>● consulting national institutes</li> </ul>	
<b>Calendar</b>	Please provide estimated dates for events that are initiated by UNCHARTED.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. June: Meetings and co-creation process with GEPAC and INE</li> <li>2. 29<sup>th</sup> of November - Workshop with key actors and stakeholders from the Portuguese cultural sector</li> <li>3. May: Second meeting with key actors and stakeholders from the Portuguese cultural sector</li> </ol>	
	Select one occasion when an ELTE team member will attend	The meeting in May would be a good occasion to host a member from the ELTE team.	
<b>4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods</b> <i>Why is this method used as a way of working together?</i>			
<b>Dynamics of valuation</b>	What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?	It is still too soon to give a conclusive answer, but the tensions between qualitative and quantitative approaches are already surfacing. We have also encountered tensions with the top-bottom approach (bureaucratic logic) and the bottom-up approach (inclusive, participative and democratic logic).	

	<p>Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)</p>	<p>We are not observing a case but initiating a co-creation process. We find it representative of the dominant societal values and representative of the cultural sector.</p>
	<p>How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?</p>	<p>This experimental case relates to previous results from UNCHARTED. It relates to the tensions found in WP2 between hierarchical administrations and inclusive participation. It relates with WP3, as we have mentioned, and the tensions found in the use of a quantitative approach to the cultural information systems. Finally, it relates with WP4 and the grammars of evaluation, which is a core concept in a co-creative process of an inclusive cultural information system.</p>
<p><b>Impact assessment</b></p>	<p>What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)</p>	<p>We aim to explore how the process of co-creation of a cultural information system can help mitigate the tensions between central authorities and the cultural field actors (managers, producers). We expect that the impacts of our guidelines reach various levels of governance, informing decision and policy makers.</p>
	<p>What are the ways in which UNCHARTED has contributed to improving valuation processes and practices? (i.e., reducing valuation tensions, making more effective use of inclusive methods)</p>	

### Annex 8: Control case 3.2. Information systems in French national cultural administration

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for examined control case</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	In general, the ministry applies inclusive methods only within its own directorates, in cooperation with the Department of Studies, Forecasting and Statistics (DEPS). On the other hand, it supports, in the cultural sector, the development of participatory science, through calls for expressions of interest and support for networks active in this field. This strategy is explained in the publications of the Ministry of Culture, such as: <i>Culture et Recherche</i> n°140, in 2020. <a href="https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Thematiques/Enseignement-superieur-et-Recherche/La-revue-Culture-et-Recherche/Recherche-culturelle-et-sciences-participatives">https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Thematiques/Enseignement-superieur-et-Recherche/La-revue-Culture-et-Recherche/Recherche-culturelle-et-sciences-participatives</a>	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	In general, the DEPS is extremely sensitive to issues of disparities, and to the obstacles that exist with regard to real inclusiveness in territorial, social, generational and health terms. Its work, in 2021-2023, focuses, for example, on the fractures between cities and the rural world; amateur practices; territorial disparities; access to culture in overseas territories, etc. But the realisation of the studies itself makes very little use of the effective participation of citizens in the realisation of these surveys. This is a methodological limit that refers to a more general and quite strong break, in France, between scientific knowledge and civic knowledge.	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	Budget DEPS: 2 million euros Staff: 21 agents	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	The main sectoral factor is, following the French model of Cultural policy, the high level of public funding at each administrative level, as shown in the distribution above. But it can be interpreted as a positive or a negative factor. The negative would be that this tradition of public funding allows data collection stakeholders to be less sensitive to innovations such as inclusive or participatory methods. The distribution of cultural public expenses (in 2021) is the following: Ministry of Culture: 3,8 Billions euros Other Ministries: 4,4 Billions euros	

