



Mpiris

Informing policy choices
through innovative social science research

POLICY DOCUMENT

04.5.1 COGHENT

ANALYSIS OF THE POTENTIAL FOR SUSTAINABILITY OF THE COMPONENTS OF THE COGHENT PROJECT



Commissioned by

Authors: Geert Van den Bossche & Johan Desseyne

APRIL 2023

Collections of Ghent

This project is financed by the European Regional Development Fund through Urban Innovative Actions (UIA).



EUROPEAN UNION
European Regional Development Fund



District09 is the ICT-partner of the city of Ghent. It is an autonomous public undertaking that supports the city in the fields of digital innovation, software development and maintenance, IT-infrastructure, and e-inclusion projects. It is responsible for a stable, trustworthy and safe IT-environment which the city, its citizens, visitors, commuters, students, and collaborators can build upon.

district09.gent/international

Mpiris is a research bureau that helps governments and organisations to take good decisions. To that end Mpiris does social science research that offers its commissioners the insights that allows them to define or redirect their policies. Mpiris uses the traditional research methods of the social sciences such as interviews, surveys and observations, but aims at distinguishing itself through the use of innovative techniques to collect and analyse data.

www.mpiris.be

Table of Content

1. Executive Summary	4
2. Introduction	10
2.1. The CoGhent Project	10
2.2. Policy Research	14
2.3. Detailed Description of the Policy Research Methodology	16
3. The Non-Technological Components of CoGhent	25
3.1. Selection of the Non-Technological Components to be Sustained	25
3.2. Requirements for Continuation	29
3.2.1. Consultation and cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the services of the city of Ghent	29
3.2.2. Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations	30
3.2.3. Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund	32
3.3. Institutional commitments	33
3.4. Conclusions.....	34
3.5. Additional Findings.....	35
4. Policy Recommendations on the Non-Technological Components	36
5. The Technological Components of CoGhent.....	38
5.1. Potential for Sustainability of the Technological Components from a Policy Perspective	38
5.2. Obstacles on the Path towards Sustainability.....	41
5.3. Paths to Overcome the Identified Obstacles to Sustainability	46
5.3.1. Keeping the CoGhent-system in use for the integrated interaction between the Ghent cultural heritage institutions and the citizen.....	46
5.3.2. Spreading the costs of maintaining the current system and installing fair arrangements for future developments.....	47
5.3.3. Detailing the role expectations about the future CoGhent-system.....	50
5.3.4. Continuing the integrated offer via (parts of) ‘the box’.....	51
5.4. Conclusions.....	53
5.5. Additional Findings.....	54
6. Policy Recommendations on the Technological Components	55
7. Policy Recommendations on the Process Towards Sustainability.....	56
8. Recommendations on the Research Process from a Methodological Perspective	57
9. Sources Consulted	61
Annex 1. Departments and services of the city of Ghent that are mentioned in the Policy Report, in Dutch and in English.....	63
Annex 2. Organisations invited to the policy research workshops.....	64
Annex 3. Assignment intra muros.....	66

1. Executive Summary

CoGhent (2020-2023) is a project of the city of Ghent (Belgium), financed by the European Regional Development Fund through the Urban Innovative Actions initiative (UIA).

The overall objective of the CoGhent project is to strengthen social cohesion through an integrated digital cultural heritage offer. This objective includes:

- The objective to connect the collections of five cultural heritage institutions of Ghent via a digital infrastructure and integrate them into the 'Collections of Ghent'
- The objective to facilitate interaction between the citizens and the digital heritage collections and additionally, to build a 'Sixth Collection' based on the input from the citizens.

CoGhent is a multi-layered, multistakeholder project. In total twelve organisations are active partner. The city of Ghent is promotor of the project, among the partners there are city services, cultural heritage institutions, academic research partners, as well as commercial players. The project pioneers in its technology-driven approach to enhance cultural participatory practice, in particular in three different neighbourhoods of the city. It is also innovative in transcending the barriers between cultural institutions, thus opening the silos between the project partners city-wide.

As part of the CoGhent project, the CoGhent policy research serves two objectives:

- It evaluates which realisations of the project have the potential to be continued after the formal ending of the project in June 2023. To be more precise, the policy research analyses which of the CoGhent outputs align with and contribute to the visions and ambitions of the research's participants to such a degree, that the latter desire their continuation.
- It formulates policy recommendations that clarify what is needed to realise that continuation.

The policy research facilitates the consolidation of the most valued and promising components of the CoGhent project into structural benefits for the partners. It also identifies avenues that allow the sustainability requirements of UIA to be fulfilled. It complements moreover the evaluations of the techno-economic and impact research that also contribute to the overall strategy towards sustainability.

The policy research examines the CoGhent outputs, which are called 'components' in this report, in two broad categories, being the technological and the non-technological components. Three of the four outputs of the policy research presented in this report, that is, the conclusions, additional findings and the policy recommendations, are mostly defined along the two categories.

The fourth output of the policy research concerns the methodology. The present report also contains a detailed description of the methodology and recommendations on the research process from a methodological perspective. Taken together, these sections serve the scalability and the transferability of the policy research. Other municipal authorities in Europe may draw inspiration from them to manage complex projects and to define in a similar way trajectories towards the sustainability of project outputs.

The results presented in this report have largely been achieved in co-creation with the managerial executives of the heritage and city parties of the CoGhent project. They met in two series of

interactive workshops to provide input and exchange perspectives, as well as validate interim results.

The policy research was conducted by Mpiris, an external research bureau that was appointed for this assignment.

The non-technological components of the CoGhent project

A unanimous consensus was reached on the potential for and desirability of the continuation of (at least) the following non-technological components:

- **Consultation and cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the services of the city of Ghent**
- **Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and non-professional associations**
- **Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund.**

The consensus on the selected non-technological components is based on the positive experiences with the components during the CoGhent project, on their contribution to the overall objective of the project, and to the (future) policy visions and ambitions of the involved institutions and city services. To be more specific,

- The selected non-technological components have contributed to the realisation of the policy vision and ambitions of the heritage institutions and the city services
 - The heritage offer and heritage related activities have become more diverse and more inclusive
 - Cultural heritage has become more visible in the city
 - Via the components, important learning and development opportunities have been created that have strengthened the competences of the collaborators of the institutions and services
- The components have enabled the heritage institutions and the city services to transcend their institutional silos and to collaborate city-wide
- The components have contributed to the strengthening of the social cohesion in the city
- The components are considered crucial for the realisation of the future ambitions of the heritage institutions and city services, which include continuing the processes that the CoGhent project has substantially accelerated but not completed.

With regard to the non-technological components, it is recommended to the local authorities of the city of Ghent that

- **the city of Ghent create an urban heritage ecosystem** in which the cultural heritage organisations, the city services, organisations and associations, that are active in the domains of heritage and outreach work, can meet and strengthen each other.
- In order to realise such an ecosystem, it is recommended to:
 - **Endorse the ambitions** of the heritage institutions and the city services in the City's next policy agreement and in the policy letters of the involved departments that will be drawn up at the start of the new city legislature (2024-2029)
 - **Appoint a party as a governance body** for the ecosystem that takes initiatives to build and strengthen the ecosystem
 - Give the governance body the mandate and the budget to coordinate the ecosystem in the city

- Assist the governance body in its tasks with a council where the heritage institutions and city services are represented (via a rotation system). The council will provide the governance body with information on the bottom-up needs and desires regarding the ecosystem. It will also contribute to the support of the initiatives of the governance body.
- Enable the governance body to design, organise and implement consultation and cooperative heritage activities
 - These can include new activities suggested by the participants of the policy research, such as a yearly city-wide network event, 'calls' for proposals for outreaching heritage initiatives and a Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund.
- **Communicate about the value of cultural heritage for the promotion of social cohesion**
 - The 'lessons learned' during the CoGhent project are (among others) that cultural heritage can function as leverage to:
 - improve and extend the public services of both cultural heritage institutions and city services
 - strengthen social cohesion in an urban context.
 - This communication will serve both
 - the city marketing of Ghent
 - the transferability of the CoGhent project.

The technological components of the CoGhent project

Usually summarised with the term '**CoGhent-system**', the main technological components of the CoGhent project are:

- **LDES** (framework of agreements for the exchange of data, open standard and event stream API)
- **DAMS** (shared digital image management system)
- **Web portal** (Collections of Ghent; data.collectie.gent)
- **Immersive digital experience room**, commonly called 'the box' (location bound object for interactive heritage offer).

Their proposed continuation:

- realises the optimal reconciliation between the requirements of the funding programme (Urban Innovative Actions) on the one hand, and the policy visions of the participating heritage institutions and city services on the other hand.
- activates an economy of scale, that enables the spreading of the necessary costs of the continuation.
- offers a solution to the need of the services of the city for a new digital image management system.

With regard to the technological components, it is recommended to the local authorities of the city of Ghent to

- **Keep the CoGhent-system in use for the integrated interaction between the heritage institutions and the citizens of Ghent**
- **As product owner, promote the CoGhent-system (or aspects of it) as the basis for a city-wide digital infrastructure for the management of digital images and their metadata**

- **Give Ghent Archives the mandate and the resources** to be responsible for the development and management of the CoGhent-system in function of:
 - the interaction between the Ghent heritage institutions and the city services
 - their interaction with the citizens and non-professional heritage associations
 - the use of the system by the urban services.
- **Spread the costs** of maintaining the current system over the next five years across all Ghent heritage institutions and urban services that use it; and determine the payment in proportion to the use and desires for the development of additional functionalities.

Policy recommendations on the process towards sustainability

In addition to the recommendations that address the continuation of respectively the non-technological and the technological components, two further recommendations relate to the course of the process towards the sustainability of the CoGhent project and conditions that will contribute to a city-wide innovative culture:

- **Employ a pragmatic approach for the process of continuation**

The continuation of the selected CoGhent components requires more than the continuation of the regular operations within the city. But the current circumstances (budget, personnel) restrain the translation of the ambitions into a new grand master plan that will realise everything at once. Rather than regarding this as a disadvantage, turn this into an asset.

- A gradual roll-out of the heritage ecosystem and the continuation of the CoGhent-system will allow taking into account the individuality of the organisations involved, their current commitments, budgets and staffing, digital expertise, etc.
- Start with a 'coalition of the willing'
- Communicate about the (small) successes and thus generate enthusiasm for other parties to join
- Provide procedures which offer opt-in options so that each partner has the widest possible scope to participate whilst at the same time aligning their participations with their own vision and ambitions.

- **Define a procedure that determines the post-project ownership of the output of innovative bottom-up projects**

Ghent has the ambition to be an innovative city, including supporting innovative projects that start from outside the city departments and services.

For this ambition to be operable, it is to be complemented with a procedure that defines, in advance or at the very start of such a project, what steps must be taken at the end of the project, in order to safeguard its lessons learned and its most important outputs. The procedure must determine the post-project ownership of the outputs and the responsibilities of the different partners in the project.

To establish such a procedure will encourage enterprising parties within the city to explore and exploit innovative opportunities. The ensuing culture of innovation will benefit the city as a whole.

Recommendations on the research process from a methodological perspective

Together with the detailed description of the methodology, this report also contains recommendations that serve the transferability of the policy research from a methodological point of view. Other municipal authorities in Europe may draw inspiration from the recommendations to manage complex projects and to define in a similar way trajectories towards the sustainability of project outputs.

- **External, neutral party.** Consider bringing into the project an external researcher as neutral partner to conduct the policy research. Such a party can move freely between stakeholders and has no position to defend in relation to the eventual results of the policy research. A possible drawback may be that getting acquainted with the project and its stakeholders and explaining the *raison d'être* of the policy research, may require more time.
- **Support.** Secure support for the policy research from the different parties involved in the project, in particular when the project is multi-layered and concerns many stakeholders, whose cooperation is crucial to the research. Secure support from the commissioning party, the general project management, the stakeholders and, if relevant, the different levels of the involved administrative and political authorities. Provide sufficient time for consultations and coordination.
- **Terminology.** Make sure, at the start of the research process or as early as possible within the process, that the stakeholders agree on the definition of the most important concepts within the project. Communicate the definitions widely and repeatedly.
- **Separate research categories.** Consider the impact on the policy research of the different layers in multi-layered projects. Particularly in innovative projects that aim to realise both non-technological and technological outputs, separate research categories will guarantee a result orientation towards specific policy recommendations that address the technological and the non-technological outputs in their own right.
- **Expectation management.** Communicate unequivocally about the objectives of the policy research, the results and how they will be used, in particular when it concerns a co-creative research process. These communications must take place at the beginning and at every step of the research trajectory.
- **Co-creation.** When policy research is (largely) conducted through a co-creative process, the contributors will influence the process and the results of that process.
 - **Participants.** Consider therefore carefully which criterions will facilitate the most conducive workshops and select the participants accordingly.
 - **Interaction management.** Make sure, in function of a (co-)ownership of the co-creative process, that the participants understand the relevance of their presence. Exploit the dynamics of the participating group as much as possible, including open discussions. At the same time, keep to the agenda and the intended results of the co-creative activity: be ready to intervene in the case of too much distraction from the core topic of the interactive session.

