

**MINUTES**  
**of the EU-CHIC Steering Committee and Advisory Committee Meeting**  
29 May and 31 May 2012

Venue: Atrium hotel, Split, Croatia

*All presentations, papers and material, mentioned in the minutes are available on the projects' web page [www.eu-chic.eu](http://www.eu-chic.eu)*

**PARTICIPANTS**

<b>STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS</b>	
UL FGG	Roko Žarnić
	Barbara Vodopivec
SKB	Wolfgang Kippes
BBRI	Yves Vanhellemont
ZZ	Vlatka Rajčić
ITAM	Jan Válek
Fraunhofer	Johanna Leissner
	Constanze Fuhrmann
NTUA	Antonia Moropoulou
UNIBO	Marta Quaranta
UNIFE	Roberto Di Giulio
	Emanuele Piaia
	Marco Zuppiroli
IPPT PAN	Marek Skłodowski
	Monika Jadzinska
TECNALIA	Rand Eppich
TECNION	Apologised absence

<b>ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS</b>	
Scotland	Ingval Maxwell, president
The Netherlands	Jacques Akerboom
Norway	Terje Nypan
Italy	Alfredo Ronchi
Belgium	André DeNaeyer
<b>INVITED GUESTS PARTICIPANTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HERITAGE PRESERVATION</b>	
Conservation department Imotski, Croatia	Ivan Alduk
Art Academy Split, Croatia	Siniša Bizjak
ITAM, Czech Republic	Jiří Bláha
UL FGG, Slovenia	Violeta Bokan Bosiljkov
UL FGG, Slovenia	Meta Kržan
Croatian Conservation Institute, Split, Croatia	Antonija Buljan
University of Bologna, Italy	Camilla Colla
State university of library studies and information technologies, Bulgaria	Valeria Fol
Politecnico di Milano, Italy	Silvia Gugu
Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, Austria	Ingrid Hopfner
Kaeferhaus GmbH, Austria	Jochen Käferhaus
University of Genoa, Italy	Sergio Lagomarsino
European College of Economics and Management, Bulgaria	Vesselin Loulanski

Populus SME, Slovenia	Darja Marinček Prošenc
Croatian Conservation Institute, Split, Croatia	Vinka Marinković
Institute for restoration of Dubrovnik, Croatia	Amalija Pavlič
University of Ferrara, Italy	Carmela Vacaro
State university of library studies and information technologies, Bulgaria	Sofiya Vasileva-Valcheva
Vectra SME, Croatia	Zlatan Novak

TUESDAY, 29 May 2012

**17.00 - 19.00: EU-CHIC Preparatory Meeting**

The EU-CHIC project coordinator, Mr Roko Žarnić, gave a welcome address to the meeting participants, members of the EU-CHIC Steering Committee, and the EU-CHIC Advisory Committee.

After the welcome address, the agenda of the meeting was presented by the Coordinator and approved by participants.

Coordinator gave WP1 presentation of management tasks performed in the last few months and to be done till the end of the project. Beneficiaries received detailed information on the last periodic and final reporting. From each beneficiary coordinator expects detailed activity reports according to each work package and each task, financial report (according to templates) and time-sheets in order to be able to prepare material for a potential audit control. E-mails with instructions will be sent to all till mid July. Coordinator pointed out that costs from the EU-CHIC project are eligible only till the end of August.

NTUA and UL will work on the final version of guidelines in June and partners are supposed to translate EU-CHIC guidelines into their languages. Johanna Leissner explained that Egyptian partner could not take active part in the project because of the political situation in Egypt. All participants agreed that information on guidelines should also be send to Egyptian partner.

WP1 presentation concluded with discussion on possible follow-up of the EU-CHIC project. Participants agreed that cultural heritage should also be found in the framework of the Horizon 2020, of humanities, of education and of ICT field. The topic is also planned to be the central focus of the round table on 31 May.

In the framework of the remaining WP5 work and general EU-CHIC results Roko Žarnić presented iceberg model. He recalled C5 Building identity card concept and presented evolution of ID system in the framework of the EU-CHIC project. Žarnić explained that his main contextual framework was consequence based approach, meaning that each intervention has certain impact on the monument

3

and that this impact should be foreseen before the intervention. He pointed out that the most important parts of the iceberg model are “alteration in use” and “maintenance plan” elements. EU-CHIC concept is to assist the owners of cultural heritage assets. His presentation evoked vivid discussion.