		<p>Regions: 0,6 Billions                  Departments: 0,9 Billions                  Communes and inter-municipal bodies: 7,4 Billions</p>	
<p><b>Integration and action area</b></p>	<p>Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● local</li> <li>● (inter-organisational )</li> <li>● regional</li> <li>● national</li> <li>● international)</li> <li>● etc.</li> </ul>	<p>The territorial impact is highly taken into account through a dedicated sub-direction of DEPS in charge of studying the « territorial dynamics ». Nevertheless, as this service is rather recent, it hardly cooperates with local authorities, and it is much more oriented toward partnerships with research institutions (the latter having more or less interactions with territorial authorities). One big exception is the regular analysis of public expenditures for culture at all institutional levels, that drives the DEPS into close cooperation with local, departmental and regional authorities and their cultural administration. The territorial impact is – within these limits – at each level equal. The inter-organisational cooperation (i.e. between ministries) is less developed than expected and – to a certain extent – declared. International cooperation, at least at European level, should be considered as a shortcoming strategy, except what we mentioned above. That’s why we put into parenthesis those levels of cooperation.</p>
	<p>To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?</p>	<p>The DEPS participates, still a long time, to European initiatives such as the Compendium for Cultural Policies in Europe or the Eurostat database. It is also co-organizing international conferences such as « Culture and Emotion » (Lyon) ; « Cultural exchanges Europe/Asia » (Paris), « Digital cultural practices » (Paris) in 2022. It is also partner of the interdisciplinary project Global Media Concentration Project leaded by Dwayne R. Winseck (Carleton Univ.) on industrial concentration in the media sector.</p>	
<p><b>2. Stakeholder analysis</b>  <i>Who works together?</i></p>			

<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● public services</li> <li>● academic sphere</li> <li>● professionals</li> <li>● private sector</li> </ul>	Public agents of the DEPS, agents of the other directions of the Ministry
	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?		Research and University agents, private societies specialised in the study field, representatives of sectors belonging to the Cultural field.
<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of actors</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	The decision about the programme of activities is taken by a Ministerial Council of Studies, with representatives of all directions of the Ministry + qualified personalities (research sector). The agents implement this programme, either internally or through partnerships with the research sector, private study societies, non-profit bodies or collective organisations dedicated to a profession, a sub-sector, or a group of interests.	
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	The hierarchy is relatively coherent with the distribution of tasks: The Council – the agents and their internal and external partnerships. Above, the DEPS belongs to the General Secretary of the Ministry, which has the status of a Central Direction of the Ministry. Above again, the minister and her Cabinet.	
<b>3. Mechanism of control case</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>			
<b>Design of the control case</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No</li> </ul>	
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bottom-up</li> <li>● Top-down</li> </ul>	
<b>Meetings / activities</b>	Do you plan to attend any events / activities related to the control case?	Yes, in the framework of existing research programmes such as: the French network of “Centres Culturels de Rencontre” – a label distinguishing heritage sites with artistic and cultural strategies ; the sociology of festival building across time ; the sociology of festival extinction. All these research activities plea for close cooperation between our research centre, the sectoral interests, and the DEPS.	
<b>4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods</b> <i>Why is this method used as a way of working together? At the moment, inclusive methods are only supported by the DEPS as an object of reflection for possible future implementations.</i>			