- **Structure.** Embedding a co-creative process in structure aids to keep the focus of the policy research.
 - **Independent, uniform structure.** Determine the structure of the policy research independently from the content of the project. In particular in multi-layered projects, a uniform set of structuring elements throughout, can counterbalance the complexity of the project and empowers the participants to position themselves within the research process.
 - **Funnel model.** Structure the interactive process according to a funnel model, that is, start with a broad scope that narrows during the course of the interactive process. This enables to gain gradual insight in the extent (and the limits) of support for the issues under discussion. A funnel model also works towards interim results that are recognisable for the participating group, and that will enhance the support for the conclusions at the end of the policy research.
 - **Conceptual models.** Employ conceptual models to structure the interaction, so that complex issues become comprehensible and all the relevant dimensions are covered. Conceptual models are also instructive when the aim is either to identify what is not yet present (for instance, concrete commitments towards sustainability) or to complement what is present but difficult to evaluate (for instance, to evaluate premature prototypes beyond their actual realisation during the project, that is, with reference to the intentions and the objectives of the technological developments).
 - **Purpose.** Structuring elements are meant to be facilitating tools to the interactive sessions. Do not, therefore, let the structure stand in the way of the co-creative process.
- **Flexibility.** In order to safeguard the intention at the core of the research process, that is, the co-creation with the most relevant partners in the project, complement the structure with a flexible approach.
 - **Agility.** Adopt from the start of the policy research assignment an agile approach to the design of the research process, to align it optimally with the progress and the changes in the project.
 - **Consultation.** Incorporate in the research process ample occasion for consultation and feedback, to make informed adjustments during the co-creative phase of the research process.
 - **Interactive sessions.** Be prepared to adapt to the live circumstances, including discarding the scheduled structuring elements in favour of an interactive discussion that contributes more towards the intended results. Be also aware that conceptual models or digital tools may cause discomfort. If the discomfort cannot satisfactorily be overcome, let go of the structuring elements and focus instead on the co-creative interaction itself.

2. Introduction

2.1. The CoGhent Project

CoGhent (2020-2023) is a project of the city of Ghent (Belgium), financed by the European Regional Development Fund through the Urban Innovative Actions initiative (UIA).

Objectives. The overall objective of the CoGhent project is to strengthen social cohesion through an integrated digital cultural heritage offer. In other words, the project aims to “open up cultural heritage for everyone, increasing its visibility, accessibility and use.” (UAI005-249, 2019). This objective comprises:

- The objective to connect the collections of five cultural heritage institutions of Ghent via a digital infrastructure and integrate them into the ‘Collections of Ghent’.
- The objective to facilitate interactions between the citizens and the digital heritage collection and additionally, to build a ‘Sixth Collection’ based on the input from the citizens.

Approaches. The CoGhent project has been realised through a number of different approaches that relate to the different layers of the project:

- **Data.** A data strategy has opened up the institutional silos of the cultural heritage institutions, and increased the quality and the availability of the cultural heritage data, conform international standards.
- **Technology.** At the technological level, open data principles have been further developed and implemented in an open-source digital infrastructure to manage and share cultural heritage data, thus maximising its usability.
- **Immersive hardware (solutions).** An immersive digital experience room has been developed and has travelled to three different neighbourhoods of the city. The mobile room encourages citizens to explore the Collections of Ghent. It also encourages them to participate actively by adding their own objects and stories in what is called the ‘Sixth Collection’ (as complementary to the Collections of Ghent that integrate the collections of the five participating cultural heritage institutions).
- **Participation.** A community-oriented approach has been developed for the interaction with the integrated cultural heritage in the visited city neighbourhoods. It has informed a series of outreaching activities, inviting the citizens to participate and strengthen their involvement in their neighbourhood community.
- **Research.** There has also been research before, during and after the development of the digital infrastructure and the interaction with the citizens, to inform, document, and evaluate the different stages of the CoGhent project.
 - The pre-development research focused on providing input for the designing phase of the infrastructure and interaction, for instance through interviews with Ghent citizens on the social cohesion in their neighbourhoods and their expectations towards an immersive digital experience.
 - During the development, the research focused on improving the infrastructure and interaction, for instance through surveys and iterative user testing.
 - The post-development research focused on evaluation. It studied the impact of the project on the social cohesion in the neighbourhoods visited, and the potential for sustainability of its outputs. In the latter category, there is the value network analysis and the business modelling, or the techno-economic research, on the one hand, and on the other hand, **the policy research**, which is the focus of this report.

Outputs. The CoGhent project has produced a large number of outputs, relating to the three layers of the project, of which the following are the most important:

- **Data**
 - An abundance of data, digital images of heritage objects and their metadata, produced, or cleaned, and published according to international standards
 - The documentation of the data production, cleaning and publishing methods
 - Knowledge transfer sessions, designed and organised by the CoGhent data intervention team.
- **Technology.** A multi-layered digital infrastructure has been developed, which includes:
 - A digital asset management system, or DAMS, built by the open source IT-company Inuits (hence referred to as ‘Inuits-DAMS’)
 - A framework of agreements that enables the sharing of cultural heritage data between digital systems, called LDES or Live Data Event Streams
 - A web portal (data.collectie.gent) that runs on both DAMS and LDES as enabling technologies, opening up the data and making them available to the public
 - The immersive digital experience room, commonly called ‘the box’, that has visited three neighbourhoods in the city.
 - The combination of the technological outputs is referred as the ‘CoGhent-system’.
- **Participation**
 - The Sixth Collection, created by Ghent citizens who upload their own heritage objects and stories onto the portal site
 - The Cultural Participation Toolkit, containing different modules that offer approaches, methods, concrete examples and inspiration to stimulate outreach workers and citizens to engage with cultural heritage
 - New forums, where the stakeholders of the project interact with each other, such as the CoGhent Updates and the Sustainability Working Group, or more informal settings where, for instance, public workers of the heritage institutions meet with outreaching workers of the city
 - Activities in and around the ‘the box’, such as creative workshops, historical walks through the neighbourhoods, a plant exchange event (27 September 2022), the CoGhent Winter Fest (16 December 2022) or the Light Festival (2 February 2023), and the documentation of these activities
 - New forums, where interested parties are challenged to explore the possibilities of the (re)use of the heritage data, such as the Open Culture Hackathon (15 October 2022)
 - The Co-Creation Fund, that offers financial support and guidance to both technological and creative projects that (re)use cultural heritage data of the Collections of Ghent
 - The CoGhent Festival (2-3 June 2023), that presents the outputs, conclusions and lessons learnt of the CoGhent project to a wide public, including the 13 projects realised through the Co-Creation Fund.

In principle, all the outputs have the potential to be continued after the CoGhent project ends. As the project is funded within the UIA programme, UIA requires that “All project main outputs (incl. investments) delivered during the project lifetime have to remain operational and continue to serve their purpose for at least the respective period of the five years to ensure the project durability.” (UIA, 2020). During an informal consultation in 2022, UIA specified that this requirement in the case of CoGhent relates to the integrated digital infrastructure, i.e., LDES, ‘Inuits-DAMS’, the web portal,

and ‘the box’, or the CoGhent-system. When the requirement is not fulfilled, (part of) the subsidy will need to be reimbursed.

It is worth noting that the UIA specification only refers to the technology of CoGhent. This does not imply that the non-technological outputs are not eligible for sustainability. It is, however, unlikely that all those non-technological outputs can be continued, or that all of them are considered valuable enough to be continued. The trajectory towards sustainability, therefore, includes the selection of those non-technological outputs that have the most potential for continuation.

The CoGhent outputs, both technological and non-technological, are hereafter called ‘components’.

Partners. Twelve parties are active partner in the CoGhent project. The organisations that are named below, are the partners that relate most to the policy aspects of the CoGhent project.

- **The city of Ghent**, as promotor of the project. Several of its branches, departments and the services for which they are responsible, contribute actively to the project:¹
 - Department Management:
 - Communications Service
 - Ghent Archives (one of the five cultural heritage institutions that has integrated its collection into the Collections of Ghent)
 - Department Strategy and Organisation:
 - Strategic Grants Service
 - Data and Information Service
 - Policy Participation Service
 - Department of Culture, Sports and Recreation: Cultural Service
 - Department for Welfare and Society: Social Cohesion Service.
- Three Autonomous Public Undertakings (AGs) of the city of Ghent:
 - **AG Art and Design** and **AG Heritage** have provided the perspective of four of the five cultural heritage institutions that actively contribute to the project (Ghent Archives, being the fifth, acting from the Department Management).
 - **AG District09** has provided the technology innovation perspective. District09 is also the commissioning party of the policy research.
- **Ghent University**, that has provided the main part of research component, excluding the policy research. The participating University unit is:
 - MICT, the interdisciplinary imec research group of Media, Innovation and Communication Technologies.
- Among the other partners of the CoGhent project, there are also a number of commercial parties. They are in particular responsible for the elaboration and implementation of the policy ambitions within the project of the above mentioned partners.

Coordination

- **The general project coordination** is in the hands of a core management team (CMT). The team is composed of a project coordinator (delegated from Strategic Grants Service of the city of Ghent) and two strategic coordinators (one from AG District09 and one from AG Art and Design).
 - CMT is responsible for the follow-up of the activities, deliverables, outputs and finances of the project.

¹ For the names of the departments and services of the city of Ghent that are mentioned in this report, in Dutch and English, see Annex 1.

- It organises the CoGhent Updates which present intermediate results to a large group of stakeholders.
- Since September 2022, it also organises the Sustainability Working Group which meets every fortnight to coordinate the trajectory towards sustaining (at least some of) the components after the formal ending of the project.
- CMT has occasionally also organised workshops to generate stakeholder input to inform that trajectory.
- **The specific research coordination** is run by MICT of Ghent University.
 - It organises the WP4 Updates (referring to Working Package 4 of the project that realises the research component), that take place monthly since August 2022. They create a forum through which the different researchers on the project stay up-to-date with each other's research.

Distinguishing characteristics. There are many ways to summarise the CoGhent project. Among its distinguishing features, its multistakeholder, multi-layered and innovative characteristics deserve special attention.

- **Multistakeholder.** Apart from the partners mentioned above – and in particular the five whose collections were integrated –, many other parties have been involved at least at some point in the project, such as non-professional heritage associations, neighbourhood committees, seniors who reside in residential care centres and students.
- **Multi-layered.** The multi-layered nature of the CoGhent project refers to the innovative combination of data, technology, and participation to enhance cultural participatory practice.
- **Innovative.** The innovative combination that CoGhent realised, also offers much opportunities for experiment and exploration. The parties involved got to know each other (better) and explored new ways of knowledge capitalisation and cooperation. They have experimented with innovative technologies, methods and techniques. And they have explored new perspectives which can enrich their own service offer. The outputs or components of the project also do not relate to one museum or city service: they transcend the institutional silos and thus create connections between more heterogeneous layers than is customary in data-driven projects. The project has built city-wide bridges between technology, people and society.

Timing. The CoGhent project runs from 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2023. The policy research has run from 1 May 2022 to 30 April 2023.

2.2. Policy Research

Objective. The objective of the policy research is twofold:

- Evaluate the potential for continuation of (at least some of) the CoGhent components from a policy perspective
- Clarify how that potential can be actualised.

Motivation. There are (at least) three reasons for the CoGhent project to include policy research:

- The policy research increases the chances of not letting the valuable outcomes go to waste. Much funding, time and effort have been spent on the CoGhent project, which is in its nature temporary. The policy research facilitates the consolidation of the most valued and promising components into structural benefits for the partners of the CoGhent project.
- The research also identifies avenues that allow the sustainability requirements of UIA to be fulfilled.
- Finally, the research complements the evaluations of the techno-economic and impact research that, with their own specific focus, also contribute to the overall strategy towards sustainability.

Specific purposes. The policy research has four specific purposes:

- **Consistency with policy visions and ambitions.** To start with, the policy research aims to evaluate the consistency of the components of the CoGhent project with the visions and ambitions of the relevant project partners. To be more precise, the research investigates which of those CoGhent components contribute to such a degree to the partners' policy visions, that their continuation beyond the CoGhent project is commendable.
- **Requirements for continuation.** With the components to be continued thus identified, the research then analyses what is required for their continuation. It therefore first defines the main obstacles that stand in the way of sustainability, in order then to explore possible solutions to overcome them. It also analyses which roles are necessary to overcome the obstacles and to actualise the continuation.
- **Policy recommendations.** Thirdly, the research aims to recommend action at the political level of the local government, i.e., the city of Ghent, so that the conditions necessary for the continuation of the selected Coghent components can be fulfilled.
- **Document methodology.** A final purpose is to document the research method in function of the scalability and transferability of the policy research of the CoGhent project.