Terje Nypan noted that CEN TC 346 standard is to come into force soon and that EU-CHIC IC model should take it into account. Apart from that, the basic question of discussion was, similar to Athens and Ravenna discussions, who are the potential end-users and what this users might need. Coordinator explained that EU-CHIC is a model, which can be shaped in a different way, according to end-users needs, i.e. end-user will shape ID card. Comparison of EU-CHIC concept with a piece of clay emerged. Participants also posed question whether owner of data and owner of monument are the same. No clear answer was given, but the point will be taken into consideration when elaborating final guidelines. Ingval Maxwell noted that financial data is missing in the proposed model. Since each element of preservation involves financial costs, financial implication of the system and the model is to be considered; therefore economic impact should be stressed in preamble of guidelines.

Further on, participants agreed that levelled EU-CHIC system is well conceived. Level 1 is actually already implemented, whilst level 2 and especially level 3 should be more detailed and elaborated. Terje Nypan stressed that EU-CHIC system is abstract and that it should be based on a concrete example; e.g. Monumentenwacht. It should be presented more concretely in order to attract the potential end-users. Alfredo Ronchi pointed out that EU-CHIC should remain European dimension, because EU-CHIC should also provide minimum of information to make possible comparison of heritage on an EU level. Johanna Leissner recalled that CFC project collects climate data for 130 objects all over Europe and that indoor and outdoor climate data are missing in the EU-CHIC model. Roko Žarnić proposed to include climate data under subsection of risks and/or survey techniques.

Terje Nypan asked participants again, why we need EU-CHIC and what the benefits of it are. Rand Eppich replied that, also on the basis of so called end-users survey, he clearly sees the benefit of EU-CHIC, which is time spent on collecting data from various databases. Therefore, as participants agreed, EU-CHIC system should provide benefits in the form of arguments: system will help to spend costs, time, will increase efficiency, sustainability of the approach, will help to avoid mistakes when rebuilding or preserving monument, will help to allocate the budget in an optimal way (i.e. is support to the decision-making). Arguments should be given in numbers and/or measurable items. Reasons for using the system and arguments to justify the system must be simple and understandable.

Terje Nypan recalled that EU-CHIC system is to support so called management by objectives: EU-CHIC is trying to establish basics to implement management by objectives into cultural heritage field. This means, that the goals of any action should be set up first. For example, if you need a maintenance plan, EU-CHIC system should direct you to the CEN TC 346 standard, which is the basis for such a plan.

Johanna Leissner gave information that EC DG Research and Education will prepare strategy for cultural heritage research. EU-CHIC should be included in the strategy, as well as long-term efforts should be made via legal forum, for example, and other platforms to upgrade EU-CHIC concept into a directive.

**Conclusion of the discussion was that all participants should send written comments, proposals for additional elements, sub-elements, references etc. and comments on the iceberg model to coordinator ASAP after the meeting in Split.**

Presentation of the iceberg model can be found in proceedings (page 177) and on the web page [www.eu-chic.eu/Split presentations/Roko Žarnić \(iceberg model\)](http://www.eu-chic.eu/Split%20presentations/Roko%20Žarnić%20(iceberg%20model)).

THURSDAY, 31 May 2012

### **15.00 - 16.30: Round table: From Current to Future Research in Cultural Heritage**

Round table was moderated by Terje Nypan. The central focus of the round table was the potential implementation of the EU-CHIC system, i.e. the EU-CHIC aim. His idea was to develop a market plan, entitled "from idea to product". Major orientation was management by objective base for the EU-CHIC system, which should strive, as it was agreed by all participants, to become a European standard. Conclusions from the round table are written in the presentation, which is Appendix 1 to these minutes.

### **17.00 – 19.00: EU-CHIC Steering Committee and Advisory Committee meeting**

At the beginning coordinator summarised discussion that took place on 29 May on the iceberg model. He gave information on the final EU-CHIC reporting and stressed that all inputs from beneficiaries should be received by coordinator by the end of September 2012. All necessary information on reporting will be send to beneficiaries by mid-July.

Antonia Moropoulou presented WP5 work in progress and, above all, pointed out work, which NTUA still needs to receive by some work packages in order to be able to prepare final guidelines.

Task 5.1: UL needs to prepare final version of Deliverable 5.1 (draft was submitted), NTUA will provide detailed analysis of each proposed parameter, UNBO, Fraunhofer, ITAM and UNIFE will prepare a table with definition of each MTT listed, including indication of relevant reference for its definition.