<p><b>Dynamics of valuation</b></p>	<p>What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?</p>	<p>The conclusions that emerge from participatory research often emphasise a hybridization of values between those rather carried by a ministry (excellence, democratisation); those more driven by economic actors (cultural economy, territorial attractiveness) and those more driven by citizens and NGOs (cultural democracy, cultural rights, personal development, and community building). These values are in tension, albeit informally, in the definition of research strategies. For example, the sectoral directorates of ministries are more sensitive to the artistic dimensions of values; DEPS services, while very focused on the statistical and scientific dimension of their data, have difficulty integrating the necessarily qualitative (more than quantitative) dimension of inclusive methods. The resulting consequence is that inclusiveness is a real research issue, but without an inclusive method. As the war is a too serious thing to entrust to the armed forces, inclusiveness seems to be a too serious thing to entrust inclusive research... That's why the degree of institutionalisation of values is very distinct one from the other: high for excellence and democratisation; low for democracy, cultural rights, and personal development.</p>
	<p>Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)</p>	<p>It derives from above that the observed case is not sufficiently inclusive in its methods, even if inclusiveness is a huge concern in policy goals. The reasons are plural: on one side, the research and study methods are not open enough to people that would represent an inclusive research capacity ; on the other side, inclusive oriented people probably do not invest enough in research strategy with respect to their efforts in political and social mobilisation.</p>
	<p>How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?</p>	<p>This case illustrates several findings from previous policy values analysis contrasting the dominant values claimed inside the governmental context (artistic centrism through democratisation and excellence) and the hybridization of values in societal context (blended valuation process from artistic excellence to democracy, from democratisation to well-being and community building). In that framework, DEPS plays a rather intermediate role, on one side dependent on the institutional dominant valuation process and, on the other side, welcoming new values and new ways of capturing and documenting them.</p>

<b>Impact assessment</b>	What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)	<p>1. Recognition of plurality of Culture valuation in society and thus enlargement of legitimation of public spending for culture</p> <p>2. Better adaptation of data information system to the evolving culture valuation</p> <p>3. Innovation in the way through which the place of culture in social life may be assessed, even in discussing the established hierarchies inside the Ministry and its territorial partners.</p> <p>All these benefits remain still in draft form more than an achieved process.</p>
<b>5. Axis-related questions</b>		
<b>Axis 3 Cultural information systems</b>	What are the criteria (political, administrative, cultural) that underlie the construction of indicators?	N/A
	What do they measure? What is missing to be measured?	N/A
	What is the decision-making chain in the construction of these indicators?	N/A
	What is the degree of participation in the cultural and artistic field?	N/A
	How are they disseminated and communicated?	N/A
	How do they articulate quantitative and qualitative dimensions?	N/A
	What values do they express? What tensions?	N/A

### Annex 9: Control case 3.3. LUQs – The process of accreditation of regional museums in the Emilia Romagna region

TOPICS	QUESTIONS/REQUESTS	ANSWERS	COMMENTS
<b>1. Drivers for examined control case</b> <i>What do they want to achieve?</i>			
<b>Inclusive modalities of actions</b>	How do inclusive methods apply to the case?	The case features SPC executing stewardship actions such as training and networking towards regional museums' applications to the SMR.	
	Can you identify any non-sufficiencies that affect inclusivity?	Accreditation to the SMR is given based on a score resembling the possession of LUQs (Quality levels)	
<b>Resources</b>	What are the resources of the case under observation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial: regional funds (indirectly)</li> <li>Human/Intellectual: professional expertise</li> </ul>	
	What are the main sectoral factors and resources that can be identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cultural heritage</li> </ul>	
<b>Integration and action area</b>	Does the case show a multilevel articulation? What is the territorial level of impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>regional</li> <li>national (marginal)</li> </ul>	The case is articulated at the regional level (SPC and museums) and national level (Ministry LUQs)
	To what extent is there a European scope in the analysed case?	The process of institutionalisation of SMR gives execution to principles consistent to those stated in the Faro convention	
<b>2. Stakeholder analysis</b> <i>Who works together?</i>			
<b>Plurality of actors</b>	Who is working on the case as internal stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>public services</li> <li>political bodies</li> <li>professionals</li> <li>citizens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Museums</li> <li>SPC and E-R Region</li> </ul>
	Who can be identified as external stakeholders?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Citizens</li> <li>Professionals</li> <li>Ministry of Culture</li> </ul>
<b>Categorisation and hierarchy of</b>	How are the tasks distributed between the actors?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPC as branch of the E-R region manages the accreditation process to SMR at the</li> </ul>	