Methodology. The methodology of the policy research is based on a number of choices that aim to ensure the involvement of the stakeholders and the result orientation of the research trajectory.

- **Stakeholders.** The involvement of the stakeholders is ensured through a co-creative series of workshops. The use of structure, tools and different forms of interaction generates a dynamic process that produce a rich, multi-layered input. It also allows a balanced contribution from the participating stakeholders.
- **Result orientation.** The result orientation is ensured by combining a solid research structure based on a funnel model and a flexible approach to the process. Each step in the research process is designed to produce an intermediate result that contributes to the realisation of the policy research objectives. The process is flexible in the sense that it

incorporates multiple occasions for consultation and feedback, which can inform adjustments in function of the best possible result.

A detailed description of the methodology can be found in Section 2.3 of this chapter.

Policy research party. AG District09 has commissioned the independent research bureau Mpiris to conduct the policy research.

- **Timing.** Mpiris entered the CoGhent project in May 2022, that is, more than two years after the start of the project. This has had the advantage that the research trajectory is designed specifically as part of the complex, multi-layered project that CoGhent is. Mpiris could make use of the documentation that the project had already produced, and of the intermediate results of activities that had taken place before its entry into the project.
- **Neutrality.** Mpiris is a neutral party to the CoGhent project. It can move freely between the stakeholders, and it has no position to defend nor preferences about the trajectory towards sustainability. This constitutes a creditable position from which to analyse different perspectives on the value of the CoGhent components, explore different paths towards sustainability and formulate policy recommendations.

2.3. Detailed Description of the Policy Research Methodology

The methodology of the policy research consists of: desk research, ad hoc consultations, the designing of interactive workshops and an assignment intra muros, the implementation of the workshops and the assignment, the conclusions, the reporting and the project management.

1. Desk research

In the first four months of the policy research (May – August 2022), desk research was conducted for the researchers to be immersed deep and fast into the CoGhent project. As the project had been running for two years at the start of the policy research, it had already developed a considerable complexity. The actions were deliberate in function of the policy research:

- Get acquainted with the different layers of the project, being data, technology, and participation
- Get to know the different stakeholders and their respective roles in the project
- Identify out of the wealth of documents and the intermediate results that had already been produced, the most relevant information for the policy research, in particular the components eligible for continuation.

2. Ad hoc consultations

Complementary to the desk research, in the same period at the beginning of the policy research, a number of ad hoc consultations have taken place. They consisted of informal conversations with cultural heritage parties to the project, with collaborators of the outreaching services of the city, and political representatives of the city, introductory meetings at the CoGhent Updates and during activities related to the visit of ‘the box’ in the city neighbourhoods. Complementary to the desk research, these consultations have enabled the researchers to gain insights into the different parties in the project, their visions, ambitions and concerns related to the sustainability of (certain) components of the project.

3. Designing the workshops and the assignment

The policy research workshops have been designed taking into account the specificity of the CoGhent project. Therefore, a design was chosen that achieves the optimal combination between co-creation, structure, and flexibility.

Co-creation

Workshops. The ambition of the policy research was to work co-creatively, so that contributors have influence on the process and the result of that process. The choice of a workshop format accommodates that ambition. The ultimate aim of the policy research is to clarify the trajectory towards sustainability of (at least some of) the CoGhent components. It is therefore crucial to establish during the research process a support base for its results. The format of interactive workshops enables the contributors to become (at least co-)owner of the process. This increases the chances that the research results will influence the actual trajectory towards sustainability.

Careful selection of participants. It was crucial to determine which parties were to be the most relevant for the co-creative workshops. In consultation with the Core Management Team (CMT), the decision was taken to invite those parties that relate the most to the policy aspects of the

CoGhent project. Four types of organisations were invited (a detailed overview of the invited and participating organisations per set of workshops can be found in Annex 2 of this document):

- The five cultural heritage institutions of which the integrated collections form the Collections of Ghent
- The city services that actively contribute to the project
- The city Departments from which those services act
- The political Cabinets that supervise them.

To be more precise, it were the high-profile managerial executives of the organisations involved, who received the invitation to the workshops. This was a deliberate choice based on the following criterions that were considered necessary for the workshops to be effective:

- An expert helicopter perspective on the components that have been developed during the CoGhent project
- Strategic insight into the policy visions and ambitions which are the benchmark of the evaluation of those components
- The mandate to take up roles and commitments in function of the trajectory towards sustainability.

It is worth noting that it was not evident to ensure the presence of the executives at the co-creative workshops. Apart from their busy schedules and demands from other parts of the CoGhent project, the executives often thought other staff members, for instance those active in the outreaching practices or their digital experts, more capable to contribute. It has required repeated efforts and the explicit authority of CMT to convince the executives of the importance of their presence.

Use of different forms of interaction and tools. During the workshops a number of tools was deployed to generate a dynamic process to produce detailed, multi-layered output. Tools used include Mentimeter, Miro and voting cards which are illustrated with heritage objects from the Collections of Ghent.

Assignment intra muros. The assignment served to structure the query into the institutional commitments towards the continuation of the non-technological components.

The assignment consists of a form that needs to be filled in by each organisation that participates at the workshops. The assignment form is based on the three components that had been selected for continuation in the first workshop, and on the role expectations that were defined per selected component in the second workshop. In the form, each of the roles which the participants had themselves identified, is further carefully segmented and defined into sub-commitments, to make the commitments as realistic and manageable as possible.

The assignment form was sent via email to the managerial executives of the parties that had participated in the workshops on the non-technological components of CoGhent, accompanied by a clear description of what was expected. That is, for each sub-commitment, the organisations were asked whether they could commit to ("Yes"), were uncertain about ("Don't know"), or declined the role ("No"). They were also asked to motivate their responses. The intended result were specific, mandated commitments of each participating organisation toward the sustainability of the selected components. The results of the assignment are integrated in the conclusions on the non-technological components (Section 3.4). The summary of the results is presented in Section 3.3, Annex 3 of this report shows the verbatim response of each individual organisation.

Selected component	
Consultation and cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the services and Departments of the city	
<i>Role expectations (in alphabetical order)</i>	<i>Description of (the segment of) the role under consideration</i>
Ambassador	Promotes the best practices on as many forums, consultation sessions and meetings as possible
Communicator	Communicates about the priorities of each organisation based on their annual plannings and project initiatives
Communicator	Engages the most suitable channels to share city-wide concrete actions and best practices.
Enforcer	Sustains the agendas in the consultation forums
Facilitator	Encourages the flow of information
Facilitator	Puts a snowball effect on individual network results
Memorialist	Captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Promotes a city-wide perspective; employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations; launches concrete suggestions for consultation and cooperation in relation to cultural heritage
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Brings together the coalition of the willing
Organiser	Is responsible for the practical organisation of the network event
Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations	
Ambassador	Triggers the field actively and accessibly with cultural heritage, with the triggers linked as concretely as possible to the reality of the envisaged target group(s)
Communicator	Creates an overview of the existing communication channels
Communicator	Facilitates the choice for the optimal communication channel(s) for cultural heritage
Communicator	Shares best field practice cases
Communicator	Shares the 'calls' city-wide
Coordinator	Coordinates the pitching sessions at the network event
Enforcer	Sustains the agendas in the consultation forums
Facilitator	Encourages the sharing of knowledge
Facilitator	Puts a snowball effect on individual network results
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Promotes a city-wide perspective
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Launches concrete suggestions for joint outreaching work with cultural heritage
Memorialist	Captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire
Organiser	Organises the workshops
Organiser	Is responsible for the practical organisation of the network event
Originalist	Triggers the organisations and associations with out-of-the-box perspectives for outreaching initiatives
Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund	
Ambassador	Brings the powerful story of the city to as many places as possible, with reference to the innovative cultural heritage initiatives in the neighbourhoods, the strengthening of the cultural infrastructure and the silo-transcending connection between different policy domains
Ambassador	Convinces the organisations and services to deposit a (limited) part of their resources in the Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund
Coach	Guides the project applications for existing and future finance options via information sessions throughout the city
Communicator	Shares the project sheets of the projects that were submitted to the CoGhent Co-Creation Fund

Communicator	Communicates about the cultural heritage offer in function of co-creation
Communicator	Supports more online presence
Communicator	Makes the new competition as widely known as possible
Facilitator	Facilitates the sharing of knowledge about existing finance options at the consultation forums
Facilitator	Facilitates the extension of existing co-creation initiatives
Financier	Explores the possibilities of and brings in extra resources
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Promotes a city-wide perspective
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Creates an overview of the existing finance options
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Launches concrete suggestions for co-creation
Memorialist	Secures the project sheets of the projects submitted to the CoGhent Co-Creation Fund
Memorialist	Reaches out with inspiring examples of the re-use of cultural heritage
Organiser	Organises the new competition

Table 1. Assignment to determine the institutional commitments towards the continuation of the selected non-technological components

Structure

Funnel model. The policy research is structured according to a funnel model, in the sense that it starts with a broad scope and narrows during the course of the process. The funnel model allows to work towards a gradual built-up of conclusions that combine the evaluation of the value of the components with the requirements for their continuation. Both the participating group and the researcher gain gradual insight in the extent of support for the components under consideration. In the process, they will also detect where the support ends, which is a necessary step towards identifying the obstacles and exploring the possible paths towards sustainability. This experience of the narrowing down will aid the policy research to work towards interim results that are recognisable for the participating group. In the same way, the participants will also grant and support the conclusions at the end of the policy research.

Distinction between non-technological and technological components. The policy research workshops are designed to address the two distinct categories of components in two separate workshop series. CoGhent is inevitably a tech-heavy project. In accordance with its multi-layered nature, the policy research chose to complement the ‘natural’ dominance of the technological components with ample room for their non-technological counterparts. To design separate workshops also guarantees a result orientation towards specific policy recommendations that address the technological and the non-technological components in their own right.

Phasing. The core of the policy research consists of two sets of two workshops each. In both the technological and the non-technological set, the co-creative process with the participants works towards a gradual built-up of conclusions that combine the evaluation of the value of the components with the requirements for their continuation.

- The first workshop of each set is focused on the evaluation of the value of the components in terms of their consistency with the policy visions and ambitions of the participants’ organisations. In the case of the non-technological components, the first workshop also generates a shortlist of components to be continued.

- The second workshop serves to validate the results of the first workshop, and to define in various segments the trajectory of the continuation of the selected components. In order to analyse what is required for that continuation, it identifies the obstacles that stand in the way and explores possible solutions to them. It also defines the roles that can contribute to the actualisation of the continuation of the components under consideration. Finally, it establishes the participants' commitment to take up those crucial roles.

The structuring elements of the policy research are deployed as tools to guide the co-creative interaction with the participants, so that the workshops and the assignment produce intermediate results that contribute to the clarification of the trajectory towards sustainability.

Workshop scenarios. The structuring elements of the workshops consist of a Power Point presentation, the use of different forms of interaction and conceptual frameworks. The presentation provides the framework for the interaction and co-creation with the participants.

Conceptual frameworks. Three conceptual frameworks have been specifically designed to structure the content of the interaction during the workshops. The frameworks enable a step-by-step analysis of the different dimensions of the trajectory towards sustainability.

- **Value evaluation.** A first conceptual framework serves to structure the evaluation of the value of the CoGhent components in relation to the visions and ambitions of the participating organisations in the workshops. That value is established with reference to the dimensions which the cultural heritage institutions of Ghent had in a trajectory separate from the CoGhent project, defined as most crucial for their individual policy vision and ambitions (Depreeuw, Bregt & Soete, 2022). In the case of the non-technological components, the framework acts as a benchmark to aid the selection of the components to be continued.

The vision and mission of the organisation
The support to its pioneering role in function of more diverse and more inclusive service offer
The broadening of (future) audiences
The strengthening of staff competencies
The strengthening of the public presence of cultural heritage, in the double sense of becoming (more) visible in the city and its neighbourhoods and as a societal player of importance

Table 2. Dimensions of policy vision and ambitions as benchmark for value evaluation

- **The trajectory towards sustainability.** A second framework breaks down the generic concept 'trajectory towards sustainability' into more manageable dimensions. It serves to structure the discussion on what is necessary for the continuation of the components under consideration. The framework suggests, among others, a possible redefinition of the objective(s) that is (are) envisaged with the continuation. It also aids to identify the main obstacles that stand in the way of that continuation, and the possible solutions to overcome those obstacles.







					
Objective	Obstacles	Step one	Phasing the trajectory	Budget	What's in it for me?

Table 3. Dimensions of the trajectory towards sustainability

- Role expectations.** A third conceptual framework serves to structure the discussion about which roles the participants deem crucial for the actualisation of the trajectory and thus for the actualisation of the potential for sustainability of the specific component under discussion. The framework presents a number of (generic) roles that can be expected to emerge in a process towards sustainability.