Task 5.2: NTUA will finalize Deliverable 5.2 (draft was submitted to partners), Tecnalía will prepare final version of bibliography and UL final version of bio profiles of each partners to be included in Deliverable 5.2. Fraunhofer will prepare definition and reference of identified MTTs according to specific proposed standards (particularly CEN 346) following the suggestions in Deliverable 4.2\_final, pp 17-18.

Task 5.3: based on the survey, Tecnalía will prepare identification of end-users and link end-users to specific IC models, ZZ should upload all EU-CHIC material to projects' web page in order to be available to all partners.

Guidelines: Fraunhofer should contribute regarding: "The development of strategies to develop similar systems for cultural items not covered by EU CHIC project: Movable assets, archaeological and natural sites, and intangible heritage. Elaboration of strategies for implementation and validation of

the EU CHIC guideline including the establishment of EU policies relevant to CHIC (EU-CHIC DoW)”. All partners should contribute further suggestions to final guidelines draft and Advisory Committee is to review the final version.

#### INTERVIEW INFORMATION

Based on the initiative from Alfredo Ronchi, member of the EU-CHIC Advisory Committee, given at the project meeting in Athens in February 2012, coordinator, dissemination leader and consortium as a whole decided to further disseminate and promote results of the project through a series of video interviews. The idea was to record video interviews during the meeting in Split and to combine individual statements, video clips of the event (opening session, people attending, speaking...) and some Split attractive monuments' clips into a promotional video of the project, cca 1 hour long. If accepted by participants, also short videos of typical monuments from each country in order to show a collection of different typologies and technologies and to introduce the richness on the project consortium can be added, as Ronchi suggested.

All Split conference participants were invited to take part in the action with individual statements. At least one representative of each EU-CHIC partner, Advisory Committee members and invited experts, participants of the conference, should take part. All who responded signed the statement, allowing to publicly use recorded material.

Proposed basic structure of the statement, which was not mandatory, but served for the orientation, was:

- Introduction (name, position...) = 20 seconds
- Why am I in the EU-CHIC consortium or interested in the topic (experiences, interest...) = 20 seconds
- What do I expect from the proposed pan-European documentation system (not general, from your specific professional standpoint; e.g. why do we need it, SWOT of proposed system...) = 40 seconds
- What are the essential elements of the proposed ID card (again, from your professional standpoint; e.g. legal status, history of interventions, risk assessment, values assessment...) = 20 seconds
- Examples of good practices (in your country) = 20 seconds
- Additional statement: it might be a motto, an announcement or a promotional message (open to your interpretation and optional) = max. 60 seconds

15 interviews were recorded by Alfredo Ronchi and Barbara Vodopivec on 31 May.

Following experts were interviewed:

- Jacques Akerboom, Monumentenwacht Noord-Brabant, The Netherlands, AC member
- André DeNaeyer, Belgium, invited expert
- Roberto Di Giulio, University of Ferrara, Italy, consortium member
- Rand Eppich, Tecnalía, Spain, consortium member, WP2 leader
- Monika Jadzinska, Polish Academy of Arts, Poland, consortium member
- Jochen Käferhaus, Austria, representative of SME, end-user
- Wolfgang Kippes, Schloss Schönbrunn, Austria, consortium member, end-user
- Sergio Lagomarsino, University of Genoa, coordinator of Perpetuate project
- Johanna Leissner, Fraunhofer, Germany, consortium member, WP4 leader, coordinator of CFC project
- Ingal Maxwell, Scotland, AC president
- Antonia Moropoulou, NTUA, Greece, consortium member, WP5 leader
- Marta Quaranta, University of Bologna, Italy, consortium member, WP3 leader
- Jan Válek, ITAM, Czech republic, consortium member
- Yves Vanhellemont, BBRI, Belgium, consortium member
- Terje Nypan, Riksantikvaren, Norway, AC member.

In the following days further experts still need to be interviewed:

- Violeta Bokan Bosiljkov, UL FGG, Slovenia, invited expert
- Anna Lobovikov-Katz, Tecnion, Israel, consortium member
- Vlatka Rajčić, ZZ, Croatia, consortium member, WP6 leader
- Alfredo Ronchi, Politecnico di Milano, Italy, AC member
- Roko Žarnić, UL FGG, Slovenia, consortium member, coordinator

- Hind Mostafa, Cultnat, Egypt, AC member
- ...

Interviews, compiled in a video presentation, will be published on the projects' web page. Partners are asked to send some more video clips of their laboratories, survey techniques (some films from Split presentations will be used), representative monuments, on-site videos etc. Video will be also send to the European Commission in order to demonstrate the potential of EU-CHIC results, efficiency of the cultural heritage projects clustering and cultural heritage research in general.