<b>actors</b>		regional level; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The questionnaire assessing museums’ possession of LUQs is designed by the Ministry</li> <li>• Regional museums apply to be credited to SMR</li> </ul>
	What hierarchical relationships can be identified between the actors?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional top-down relationship between Ministry and E-R Region</li> <li>• SPC is part of the E-R Region</li> <li>• Museums are formally independent from SPC but can be recipients of resources (training, funding). The relationship between museums and SPC is punctuated by training sessions and co-work interactions on LUQs assessment/ development</li> </ul>
<b>3. Mechanism of control case</b> <i>How do stakeholders work together?</i>		
<b>Design of the control case</b>	Are you observing an institution/process with ongoing inclusive methods or not?	No
	If Yes, what is the governance dynamic associated with inclusive methods or demands?	N/A
<b>Meetings / activities</b>	Do you plan to attend any events / activities related to the control case?	No
<b>4. Legitimacy of inclusive methods</b> <i>Why is this method used as a way of working together?</i>		
<b>Dynamics of valuation</b>	What values of culture are identified in practice by stakeholders? In what types of practices do these values emerge? In what framework of tensions do these values appear? Who are the stakeholders that represent the different values? How are these values institutionalised?	The value of culture identified by stakeholders relates to accessibility. This value emerges in practices of valuation and knowledge exchange on a museum quality The value is at the nexus of tensions related to the role of accessibility within the whole LUQs framework.

	Do you find that the observed case is sufficiently inclusive? Why? (i.e., representativeness of targeted users, capacity to mirror dominant societal values, etc.)	It can be appreciated as inclusive considering the institutional and highly rigid, bureaucratic context (from the Ministry of Culture to local institutions) where the practices take place.
	How does it relate to previous UNCHARTED results, policy briefs and previous case studies?	It relates to the potential conflicting views over broad conceptions of value such as accessibility to culture.
<b>Impact assessment</b>	What are the benefits of using inclusive organisational methods? (capacity building, enhanced communication, innovative practices etc.)	Capacity building at heritage sites, professionalisation and local cultural development.
<b>5. Axis-related questions</b>		
<b>Axis 3 Cultural information systems</b>	What are the criteria (political, administrative, cultural) that underlie the construction of indicators?	Political
	What do they measure? What is missing to be measured?	Quality at different angles Specific and substantive aspects of small-sized museums
	What is the decision-making chain in the construction of these indicators?	Experts commission->Ministry-> Local entities
	What is the degree of participation in the cultural and artistic field?	Low
	How are they disseminated and communicated?	They are not yet
	How do they articulate quantitative and qualitative dimensions?	Strong imbalance, they mainly assess the existence of procedures linked to quality
	What values do they express? What tensions?	Accessibility Comparative ranking vs qualifying expertise

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Colombo, Alba and Font, Martí (2020). *Fàbriques de Creació. Objectius comuns i indicadors per al diagnòstic de la realitat d'acció*. Barcelona: Ajuntament de Barcelona. At [http://www.bcn.cat/cultura/docs/Informe\\_cualitativa\\_Fabriques\\_Creacio\\_2.pdf](http://www.bcn.cat/cultura/docs/Informe_cualitativa_Fabriques_Creacio_2.pdf)
- Noella J. Gray, Catherine Corson, Lisa M. Campbell, Peter R. Wilshusen, Rebecca L. Gruby & Shannon Hagerman (2020). Doing Strong Collaborative Fieldwork in Human Geography, *Geographical Review*, 110:1-2, 117-132, DOI: 10.1111/gere.12352
- Rossi, M., & Fiorentini, G. (2022). *L'Altra Volterra: Un'esplorazione territoriale tra attesa e rigenerazione*. Volterra: Tuscany.
- Volterra XXII - Rigenerazione Umana Capitale Italiana della Cultura 2022, Città candidata. Retrieved 28 February 2022, from [https://staging5.volterra22.it/wp-content/uploads/Dossier\\_Volterra.pdf](https://staging5.volterra22.it/wp-content/uploads/Dossier_Volterra.pdf)