Bridge Builder 	Communicator 	Competence Builder 	Contrarian 	Driver 
Enforcer 	Facilitator 	Financier 	Knowledge Sharer 	Motivator 
Observer 	Originalist 	Sounding Board 	Further roles ...	

Table 4. Generic role expectations

Flexibility. The design of the research process combines the above described structure with a flexible approach.

- Agility.** An overall agile approach has secured the adaptation of the design of the research process to the specificities of the CoGhent project, in particular in function of facilitating the co-creative process.
- Consultation.** The research process is also flexible in the sense that it has incorporated multiple occasions for consultation and feedback, which have informed adjustments in function of the best possible result.
- Variation.** In addition, the flexible approach has accommodated variation in the structuring of the two sets of workshops:
 - In the case of the technological components, the UIA specification is precise about which components need to be continued beyond the formal ending of the CoGhent project. A selection from a longlist, as was needed in the case of the non-technological

components, was therefore not part of the first workshop on the technological components.

- The phasing of the workshops of the non-technological components did contain the extra step of selecting the components that were deemed most valuable for continuation. As a consequence, the query into which roles the participating organisations would commit themselves to, was addressed in the separate assignment *intra muros*.

4. Implementation of the workshops and the assignment

Preparations. Before the actual implementation of the workshops and the assignment, a number of practical preparations have taken place, including designing and sending out the invitations, composing the presentations and the exercises that involve digital tools, booking suitable locations and providing the materials, such as the voting cards.

Implementation. The workshops that evaluated the potential for continuation of the non-technological components took place on 14 November 2022 (5 participating organisations) and 28 November 2022 (7 participating organisations).

The assignment *intra muros* was sent to the managerial executives on 2 December 2022, the replies (7 participating organisations) came in between 14 and 22 December 2022.

The workshops on the technological components took place on 7 February (16 participating organisations) and 23 February 2023 (13 participating organisations).

5. Conclusions and reporting

The final phase of the policy research consists of drawing conclusions from and reporting on the input throughout the process. The output of the policy research contains four segments. Consistent with the twofold categorisation during the workshop phase, the first three segments are largely treated separately for the non-technological and the technological components.

- **Conclusions.** The conclusions summarise the analysis of the potential for continuation. They do so in terms of both the definition of the CoGhent components to be sustained, and the identification of the requirements of the trajectory towards that continuation. The conclusions are the direct result of the workshops.
- **Additional findings.** The many consultations with the stakeholders, both formal and informal, have yielded additional findings that were not explicitly defined but also hold valuable suggestions for the trajectory towards sustainability.
- **Policy recommendations.** The policy recommendations address the local authorities, in this case the political representatives of the city of Ghent. The recommendations define which political initiatives will actualise that trajectory. The recommendations are related to respectively the non-technological components, the technological components, and, the course of the process towards sustainability. The recommendations are informed by the policy research in its entirety.

- **Methodology**
 - The description of the research method serves the scalability of the research. The method can be used to iterate the process for those CoGhent components that were not selected in the research workshops, or to evaluate the alignment of (parts of) the CoGhent-system with policy visions and ambitions during the process towards sustainability, that is, when more parties use the system, or when the budget is raised.
 - The report also contains recommendations that draw lessons from the research process from a methodological perspective. Taken together with the descriptive segment, they serve the transferability of the policy research. Other municipal authorities in Europe may draw inspiration from them to manage complex projects and to define in a similar way trajectories towards the sustainability of project outputs.

6. Project management

Throughout the entire policy research trajectory, there have been regular consultation moments with AG District09, with the Core Management Team (CMT), during the Sustainability Working Group, the WP4 Updates and the CoGhent Updates. The consultations have enabled a flexible project management so that the research process at all times kept in touch with the CoGhent project at large.

- **Commissioning party.** At every step of the trajectory, there were consultations with AG District09. The main aim was to check at regular intervals the agreed research trajectory, inform on its progress and discuss whether adjustments were expedient. During the co-creative part of the research, there was feedback on the intermediate results, for instance by means of quick take-aways of the workshops. There were also many ad hoc consultations via phone, e-mail or online meetings in order to stay up-to-date with developments in other parts of the project, to identify possible gaps, clarify certain choices, inconsistencies, etc.
- **CMT.** Consultations with the CMT aimed at optimal coordination between the steps of the research trajectory and other project activities to increase the chances of complementarity and to avoid outstretching the demands on the stakeholders.

For instance, the Sustainability Workshop which the CMT organised on 15 September 2022, was awaited so that its output could be integrated into the design of the research workshops. During the workshop, a group of CoGhent stakeholders (27 participants) compiled a longlist of components which the participants deemed valuable in terms of their potential for continuation. The resulting longlist of components was used for the design of the research workshops on the non-technological components.

It was also in consultation with the CMT that a joined decision was reached on the most relevant participants for the research workshops.

- **The Sustainability Working Group** provided updates on other consultation processes that impact the project's trajectory towards continuation, including meetings with the Heads of Department of the city of Ghent or the interim reporting to the UIA representative.

- **WP4 Updates.** At the WP4 Updates, the researchers of the impact, techno-economic and policy research presented their intermediate results, gave feedback and consulted with each other with regard to contacting stakeholders, reviewing texts, etc. The coordination of the presentation of their intermediate results at the CoGhent Updates also happened in this forum.
- **CoGhent Updates.** At the CoGhent Updates, there was ample room for feedback and cross-referencing between the different parts of the project.

3. The Non-Technological Components of CoGhent

This chapter consists of:

- The evaluation of the potential for sustainability for the non-technological components from a policy perspective
- The description of solution paths for the identified obstacles to sustainability.

These results were realised, as is described in the section on methodology, through a co-creative process, the core of which consisted of two workshops with the managerial executives of:

- The cultural heritage organisations that were active contributors to the CoGhent project
- The city services that were active contributors to the CoGhent project.

The motivation for the configuration of the participants’ group is described in the section on methodology (2.3). A detailed list of the invited and participating organisations is to be found in Annex 2 of this report.

3.1. Selection of the Non-Technological Components to be Sustained

Conform the first objective of the policy research, the first workshop on the non-technological components assessed the consistency of those components with the visions and ambitions of the workshop’s participants and in particular of the organisations they represent. As there are many non-technological outputs of the CoGhent project, the assessment started from the longlist of non-technological components that was defined at the Sustainability Workshop (organised by the Core Management Team, 15 September 2022, 27 participants). The conceptual framework on value evaluation (see Section 2.3 above), acted as a benchmark to aid the selection of those components that contribute most to the realisations of the participants’ policy visions and ambitions.

This section defines each component and presents a summary of the interactive discussion which decided on the selection of the three non-technological components to be sustained.

<i>The non-technological component under consideration</i>	<i>Definition</i> <i>Evaluation based on the conceptual framework of value evaluation</i>
1. Consultation and cooperation between the cultural heritage institutions	<p>Component that focuses on the interaction within the cultural heritage landscape itself in order to promote heritage (in function of social cohesion in the city). It includes regular meetings, the sharing of information, expertise and best practices, and the definition and implementation of collective initiatives and (sub)projects by the cultural heritage institutions.</p> <p>This component achieves strong scores on most of the surveyed policy dimensions: vision and mission, pioneering a more diverse and inclusive service, strengthening staff competences and the public presence of heritage. The participants in the workshop do not expect an effect of this component on the broadening of (future) audiences. They clarify that, apart from the connection with social cohesion in the city, this component was not developed during or unique to the CoGhent project. They also expect it to be sustained in any case because all stakeholders recognise its importance.</p>

2. Consultation and cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the city services

Component that focuses on the interaction between the cultural heritage and the city services in order to promote heritage in function of social cohesion in the city. It implies overcoming the institutional silos in order to meet, share information, expertise and best practices, set up and implement collective initiatives and (sub)projects between the heritage institutions and the services of the city.

This component scores strongly on the surveyed policy dimensions. This type of consultation and collaboration is equally not unique to the CoGhent project but there is no confidence that it will be sustained without specific effort. According to the participants, it therefore makes sense to continue actively countering the compartmentalisation which is still strong in the city. Heritage is evaluated as a well-functioning tool for the staff of the Social Cohesion Service, but it is important that the heritage institutions keep triggering them with content, initiatives, and projects. The participants hope other city services (not present in the workshop) will take up a coordinating role in order to sustain the cross-silos consultation and collaboration component. Are explicitly mentioned: the Department of Culture, the umbrella of the Autonomous Public Undertakings (AGs) and or the Communications Service.

3. Consultation and cooperation with non-professional associations

Component that focuses on the interaction between the cultural heritage institutions, the city services, and non-professional groups within the city that also work with and promote cultural heritage. Examples of civil society groups that are relevant here, are: local history circles, neighbourhood committees and other non-professional associations.

The value of this component is reflected in the high scores it receives for its consistency with the surveyed policy dimensions. The non-professional groups are valued for their knowledge of the field, the many active volunteers they engage, and their communications, often via social media, that realise much interaction. These non-professional groups were only in a limited way included in the CoGhent project. According to the participants, it will be an added value to include them fully in the process towards sustainability.

Consultation and cooperation with these non-professional groups must encompass support towards a higher degree of professionalism, including digitisation trajectories. Joint initiatives between the cultural heritage institutions, the city services and the associations will enhance the promotion of heritage in the city and aid its public visibility.

4. Outreaching work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures, etc.

Component that considers the contribution to social cohesion of the people who work in the urban neighbourhoods to connect and empower individuals and groups.

This component scores very high on all surveyed dimensions. When the neighbourhood scouts, community workers and neighbourhood key figures work with cultural heritage, they raise awareness for the role heritage can play in the search for meaning, belonging and agency. The low-threshold nature of their outreaching work gives local residents the feeling that the heritage is also 'theirs'. The participants in the workshop highly value this component in terms of its contribution to making heritage more inclusive. They strongly support its continuation. They also deliberate on complementing the outreaching work with cooperations with civil society (component 3).

5. Outreaching work by non-professional associations

Component that considers the initiatives of non-professional associations to reach out with cultural heritage.

The participants in the workshop do not recognise this as a separate component. They suggest that it be added to component 3 or 4.

6. The Sixth Collection

Component that considers the collection that is created by Ghent citizens who upload their own heritage objects and stories onto the CoGhent web portal. The Sixth Collection complements the integrated collections of the five heritage institutions that participate in CoGhent.

This component has limited alignment with the heritage institutions' policy dimensions. There have been considerable technical delays, which complicates the evaluation of this component. More fundamentally, the participants in the workshop are sceptical about the concept of 'non-exposed' heritage (which would be gathering dust in attics in large quantities). They also doubt whether the large public can (continue to) be motivated to contribute to a citizens' heritage collection. They furthermore assume that most citizens cannot overcome the intrinsic technological thresholds.

At the very least, if the Sixth Collection is to be continued, assistance must be provided for all the practical difficulties that citizens may encounter in the uploading process. This implies appointing intermediary figures who can facilitate the interaction between the collection and the public. Although these figures may be found within component 3 or 4, how their assistance could be organised practically, is not immediately clear.

7. The Box

A high-tech mobile experience room that brings the collections of the cultural institutions to the public space in the city. By triggering the curiosity of the inhabitants, it serves as a starting point for conversations and activities about heritage.

The impact analysis of the box is still ongoing (as part of the post-development research of the CoGhent project), but the participants refer to a number of limitations that weigh heavily on their (favourable) evaluation of the component. They refer to the fact that the box could only visit three city neighbourhoods. In addition, its closed construction (to be weather- and vandalism-proof) limits the effective presence of cultural heritage in the public space. As an incentive to organise activities that trigger with heritage, the box is functional, but it is above all the interaction of the field workers with the local residents, that affects the social cohesion in the neighbourhoods. That implies that the box cannot function without personnel present. It also automatically generates (maintenance) costs, of which it is unclear who will bear them.

According to the participants, the potential of the box cannot surpass the value of the outreaching work evaluated above (component 4).

8. Cultural Participation Toolkit

Toolkit containing different modules that offer approaches, methods, concrete examples, and inspiration, to stimulate residents to engage with cultural heritage.

The participants in the workshop agree that assembling an agglomerated body of accessible, practical expertise about outreaching heritage work was a good idea in principle. They also conclude, however, that in practice the toolkit is not used (it is also

little known). Providing methodologies and techniques is not sufficient for those who are not already working in outreaching ways. Those who already work outreachingly, do need triggering with heritage content (see component 2), but they have developed their own approach that is not enriched by this kind of top-down document. The effects regarding (future) audiences and the public presence of heritage are estimated very low.

9. Co-Creation Fund

Fund set up during the CoGhent project that offered financial support to either technological or creative projects that (re)use Ghent digital cultural data. Out of the 36 applications 13 projects have been selected for realisation. They will be presented at the CoGhent Festival (closing event of the CoGhent project, 2-3 June 2023).