At the end of the EU-CHIC meeting coordinator thanked all partners and Advisory Committee president and members for all their work on the project. He stressed that it would be of immense importance that EU-CHIC group, together with cluster projects members and invited experts, who took part in the projects' workshops, continue to cooperate and work together in order to further implement results of the project. Same commitment to the project and its results was given by Ingval Maxwell, president of the Advisory Committee, who gave appreciation to coordinator of the project and to all partners. In particular, he stressed the importance of young experts taking part in the cultural heritage research, who will in future continue the work begun more than 20 years ago.

*Summarised by Barbara Vodopivec*

*Proof-read and edited by Ingval Maxwell*



Appendix 1: Presentation by Terje Nypan: Results of the round table discussion, 31 May 2012.



## ROUND TABLE

1. NEEDS & ADVANTAGES
2. 2. From idea to product. The marketing plan
3. 3. The vast range, the next steps, future research.



## 1. NEEDS & ADVANTAGES

- ✧ What can it do?
- ✧ How does it do it?
- ✧ Why is this interesting – for you?
- ✧ Potential uses
- ✧ What are the selling points

## 2. From idea to product. The marketing plan

- ✧ The users? The client?
- ✧ Who is willing to pay for it (its the economy you jerk)
- ✧ Rationale.
- ✧ The marketing plan – get practical and forget your content ambitions.
- ✧ How will you sell the investment.
- ✧ The system specifications

## 3. The vaste range, the next steps, future research.

- ✧ The next steps
- ✧ What are the major challenges
- ✧ Future prioritised research subjects / topics
- ✧ Research or development / implementation
- ✧ Who gets the 3. The vaste range, the next steps, future research.benefit from CH?

## WHAT IS CHIC?

- ✧ WHAT IS CHIC? WHAT DOES IT DELIVER?
- ✧ GUIDELINES FOR USER FRIENDLY SYSTEM FOR CH MANAGEMENT
  - ✧ dynamic interaction with end users
- ✧ DELIVER NUMBERS IN ECONOMIC TERMS (COSTS VS RETURNS). With experiences based costs.
- ✧ SATISFIES THE NEED FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY INPUT IN CH
- ✧ TO SUPPLY A TOOL FOR A CH EU STRATEGY?
  - ✧ MAKE OUR RESEARCHER LIFE EASIER – MULTILAYER SYSTEM
  - ✧ FOR WHOM?
  - ✧ CONTRACTORS?

## PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES ADVATAGES

- ✧ What can it do? Quality control (how will you do that),
- ✧ Bridges gap between industry and ch managment
- ✧ Scientific support to policies
- ✧ Management system that reduces costs for maitenance and repair and makes the statistical reporting to parliament more effecient
- ✧ Collect and structure huge amounts of knowledge and deliver it to the user. **Practioner based**, examples for use in my case (benchmarking). Can develop new tools and experience.
- ✧ Deliver comparable information across Europe for statistical reporting and management by objectives.
- ✧ 2/3 of govt management systems are in paper – so this system provides a format (guideline)
- ✧ How does it do it? BY IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES.
- ✧ What are the selling points

## MARKETING

- ✧ Do we have a business plan? The users? The client?
  - ✧ Who is willing to pay for it? WE ARE NOT READY FOR A CLIENT.
  - ✧ NEED TO WORK MORE (WORK = PLEASE DEFINE)
  - ✧ THE EU HAS PAID – CAN PAY MORE
- ✧ A EU Directive?????A standard? = Metadata standard for constructed cultural heritage in Europe TC 346
- ✧ Rationale 1. Has to match an existing policy need!. Strategy for built heritage. Tourism. Regional development. Cultural Heritage Label.
- ✧ Develop a set of mandatory data (CHIC Guidelines) that is interesting for the management and reporting on the EU Heritage Label.
- ✧ Gis then applications are open.
  
- ✧ The marketing plan – EU heritage label.

## RESEARCH

- ✧ The next steps
  - ✧ Use the pillars in Horizon to argue for ch research: A. invest in future jobs and growth b. peoples' concerns about their **livelihoods, safety and environment**. C. Strengthening the EU's global position in research, innovation and technology.
  - ✧ Economic research, job creation, tourism and economic importance of maintenance.
    - ✧ This interesting research and comprises a number of technical issues – proposals made here.
  - ✧ “Use cultural heritage to save Europe”
  - ✧ Petition stakeholders / research projects 1986.