This component achieves high scores on all the surveyed policy dimensions. The participants in the workshop see the Co-Creation Fund as a successful encouragement for a variety of groups (youngsters, tech experts, etc.) to explore the potential of cultural data. These groups generally do not belong to the traditional audiences of the cultural heritage institutions. The Co-Creation Fund thus contributes to the visibility of heritage in the urban context, possibly extending its impact to hitherto uncharted publics, domains and sectors.

With the conceptual framework on value evaluation as benchmark, the interactive discussions led to the conclusion that the following components align most with the participating organisations' policy visions and ambitions and therefore are to be sustained:

- **Consultation and cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the city services**
- **Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations** (merging components 3-4-5 from the longlist)
- **Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund.**

3.2. Requirements for Continuation

Conform the second objective of the policy research, the second workshop on the non-technological components examined what is required for the continuation of the selected components.

This examination consisted of the following steps:

- The validation of the selection of the non-technological components to be sustained (conclusion of workshop 1)
- The identification of obstacles on the path towards sustainability
- The exploration of solutions to overcome those obstacles
- The analysis of which roles necessary to overcome the obstacles and actualise the continuation.

To enable a sufficiently realistic reflection on the process towards sustainability, the participants were asked to consider a period of three years after the closure of the CoGhent project in June 2023. 2024 is an election year (with municipal, as well as federal and European, elections). 2026 then constitutes the middle of the new city legislature. The participants were further aided in their examination by the conceptual frameworks on the trajectory towards sustainability and on the role expectations (see Section 2.3).

The deliberations concentrated on the (re)defining of the objective, the main obstacle, the important first step and the phases of the trajectory towards sustainability. Budget and deliverables were not included in the discussions. The remainder of this section presents the participants' conclusions on the requirements of continuation in a bullet-wise summary per selected component.

3.2.1. Consultation and cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the services of the city of Ghent

Objective in three years' time (2026)	The participating parties have (in 2026) themselves experienced the benefits of (more) consultation and cooperation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They understand and have first-hand experience with the fact that cooperation strengthens their own (particular) interests ○ They understand and experience the advantages of having cooperation structurally embedded in the city's architecture (independently from whom the participants in the workshop called the original "believers").
Main obstacle	Difficult information flow
First step	Individual "believers" set up small-scale initiatives of consultation and cooperation
Phases of the trajectory towards sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All parties document concisely their own objectives, initiatives, and regular operations in function of more consultation and cooperation, including the 'translation' of organisation specific jargon ○ The partners make an extra effort to gain more insight in each other's objectives and operations

- Concrete agendas are defined for the existing consultation forums. The agendas accommodate both the individual and the collective interests of the participating organisations
- Ambassadors are given the necessary space and time to share the best practices of consultation and cooperation
- ‘Small’ collaborations (often dependent on individuals) are extended to a more structural ‘coalition of the willing’
- Every year a city-wide network event is organised.

Role expectations in function of the continuation of the component

(Here and below listed in alphabetical order)

- Ambassador:** promotes the best practices of consultation and cooperation on as many forums, consultation sessions and meetings as possible
- Communicator:** communicates city-wide about the priorities of each organisation based on the annual plannings and project initiatives; engages the most suitable communication channels to share city-wide concrete actions and best practices
- Enforcer:** monitors the agendas in the consultation forums
- Facilitator:** encourages the flow of information; puts a snowball effect on individual network results
- Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector:** promotes a city-wide perspective; employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations; launches concrete suggestions for consultation and cooperation in relation to cultural heritage; brings together the coalition of the willing
- Memorialist:** captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire
- Organiser:** is responsible for the practical organisation of the network event.

3.2.2. Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations

Two-fold objective in three years’ time (2026)

- The outreaching work of neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations, is enhanced by cultural heritage cases that the heritage institutions actively present to them
- The outreaching work of the cultural heritage institutions is enhanced by (neighbourhood and thematic) knowledge and expertise that the field intermediaries actively present to them.

Main obstacle

Insufficient and inadequate knowledge transfers

First step

Create an exhaustive overview of the existing (city) communication channels. The different parties involved in outreaching heritage work, use a myriad of communication channels, which are not known to all. Creating the overview will aid the choice of the most effective communication channel(s) in the promotion of outreaching heritage work.

Phases of the trajectory towards sustainability

- It is determined which of the present city communication channels, is most efficient to be used for the enhancing of outreaching work
- The (initial) choice to collaborate (solely) with neighbourhood associations to do outreaching heritage work is communicated city-wide

- The cultural heritage institutions make themselves more visible for possible partners in the field
- The cultural heritage institutions proactively approach the neighbourhood associations
- Concrete agendas are defined for the neighbourhood consultation forums. Their focus is on the promotion of knowledge transfers. The cultural heritage institutions and city services actively trigger the neighbourhood associations with cultural heritage
- ‘Calls’, whereby an initiator calls for contributions to and cooperation in open proposals for outreaching initiatives, are systematically shared city-wide
- Neighbourhood directors (“wijkregisseurs”) are given the time and space to be widely accessible for citizens, organisations and associations
- Ambassadors are given the necessary space and time to share the best practices of outreaching work
- The best field practices are widely spread throughout the optimal city communication channel(s)
- The cultural heritage institutions draw up a concrete plan whereby the existing sharing of knowledge with the neighbourhood directors is extended step by step, in order, in the end, to cover all the neighbourhoods of the city
- Workshops are organised. Heritage content and outreaching methods are defined and demonstrated as concretely as possible, so that they are deployed immediately by the outreach workers
- The cooperation is extended to non-neighbourhood thematical associations
- Part of the yearly network event is reserved for the pitching of the ‘calls’. They are pitched at different levels, so that the proposals reach the most relevant party (fieldworkers, managerial executives, etc.).

Role expectations in function of the continuation of the component

Ambassador: triggers the field actively and accessibly with cultural heritage, with the triggers linked as concretely as possible to the reality of the envisaged target group(s)

Communicator: creates an overview of the existing city communication channels; facilitates the choice for the most optimal city communication channel(s) for cultural heritage; shares best field practice cases; shares the ‘calls’ city-wide

Coordinator: coordinates the pitching sessions at the network event

Enforcer: monitors the agendas in the consultation forums

Facilitator: encourages the sharing of knowledge; puts a snowball effect on individual network results

Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector: promotes a city-wide perspective; employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations; launches concrete suggestions for joint outreaching work with cultural heritage

Memorialist: captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire

Organiser: organises the workshops; is responsible for the practical organisation of the network event

Originalist: triggers the organisations and associations with out-of-the-box perspectives for outreaching initiatives.

3.2.3. Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund

<p>Objective in three years' time (2026)</p>	<p>The new Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund stimulates people and organisations to (re)use Ghent cultural heritage across the individual collections of the cultural heritage institutions, to strengthen the social cohesion in the city. This implies that, contrary to the Co-Creation Fund that was realised during the CoGhent project, there is no separate 'technological' part of the competition: all focus lies on the social leverage of cultural heritage.</p>
<p>Main obstacle</p>	<p>The current Fund is a one-off initiative</p>
<p>First step</p>	<p>Create an exhaustive overview of the existing finance options for non-institutional cultural heritage initiatives</p>
<p>Phases of the trajectory towards sustainability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The information of the existing finance options is shared as widely as possible via the city communication channels and in the consultation forums ○ The project sheets of the present Co-Creation Fund are made available to inspire the widest possible audience to (re)use the heritage collections ○ The cultural heritage institutions make (parts of) their own collections available for co-creation and communicate about that offer more widely than is presently the case ○ The cultural heritage institutions examine how they can extend their existing co-creation initiatives (that often concentrate on their individual collections), to the Collections of Ghent as a whole ○ The cultural heritage institutions organise their online presence more in function of co-creation ○ A city-wide Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund is set up ○ The new, city-wide competition invites the submission of co-creative cross-competence projects.
<p>Role expectations in function of the continuation of the component</p>	<p>Ambassador: brings the powerful story of the city to as many places as possible, with reference to the innovative cultural heritage initiatives in the neighbourhoods, the strengthening of the cultural infrastructure and the silo-transcending connection between different policy domains; convinces the organisations and city services to deposit a (limited) part of their resources in the Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund</p> <p>Coach: guides the project applications for existing and future finance options via information sessions throughout the city</p> <p>Communicator: shares the project sheets of the projects that were submitted to the CoGhent Co-Creation Fund; communicates about the cultural heritage offer in function of co-creation; supports more online presence; makes the new competition as widely known as possible</p> <p>Facilitator: facilitates the sharing of knowledge about existing finance options at the consultation forums; facilitates the extension of existing co-creation initiatives</p> <p>Financier: explores the possibilities of, and brings in extra resources</p> <p>Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector: promotes a city-wide perspective; creates an overview of the existing finance options; employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations; launches concrete suggestions for co-creation</p> <p>Memorialist: secures the project sheets of the CoGhent Co-Creation Fund; reaches out with inspiring examples of the re-use of cultural heritage</p> <p>Organiser: organises the new competition.</p>

3.3. Institutional commitments

The next step in the examination of the potential for sustainability of the non-technological components, was to establish which of the defined roles the participating cultural heritage institutions and city services would commit to.

Through the assignment form (see Section 2.3), each participating organisation declared its institutional commitments towards the continuation of the non-technological components. The table below shows per selected component and in summary, which roles the participating organisations² committed themselves to. The results of the assignment are integrated in the conclusions in the next section of this chapter. The verbatim responses of each individual organisation, including the subdivision of the main roles, are to be found in Annex 3 of this report.

<i>Role commitments (in alphabetical order per component)</i>	CS	DMG	EC ³	GA	HvA & IM ⁴	SCS	STAM
Consultation and Cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the city services							
Ambassador		✓				✓	
Communicator	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Enforcer							
Facilitator				✓	✓	✓	
Helicopter/Bridge Builder/Connector						✓	✓
Memorialist				✓	✓	✓	
Organiser							
Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations							
Ambassador	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Communicator	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Coordinator							
Enforcer							
Facilitator						✓	
Helicopter/Bridge Builder/Connector						✓	✓
Memorialist						✓	
Organiser							
Originalist		✓			✓	✓	
Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund							
Ambassador	✓					✓	
Coach					✓		
Communicator	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Facilitator	✓			✓			
Financier							
Helicopter/Bridge Builder/Connector							✓
Memorialist				✓		✓	
Organiser							

² CS stands for Communications Service, DMG: Design Museum Gent, EC: Erfgoedcel, GA for Ghent Archives, HvA & IM: Huis van Alijn & Industriemuseum, SCS: Social Cohesion Service, STAM: Stadsmuseum. More information on the participating organisations can be found in Annexes 1 and 2.

³ The Erfgoedcel focused in its response to the assignment on its particular position in the cultural heritage landscape and chose to clarify its future plans and commitments without reference to the roles defined in the assignment; see (the translation of) its text in Annex 3.

⁴ The same director heads the Huis van Alijn and the Industriemuseum, the two institutions submitted a joint response to the assignment.

3.4. Conclusions

The policy research reached an unanimous consensus on the non-technological components to be continued after the CoGhent project ends. The components selected to be sustained, are:

- Consultation and collaboration of the cultural heritage institutions with the Departments and Services of the city of Ghent
- Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood figures and associations
- The Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund.

The selection reflects the shared ambition of the cultural heritage institutions and the city services to transcend the institutional silos and cooperate city-wide. The selection also demonstrates the participants' ambition to make their offer and services more diverse and inclusive. The selection shows furthermore strong support for making cultural heritage more visible in the city in function of social cohesion.

In terms then of the trajectory towards sustaining the selected components, it is significant to which degree information and knowledge transfers condition the chances of success according to the participants. There is no lack of knowledge and expertise within the city and the participants value them highly. But they point out that those qualities get stuck at an individual level, that is, they lack a context in which they can easily and efficiently be shared.

Many of the roles that the participants define as crucial for the continuation of the components, exemplify that need to share information, knowledge and expertise. The roles thus focus mostly on the actions that are needed to put consultation and collaboration at the centre of the process towards sustainability.

The same applies to the new proposals that were formulated. A yearly city-wide network event, 'calls' that share open proposals for outreaching heritage initiatives and a new Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund, aim to create more opportunities for knowledge sharing and collaborations. Hereby the participants show once more their ambition to overcome the obstacles on the path to sustainability and thus safeguard what they consider to be the most important non-technological 'products' of the CoGhent project.

That ambition is not, however, immediately obvious when it comes down to the assignment results. The commitments to which the participants subscribed on behalf of their respective organisations, are limited. The decisive factor here is whether or not the commitment can be fitted into the already existing activities and services of the organisation.

In short, the current circumstances, in particular in terms of budget and personnel, restrain the translation of the ambitions towards sustainability into new tasks and roles for the participating organisations. It is therefore necessary to assign those ambitions to the next level, that is, to recommend to the political representatives of the city to create the circumstances in which the most valued non-technological components of the CoGhent project can be sustained.

3.5. Additional Findings

The policy research regarding the non-technological components of the CoGhent project yielded, aside the above conclusions, a number of more implicit disclosures that hold valuable suggestions for the trajectory towards sustainability. These additional findings also inform the policy recommendations in the next chapter.

Non-technological value. CoGhent is inevitably a tech-heavy project. There is some concern that the process towards sustainability may not pay sufficient attention to the safeguarding of the non-technological components.

(More) communication. In more general terms, there is a sense of frustration that the many positive results of the CoGhent project do not get the prominence they deserve. The city has an opportunity here to communicate large and wide about the power of cultural heritage. In particular how heritage can be instrumental in transcending the institutional silos and in strengthening the social cohesion in the city, is an important message that merits the widest possible dissemination.

Pragmatism. The exploration of the different dimensions of the process towards sustainability (Section 3.2), automatically yielded a pragmatic approach. That is, the circumstances that are not immediately favourable towards continuity (mostly the pressures on budget and personnel), were bypassed in order to explore more realistic paths towards the continuation of the non-technological components. This is an important lesson that can guide the whole process towards sustainability: it is not because a grand 'master plan' is discordant with the present state of affairs, that the ambition of continuation must be abandoned. Continuing to build gradually, in clearly-defined phases, on existing structures and initiatives, increases the chances of success for sustainability.

Further explorations. More than the now selected non-technological components can be explored with the detailed description of the methodology (Section 2.3). For instance, the Cultural Participation Toolkit was not selected for continuation, but the citizen insights and stories that were produced during the CoGhent project, are manifestly valued. It would be interesting to explore what would be needed to develop a crowdsourcing method to bolster social cohesion and inclusion city-wide. With regard to the present toolkit, it could be employed to entice interest in heritage in other than outreaching contexts. It is worth considering, for instance, what adaptations it might need to fulfil that purpose in education.

Another example is the exploration of what could be called the extensions of the selected components. With the components, the cultural heritage institutions have stepped out into the city to reach new audiences. It is expected that these components in time will be complemented with initiatives that also bring those audiences inside the institutions themselves. These future initiatives were not discussed in the workshops but are worth further exploring during the process towards sustainability.

4. Policy Recommendations on the Non-Technological Components

The objective of the policy recommendations is to clarify to the political representatives of the city of Ghent, what is necessary at the political level to sustain (at least part of) the non-technological components of the CoGhent project.

The selected non-technological components of the CoGhent project are in line with the (future) policy ambitions of the participating cultural heritage institutions and the city services. The selected components are to be continued because they contribute positively to the actualisation of the policy ambitions of the participating organisations. The components also create learning and development opportunities for these organisations. The components moreover contribute to the strengthening of the social cohesion in the city.

For these reasons, it is recommended that the local authorities, that is, the political representatives of the city of Ghent:

Create a heritage ecosystem in which cultural heritage institutions, city services, organisations and associations, that are active in the domains of heritage and outreaching work, can meet and strengthen one another.

In order to realise such an ecosystem, it is recommended to:

- **Endorse the ambitions of the heritage institutions and the city services in the City's policy agreement and in the policy letters of the involved departments**
- **Appoint a party as a governance body** for the ecosystem that takes initiatives to build and strengthen the ecosystem
 - Give the governance body the mandate and the budget to coordinate the ecosystem in the city
 - The coordination of the ecosystem consists (at least) of:
 - The composition and the management of a representative council that represents the participating heritage institutions and the city services. Not to overload the pressure on personnel, the composition of the council can best be organised via a rotation system. Through the council, the governance body will secure information on the bottom-up needs and desires regarding the ecosystem, and support for its initiatives.
 - The design, organisation and implementation of consultation and cooperative heritage activities
 - These can comprise the new proposals suggested during the policy research, such as a yearly city-wide network event that promotes the knowledge flow among the city collaborators, 'calls' that share open proposals for outreaching heritage initiatives and a Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund that stimulates the (re)use of the Ghent cultural heritage data
 - The setting up of a 'Learning Network' that shares the best practices of the CoGhent project with other city (heritage) parties and private actors.

- **Communicate about the value of cultural heritage for the promotion of social cohesion**
 - The 'lessons learned' during the CoGhent project are (among others) that cultural heritage can function as leverage to:
 - improve and extend public services
 - strengthen social cohesion in an urban context.
 - This communication will serve both
 - the city marketing of Ghent
 - the transferability of the CoGhent project.

5. The Technological Components of CoGhent

This chapter consists of:

- The evaluation of the potential for sustainability of the technological components of the CoGhent project from a policy perspective
- The description of solution paths to overcome the identified obstacles to sustainability.

These results were realised, as is described in the section on methodology, through a co-creative process, the core of which consisted of two workshops with the managerial executives of

- The cultural heritage organisations and the city services that were active contributors to the Coghent project and relate to the policy aspects of the project
- The city Departments and Cabinets that are responsible for these organisations and services.

The motivation for the configuration of the participants' group is described in the section on methodology. A detailed list of the invited and participating organisations is to be found in Annex 2 of this report.

5.1. Potential for Sustainability of the Technological Components from a Policy Perspective

The assessment of the potential for sustainability of the technological components of the CoGhent project, focused on the components UIA requires to sustain, being LDES, 'Inuits-DAMS', the web portal and 'the box'. However, the level of support for those components was examined at the level of the concepts they represent, rather than on the level of their actualisations as a prototype within the project.

The examination thus concerns the following concepts:

- **Framework of arrangements** that enables the sharing of data between digital systems. This is the conceptual description of which the LDES (Live Data Event Streams) is the realisation.
- **Common image management system** that incorporates both digital images and their metadata. This is the conceptual description of which the 'Inuits-DAMS' (Digital Asset Management System) is the realisation.
- **Place bound object(s)** through which the Collections of Ghent can be presented to the citizens in an interactive way. This is the conceptual description of which 'the box' is the realisation.

Workshop 1 examined through a series of questions to which degree the concepts aligned with the vision and ambitions of the participants. The interactive discussions came to the following conclusions on the potential for sustainability of the technological components:

1. With reference to the framework of arrangements

There is unanimous support to exchange and enrich data with as many parties as possible. The participants do not want to limit the possibilities of such future exchanges: they want to exchange with other institutions and organisations, with citizens and non-professional associations, if possible, world-wide.

There is a shared vision on the importance of automated exchange in the future, independent from the data-base systems that the partner organisations employ and the exchange possibilities that are included in those systems.

At the same time, the participants formulate certain conditions for future exchanges: it must remain possible to intervene in the automated exchange for reasons of selection, intellectual property rights and authority of provenance. These limiting conditions of future automated exchange relate to issues of digital maturity and the importance of a common guideline framework (See 4.2 below).

The above nevertheless implies that there is de facto support for a framework of arrangements that allows to share data between digital systems, of which the LDES that was realised during the CoGhent project, is a specific development.

2. With reference to the common image management system

There is a shared ambition for the integrated management of digital images and their metadata of cultural heritage artefacts.

The participants, however, do not decide whether such a management must be facilitated by a single system, or by multiple systems that can easily integrate with each other.

It follows that there is no support for one common system, nor for sustaining the 'Inuits-DAMS', that was realised within the CoGhent project, as a shared management system between the partners. This implies that a tension arises here between the policy support among the organisations and the sustainability requirements set by UIA.

Discussions show that the lack of agreement on the desirability of a common image management system is due, inter alia, to different ambitions among the participants in relation to innovation and the context in which they want to present their organisations and collections. In terms of the preferred presentation, the priorities lie respectively within the city of Ghent or within the cultural heritage sector at large. The lack of agreement also relates to issues of product ownership, the qualities of the provider(s) that will be responsible for the (further) development of a common image management system, and the functionalities of that system. Finally, there are also concerns about the individuality of one's own organisation, about the competences of collaborators, and the budgetary requirements (See 4.2).

3. With reference to the place bound object(s)

There is a consensus to continue in the future to present the heritage collections via digital media.

For all participants, this also includes using place bound objects through which the interaction with the citizen can be realised in situ.

Some participants envisage presenting the collection in the future digitally via (a part of) the actual 'box' that was realised within the CoGhent project.

This means that the consensus on collection presentation via digital media and place bound objects is not extended to a consensus on the continuing of 'the box', which was realised within the CoGhent project. Here, too, a tension arises between the policy support among the organisations and the UIA sustainability requirements.

Discussions show that the lack of agreement on the desirability of continuing 'the box', is due, *inter alia*, to the uncertainty about the objectives that 'the box' would serve after the project. Without the relation to the (three) neighbourhoods which 'the box' visited, it is uncertain whether the organisations will in the future produce new content for 'the box', in particular new heritage stories. At the time of the workshop, there was also no clear view on the practical implications of 'adopting' (part of) 'the box', including the potential costs that this will entail for the adopting organisation(s) (See 4.2).

4. Conclusions

In globo, it appears that there is considerable support for the concepts of which the technological components are the concrete realisations within the CoGhent project. They are largely in line with the policy visions of the parties involved.

The common positions on the technological concepts support the policy vision that also emerged from the evaluation of support for the non-technological components, namely the ambition to continue to transcend the silos and work together across institutions and services, that is, the support for the ambition to build an ecosystem in which the different parties collaborate and reinforce each other.

Where there is no agreement between the parties on the desirability of the proposed concepts, this is due to a number of issues on which the participants have different views, ambitions and concerns. These issues are described in more detail in the following section.

5.2. Obstacles on the Path towards Sustainability

The issues on which the participants did not reach agreement, impact on the potential for sustainability of the technological components of the CoGhent project.

The table below defines the issues and elaborates on how the participants differ about them. Not all issues are considered relevant by all participating organisations. And when they are considered relevant, their weight in the balance of sustainability varies.

<i>Concise description of the identified issue</i>	<i>Definition of the issue</i> <i>Elaboration on the different viewpoints of the participants</i>
Digital maturity of the organisations involved in data exchange	<p>Concern about the quality of (meta)data that organisations involved in the automated exchange of data, will deliver, whether the organisations act conform (changing) legislation, the degree to which they give insight in the provenance of their (meta)data and how they handle conflicting (meta)data.</p> <p>The participants in the workshop are aware that even among their own organisations, there is a difference in the digital maturity reached during the CoGhent project. Some are confident, as we have seen, that their organisation is digitally mature enough for the process of continuation. Others rely on being unburdened by the services which they expect the management system to provide.</p> <p>When then it comes down to sharing with and enriching data with other, new partners, the participants want to be sure that those partners also will act conform the relevant legislation and will act responsibly regarding the other elements that make up the criterium of digital maturity. The assumption is that any new organisation will have to follow a preparation process, before it can enter the common system at the same level as the already participating organisations. It will therefore be necessary to design and document that preparation process and to nominate a coordinating authority that can judge the level of digital maturity.</p>
Common guideline framework	<p>The necessity to agree on a common set of quality guidelines on how data must be managed.</p> <p>Each participating organisation must be willing to partake in constructive consultations to reach a common framework of guidelines. Each organisation must also guarantee the implementation of that commonly agreed set of guidelines in the internal processes of the organisation. This implies that each organisation is aware of its individual responsibility and acts accordingly.</p> <p>Finally, the quality guidelines must also be future-proof. This implies that from the beginning a procedure must be agreed upon which will serve regular consultations, and a step-by-step plan for the regular update of the guidelines.</p> <p>These three sub-issues raise the further issue of which party will coordinate the processes of consultation, implementation, and the follow-up of procedures. As before with the issue of digital maturity, this is related to the issue of ownership.</p>
Position on innovation	<p>The ambition to work with internationally accepted standards and or (the most) innovative technologies to improve the quality and openness of the collections and</p>

to promote the use and reuse of the data in (international) projects and partnerships.

Some of the participants in the workshop aim to be innovative frontrunners to realise their (international) ambitions. They emphasise the importance of being (and remaining) up-to-date and experimenting with new technological developments. Other participants stress the limitations of budget and or personnel. They prefer an established, stable system and expect to be unburdened by the services of the system provider.

Presentation within the city of Ghent

The ambition to present a (more) unified profile of the city of Ghent to the outside world, in relation to, for instance, other cities or higher political levels. The joint (cultural) offer can act as leverage, to attract attention and to highlight the attraction and the innovative actions of the city.

Some participants are in favour of presenting their own organisation as part of the city of Ghent. They argue that Ghent lags behind, compared to other cities such as Antwerp and Bruges that are far more visible through a unified digital profile. In addition, a common approach to digital images will eliminate the current, artificial division between heritage images and the images commissioned by a city department or service. The life cycle of city images will be re-evaluated as they will be considered the heritage images of the future. A city-based management system will also contribute to the further opening up of silos and the promotion of the collaboration between cultural heritage organisations and the city departments and services. These participants also argue that only a collective appeal of all the CoGhent partners in favour of a city-based common digital management system will have enough weight to influence the political decisions within the city. They think the presentation of the city as a whole is particularly crucial to get the realisation of a common digital management system prioritised in relation to the many other requests for digitisation trajectories in the city.

This focus of presentation contrasts with the one below. It is important to mention that no participating organisation is against being presented either within a city or a cultural heritage context, but the weight of priority for the organisations differs greatly.

Presentation within the cultural heritage sector at large

The ambition to present a (more) unified profile of the cultural heritage sector to be more effective (among others) in creating more visibility for heritage in the public sphere.

The participants who stress the priority of being presented within the context of the cultural heritage sector at large, see less value in the context of the city to realise the vision and ambitions of their own organisations. They opt for a cultural heritage ecosystem that is not defined geographically and that can include non-professional cultural heritage organisations and associations. According to these participants, such an ecosystem will support, more than the city-based alternative, the common vision to share and enrich heritage data. They also expect few (re)users to attach much value to a (purely) Ghent-based offer of cultural heritage.

Product ownership

The need for a clear product ownership of the shared digital image management system, including coordination possibilities and capacities, means and personnel.

Irrespective of the preference for a city-based or cultural heritage-based system, all participants stress the importance of determining the system ownership for the continuation process of the technological components of CoGhent. Some participants expect the city to take initiative and define a digital strategy, an organisation model, the services that are to be developed, and the rules of

engagement for partners and stakeholders. Others look towards the Flemish Government and its recent initiatives in the context of 'Digital Flanders', including the plans to set up "a digital basic infrastructure for the sustainable handling with digital collections" (Digitaal Vlaanderen, 2022).

Quality provider

A complex of elements that define, according to the participants of the workshop, the quality of the provider of a common digital image management system.

The elements, which have different weight for the different participants, include:

- The future-proof status of the provider, including the expertise to keep up-to-date with new evolutions and the financial resources to implement them
- The services which the provider offers to unburden its clients
- The possibility as a client of having a say in and of co-creating future developments
- The degree to which the provider can integrate:
 - New partners (thematic/geographical)
 - New functionalities
 - New developments
- The degree to which the system offers modules in a shared services model in which not all partners must subscribe to the entire offer, but can make individual choices (opt-in) on the basis of their own vision and ambitions.

Many of these elements relate to other issues, such as digital maturity, innovation, presentation, functionalities and individuality.

Functionalities

The offer of functionalities which the common image management system will offer in the future.

Some partners are hesitant towards a possible overload of functionalities. Too many functionalities might stretch the competences of the organisations' collaborators, they may destabilise the system, or they may simply not be used.

Other partners emphasise the importance of new functionalities being developed, for the system to be useful for the realisation of their vision and ambitions.

The list below is not to be understood as exhaustive. It contains the functionalities that were mentioned during the workshop deliberations.

- Uploading of images
- Sustainable storage of images
- Opening up of images
- Automated metadata management (framework of agreements, responsibility, provenance)
- Management of intellectual property rights
- Management of roles within the system
- Standardised handling of images requests
- High quality image reproduction (IIIF)
- High quality information reproduction
- Unique ID or URL per image
- Downloading in bulk
- Exchange with other systems (e.g., MAM meemoo)
- Focused search actions (each field searchable, filters possible)
- Search on inventory number
- Search actions to be organised, saved, downloaded, exported
- Integration of heterogeneous data (both image and information driven)
- Possibility to generate link to the entire collection
- Presentation of the collections available within the system

- Link with other (external) collections
- Link with the platforms of external partners
- Integration of applications of external partners
- Uploading by non-professionals.

Individuality organisation

The importance that an organisation attaches to the possibility of conducting its own experiments and to define its own (extra) developments in line with its own vision and ambitions without impediment by the common digital image management system.

Some participants in the workshop project stress the individuality of each organisation. They value that uniqueness strongly and want to see it preserved in any future developments. They fear that joining a common management system will disable the space an organisation will need to follow its individual course.

Other participants are less sensitive to this issue. They emphasise the benefits of collaboration to keep up with the technological evolutions. They fear that without a shared digital management system, their organisations (and their collections) might become irrelevant in an increasingly digitised world. Sharing a digital management system will according to them amass more resources, so that new technological evolutions can contribute to the realisation of the vision and ambitions of each participating organisation.

Competence of collaborators

The need for intra muros (digital) expertise, the possibility to attract digital profiles and train the present collaborators, among others through updated documentation and instructions.

Several participants emphasise the great leaps of progress that the digitisation of the cultural heritage has taken thanks to the CoGhent project. However, a great deal of that progress, in particular concerning the data cleaning, has been realised by the data intervention team, that is, extra FTEs who were assigned to the different institutions during the project. Training sessions have taken place and all of the work has been documented, but it remains unclear to which degree the expertise of the project collaborators has been transferred to the regular staff of the institutions. Continuing the technological components of CoGhent thus also requires an investment in the corresponding skills, that is, at the non-technological level.

Some of the participating organisations are confident that they have learnt enough so that the progress can be continued, albeit at a slower pace than during the CoGhent project. Other parties are not entirely convinced. In that case, the possibility that their collaborators may not have the necessary digital skills, informs their hesitancy to choose for a common digital image management system in the future.

In their recent applications towards the Flemish Department of Culture, all the participating organisations have argued for extra funding, specifically so that new digital profiles can strengthen the intra muros capacities (the decision is pending at the time of writing this report).

Budget

The financial means necessary to maintain and further develop a shared digital management system and to maintain 'the box' in the future.

There is no doubt that the budget is the dominant obstacle on the path of continuing the technological components of the CoGhent project. Recent and current geopolitical and worldwide crises (also) affect the city of Ghent, which includes the challenge to keep the budget in balance. All the participating organisations, city departments and services function within a strict financial

framework, which curtail the possibilities of investment or the development of new initiatives in the short term.

At the time of the workshop, no workable financial estimates for the continuation of the CoGhent-system were available. They will be included in the business research report as part of the techno-economic research on the CoGhent project.

Objectives of the post-CoGhent box

Clear objectives for the use of ‘the box’ after the CoGhent project has ended.

During the CoGhent project, the objective of ‘the box’ was to enable the interaction between the Collections of Ghent and the citizen in the three neighbourhoods of the city it visited. The interaction included both the exploration by the citizen of the Collections of Ghent via the touch tables in ‘the box’, and the presentation of heritage stories on the large interactive wall of ‘the box’. The stories are the result of the collaborative interactions between the cultural heritage organisations, the outreaching workers of the city and the residents of the respective neighbourhoods.

When, after the CoGhent project ends, the relation to the neighbourhoods is dissolved, the objective of ‘the box’ may need to be redefined.

If the future box continues to enable the interaction between cultural heritage and the citizen, the question turns to the content of that interaction. Some participants aim to continue presenting the Collections of Ghent and heritage stories based on those Collections. Others envisage in the future, interaction and stories on the basis of their own collection. Other forms of future interaction between the cultural heritage and the citizen, for instance, in relation to new exhibitions or new outreaching activities, are also possible.

In principle, other forms of interaction that do not relate to cultural heritage, can also be considered. They would, however, not suffice to comply with the UIA requirements.

Adoption of (part of) ‘the box’

Assignment of ‘the box’ in its entirety or parts thereof, prior to its integration in the new wing of the Design Museum Ghent, DING (planned for 2026).

As ‘the box’ will no longer travel to the city neighbourhoods after the end of the CoGhent project, the physical form of ‘the box’ in the future must also be (re)considered. At the time of the workshop, it seemed likely that ‘the box’ will be divided during the interim period (2023-2026), with the story wall to be installed in one organisation, and the three touch tables each in other organisations.

A number of participants express interest in adopting (part of) ‘the box’, but there is reluctance because it is unclear what the adoption means in practical terms.

Some participants are concerned whether their organisations have sufficient space to house (part of) ‘the box’, in particular if the requirement is that (part) of ‘the box’ be positioned in a space that is publicly accessible. It is not clear which party could clarify the (practical) requirements of the adoption.

In addition, participants interested in adopting (part of) ‘the box’ also expressed concerns about the potential costs of the adoption, for instance for maintenance. Again, it remained unclear which party could provide the necessary budgetary clarification.

5.3. Paths to Overcome the Identified Obstacles to Sustainability

On the basis of the insight into the consistency of the concepts with the policy visions of the parties involved on the one hand, and the identification of the obstacles that seem to stand in the way of sustainability on the other, solution paths were defined in consultation with the participants in Workshop 2, to best meet the sustainability requirements that UIA set out.

5.3.1. Keeping the CoGhent-system in use for the integrated interaction between the Ghent cultural heritage institutions and the citizen

This first solution path reconciles:

- The requirement of UIA that “All project main outputs [...] have to remain operational and continue to serve their purpose” (UIA, 2020), conform one of the main objectives of the CoGhent project, namely to “open up cultural heritage for everyone, increasing its visibility, accessibility and use” (UIA005-249, 2019). When this requirement is not fulfilled, (part of) the subsidy will need to be reimbursed.
- The lack of support for a common image management system, as a result of which the continued use of ‘Inuits-DAMS’ as an image management system for internal use is not considered desirable by all parties involved.

The solution consists of a compromise:

- The digital images and their (meta)data that are at present in the system, remain in ‘Inuits-DAMS’
- The integrated offer extra muros via web portal, story wall and tables, remains in existence for at least the next five years
- Organisations choose individually whether they also employ the CoGhent-system for other (internal) use (as image management system that manages their digital images and their metadata).

This fulfils the requirements of UIA: LDES, ‘Inuits-DAMS’, the web portal and ‘the box’ remain operational for the next five years and continue to serve their purpose. The institutional silos remain open and the technological components continue to contribute to the accessibility of cultural heritage. They also continue to facilitate the interaction with the citizen of cultural heritage through a digital offer. There is therefore no need to reimburse the subsidies.

This path also responds to the diversity in the ambitions to use a common image management system. Institutions that do not want to use the CoGhent-system as an internal system for managing digital images and their metadata, are not obliged to do so. At the same time, the option is left open for those institutions that do want to use the ‘Inuits-DAMS’ as an internal image management system, to do so and, if so desired, to develop it further.

Conclusion

The proposed solution opens possibilities for sustaining the main CoGhent outputs. Following this path, the technological components will continue to serve their purpose. The path does not exclude further development or customisation, while at the same time it respects the individuality of the institutions involved.

5.3.2. Spreading the costs of maintaining the current system and installing fair arrangements for future developments

This second solution path reconciles:

- The requirement of UIA that “All project main outputs [...] have to remain operational and continue to serve their purpose” (UIA, 2020), conform one of the main objectives of the CoGhent project, namely to “open up cultural heritage for everyone, increasing its visibility, accessibility and use” (UIA005-249, 2019). When this requirement is not fulfilled, (part of) the subsidy will need to be reimbursed.
- The lack of budgetary space and a shared ambition to maintain the CoGhent-system among the current project partners, let alone further to develop it.

The solution consists of:

- Maximising the shared use and reuse of the CoGhent-system
- Sharing the costs of maintaining the current system among all parties that (re)use the CoGhent-system
- Financing the further development of the CoGhent-system (e.g., additional functionalities) in proportion to the use and the wishes of the parties requesting the expansions
- Searching additional (project based) finance opportunities, e.g., the Plan for Digital Innovation of the Flemish Government, the Flemish Virtual Museum, the European Data Space, new calls of Horizon Europe, Creative Europe, or City of Things.

This solution is based on the search for an economy of scale, whereby the cost per party decreases as the number of parties increases. It counters the cost that is associated with the proliferation of multiple systems within the city. It also maximises the ability to share expertise, scripts, guidelines, etc. among the participating parties. In this way, the solution meets also the ambition that was expressed during the non-technological phase of the policy research, for a better knowledge and expertise flow throughout the city.

Moreover, the solution answers the demand for a (new) image management system for the services of the city of Ghent. Currently, there is the system called ‘Beeldbank’ (Image Bank) which operates across all the entities of the city. But the city works with a licence for an older version of the product; a switch to the new system (2.0) would require a higher budget, which is not available in the current times. Moreover, according to the participants of the workshops, Beeldbank 2.0 does not offer the functionalities that they require, such as good search options and exchange facilities. There are no clear guidelines in terms of selection or the definition of (meta)data. The system also does not operate according to internationally accepted standards such as linking functionalities with LOD or IIIF. All this presents the city with the challenge of implementing an efficient and future-proof image management system that meets the needs of its services. The shared use of the CoGhent-system can constitute the basis for a city-wide digital infrastructure.

The parties that the workshop participants put forward for an additional shared use or reuse of the CoGhent-system, can be divided into two categories:

- **Core users:** parties that structurally (can) make use of and benefit from the CoGhent-system. These core users are regarded as parties that, if they join the CoGhent-system, should also contribute financially to maintaining it. If they want to make further developments or make more intensive use of the CoGhent-system, they will have to contribute financially to (the expansion of) the system according to their use and wishes.

- **Occasional users:** parties that ad hoc (can) make use of and benefit from the CoGhent-system. It does not seem realistic to expect from these parties a contribution towards the maintaining of the CoGhent-system. A contribution per use and in proportion of their demand may nevertheless be considered. At the same time, it is important to respect the original philosophy behind the CoGhent project, which emphasised the use of open data and open source development (UIA, 2019), and thus suggests free of charge use by occasional users in the future.

Suggestions for potential additional core users are:

- **Professional cultural (heritage) organisations**
 - Located in Ghent, such as the Dr Guislain Museum, GUM (Ghent University Museum), the Historic Houses of Ghent, MSK (Museum of Fine Arts), SMAK (City Museum for Contemporary Art), and the World of Kina Museum
 - Beyond Ghent, such as the Museum Hof van Busleyden (Mechelen), ...
- **The ‘thematic’ services of the city of Ghent.** The organisation chart of the city of Ghent consists of 78 services, internal and external autonomous public undertakings. The participants in the workshop do not see the benefits of the CoGhent-system for entities such as HR, Facility Management, or the Finance Department. The other entities (54 in total) offer a so-called thematic service which may be supported by or benefit from the CoGhent-system. The participants mentioned the following services (listed in alphabetical order):
 - Childcare Services
 - Communications Service
 - Educational Service Office
 - Ghent Tourist Office
 - Parks and Public Gardens Service
 - Policy Participation Service
 - Residential Care Centres
 - Roads, Bridges and Waterways Service
 - Social Cohesion Service
 - Urban Archaeology and Heritage Conservation Service
 - Youth Services

Suggestions for potential additional occasional users are:

- Non-professional cultural heritage organisations, such as local heritage associations, Church Councils and local documentation centres or archives
- Professionals, such as architects, archaeologists, image agencies
- Researchers
- Online communities
- Applicants to the Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund
- Individual citizens

The advantages that these parties can enjoy from the CoGhent-system, are situated in two categories, depending on the main use of the digital images:

- **(Re)use of cultural heritage images**
 - **Efficiency.** A single publication of the images activates the availability for many different (re)uses, internally, in the CoGhent-system and on many different (external) platforms. The

participants of the workshops mentioned platforms such as Ghent Mapped, Cinema Belgica, the Flemish Virtual Museum and Europeana.

- **Links within the cultural heritage ecosystem, including aggregators.** By presenting the digital cultural heritage images within a larger context, the CoGhent-system supports the realisation of a larger, possibly world-wide cultural heritage ecosystem. In such a system, aggregators will link the CoGhent images and their data with data from a wide range of sources, process them in a value-added way and repackage them in a form that encourages the use and reuse of the cultural heritage data.
- **More publicity and visibility.** The digital images will not only be presented in the CoGhent-system, they will also be tagged with the organisations that host them. This implies that their presence in the CoGhent-system, will also make the participating parties more discoverable and discernible. The digital images can thus function in promotion of individual organisations.
- **More research opportunities.** Because the images are made available in a digital and high-quality form, researchers are no longer required to visit the hosting organisation. They will also be encouraged to examine significant links between the original object(s) of their research and other cultural heritage artefacts that are also present(ed) in the CoGhent-system.
- **Recognition.** Especially non-professional heritage associations could strengthen their (digital) identity through the CoGhent-system and draw recognition from their presence on an integrated platform and from the (re)use of their digital images.
- **Expected indirect benefits.** Through the improved visibility of the cultural heritage organisations, it can be expected that (re)users of the CoGhent-system are also encouraged to visit the organisations themselves. This expectation includes lowering the threshold which the 'unserved audiences' traditionally experience in relation to cultural heritage organisations.
- **Technical use of the digital images (file-based)**
 - Higher quality of images
 - More efficient search options
 - Guaranteed correct information via the (meta)data of the images
 - Correct management of the intellectual property rights
 - Better management of internal processes
 - Better service offer

Conclusion

The proposed solution exploits the economy of scale. It can also contribute to raising the image management to the same level as the information management. It stops the artificial distinction between contemporary and cultural heritage images (whereby it lengthens the lifecycle of the images). It also offers possibilities to develop customised use cases.

5.3.3. Detailing the role expectations about the future CoGhent-system

This solution path meets:

- The current uncertainty about the product ownership of the CoGhent-system
- The lack of a governance body with the mandate and the resources to manage the CoGhent-system.

The solution consists of:

- The reconfirmation of the product ownership by the city of Ghent of the CoGhent-system as foundation for a city-wide digital infrastructure for the management of digital images and their metadata. Within the city, the product ownership can be assigned more specifically to the IT government agency, the Department of Culture or Strategic Coordination.
- The assignment of the coordination of the CoGhent-system to Ghent Archives to be responsible for the development and management of the system in connection with
 - The interaction between the Ghent cultural heritage institutions
 - The interaction with citizens and non-professional heritage associations
 - The use of the system by the city services.

This solution responds to the readiness of Ghent Archives to play this role, provided that a clear mandate and the necessary resources are granted.

The specific tasks assigned to Ghent Archives should include:

- The development of an image and data strategy
- The development of quality guidelines, in particular with regard to the uploading of the images and the definition of their data
- Introducing the city services to the CoGhent-system and querying their needs and wishes
- Realising and keeping up-to-date an overview of the different needs and wishes of the city services with regard to the CoGhent-system
- Maintaining a centralised communication with the technical partners
- The development of use cases per user
- The selection of image material, in function of the needs of both the (re)users and the future cultural heritage of the city.

5.3.4. Continuing the integrated offer via (parts of) 'the box'

The 'box' will be integrated in the new wing of Design Museum Gent, DING, in 2026. The consideration here of continuing the integrated offer, refers to the interim period 2023-2026.

This solution path reconciles:

- The requirement of UIA that "All project main outputs [...] have to remain operational and continue to serve their purpose" (UIA, 2020), conform one of the main objectives of the CoGhent project, namely to "open up cultural heritage for everyone, increasing its visibility, accessibility and use" (UIA005-249, 2019). When this requirement is not fulfilled, (part of) the subsidy will need to be reimbursed.
- The limited support base for 'the box':
 - Uncertainty about the objectives beyond the CoGhent project
 - Uncertainty about the practical requirements of the adoption of (parts of) 'the box', including its budgetary implications.

The solution consists of:

- The continuation of the current offer (maintenance of the integrated cultural heritage content, i.e., the Collections of Ghent and the existing heritage stories, see also 4.3.1)
- The development of a script to develop and add new content
- The possibility to develop new content on a voluntary basis
- The continuation (possibly in separate but operational components) of the physical hardware of 'the box'.

The participants of the workshops formulated concrete suggestions for the future use of 'the box'.

The parties that currently take part in the CoGhent-system, can develop new content based on the Collections of Ghent, that is, based on the integrated cultural heritage offer. This may take the form of new heritage stories, or thematic packages that focus on reaching specific target groups, including 'unserved audiences'. The participants also see possibilities to present in the future form the box may take, including its separate components, content that belongs to an individual organisation. This could be publicity material for a new exhibition or highlights from an individual collection. To organise this properly, the participating organisations best agree on a rotation system that takes into account their annual plannings and project initiatives.

The city services, in particular the Social Cohesion Service and the Policy Participation Service, can continue to use 'the box' to trigger their collaborators with heritage material they can engage with in their community and neighbourhood work. The city services can use their field expertise to encourage the cultural heritage organisations to develop new heritage stories or thematic packages that are particularly attractive in an outreaching context.

New initiatives may also provide new opportunities for the future use of 'the box'. The participants in the workshop see possibilities to include the integrated offer in the programming of the city as European Youth Capital (2024). The candidacy of Ghent as European Capital of Culture in 2030 may both be enriched by the integrated offer and present a new opportunity to explore future uses of 'the box'. Lastly, the participants also suggested that trainees from the inter-university Institute for Public History (associated with the Ghent University) may contribute to the development of new content for the box in the future, or explore new developments that other parties may implement.

Coordination. An issue that still should be solved, is the coordination of (parts of) ‘the box’ in the next three years (before its integration in the new wing of the Design Museum Ghent, DING, in 2026). The coordination must ensure (at least) the maintenance of hardware and software, content management and the search for new opportunities (new content, target groups, etc). There is no immediate candidate to take up this commitment and the policy research did not allow the identification of a party to whom this role is best assigned.

5.4. Conclusions

The technical outputs of the CoGhent project are conceptually largely in line with the policy vision of the organisations involved, but in relation to other objectives, a difference in ambitions emerges that stands in the way of a maximalist continuation of the technological components.

In addition to the differences in ambition, a number of objections to or shortcomings of the current technological components, also stand in the way of their maximalist sustainability.

However, the extent to which the visions are similar, in combination with the UIA sustainability requirements, do imply a window of opportunity in which different expectations can be reconciled.

The proposed paths towards sustainability encompass:

- **Keeping the CoGhent-system in use for the integrated interaction between the Ghent cultural heritage institutions and the citizen**
- **Spreading the costs of maintaining the current system and installing fair arrangements for future extensions**
- **Detailing the role expectations about the future CoGhent-system**
- **Continuing the integrated offer via (parts of) 'the box'.**

Together, these solution paths overcome the following identified obstacles: the common guideline framework, the presentation within the city and the cultural heritage sector, the individuality of the involved organisations and the budgetary requirements.

Other identified obstacles, such as digital maturity of the organisations involved in data exchange and the competence of collaborators, belong more to the non-technological sphere of the CoGhent project and are to be overcome through the policy recommendations in Chapter 4.

Further obstacles, such as the product ownership and the positioning towards innovation, will be addressed in the policy recommendations below (Chapters 6 and 7).

One obstacle that has not been explicitly addressed in the proposed solutions, is the issue of the quality of the provider. The expectation is that this is addressed in the complementary techno-economic research of the CoGhent project.

5.5. Additional Findings

The policy research regarding the technological components of the CoGhent project also yielded the following additional findings that were not explicitly expressed but also hold valuable suggestions for the trajectory towards sustainability.

Terminology. Precise terms and terminology are essential in a co-creative process. It has taken much effort during the policy research to come to the conceptual definitions of the technological components and the distinction of the specific characteristics of the concrete technological realisations within the CoGhent project, that were agreed upon by the strategic coordinators and the participants to the workshops. It is likely that much frustration, equivocal expectations and mistrust between the stakeholders, could have been avoided by defining and sharing clear-cut terminology at the beginning of the project.

Business case. It is important to develop a complete business case for the CoGhent-system in its future form. This could not be realised within the policy research. The techno-economic research of the CoGhent project will include both a qualitative model of costs and benefits for the functionalities of the CoGhent-system, and an exploration of methodologies for quantification. This implies that the definition of a complete business case, including its concrete quantification, lies in the future.

The policy research has nevertheless yielded suggestions towards the realisation of that business case. In particular, the hypothesis of the policy research that the cost to sustain the CoGhent-system can be reduced by the introduction of more parties to the system, suggests further lines of research.

It is thus recommended that further research investigates whether the costs for consultation and coordination, differentiation, and additional developments, increase if more parties are involved.

The business case must also calculate the costs for the city, the organisations and services involved, of the status quo, in particular, the continued absence of a common image management system. Those costs must include the calculation of compensation measures for lower efficiency, and the time that cannot be spent on other, possibly more core tasks.

Circumstances. The time frame UIA set for the sustainability requirements, is five years. In that period, circumstances will change. With the continuation of the technological components, even at the most minimalist level, the city of Ghent and its cultural heritage institutions can prepare to take swift advantage of more favourable conditions when they occur.

Product ownership. The discussions of the policy research have revealed uncertainty about the product ownership of the outputs at the end of innovative bottom-up projects. The implicit assumption appears to be that the party that initiated the project, becomes product owner after the project has ended. This assumption may be discouraging for enterprising parties to explore and exploit innovative opportunities.

6. Policy Recommendations on the Technological Components

The policy recommendations regarding the technological components of the CoGhent project are motivated by the objective to reach the optimal reconciliation between the UIA requirements of continuation on the one hand, and the policy visions of the participating heritage institutions and city services on the other.

The motivation for the suggested paths towards sustainability is that they will overcome the identified obstacles. They also will maximise the economy of scale, and thus the spreading of the inevitable costs of the continuation. The continuation moreover offers a solution to the need of the services of the city for a new digital image management system.

For these reasons, it is recommended that the local authorities, that is, the political representatives of the city of Ghent:

- **Keep CoGhent-system in use for the integrated interaction between the heritage institutions and the citizens of Ghent**
- **As product owner, promote the CoGhent-system (or aspects of it) as the basis for a city-wide digital infrastructure for the management of digital images and their metadata**

- **Organise the coordination of the CoGhent-system in the future**

Give Ghent Archives the mandate and the resources to be responsible for the development and management of the CoGhent-system in function of:

- the interaction between the Ghent heritage institutions and the city services
- their interaction with citizens and non-professional heritage associations
- the use of the system by the city services.

- **Secure the finances of the CoGhent-system in the future**

Spread the costs of maintaining the CoGhent-system over the next five years across all Ghent heritage institutions and urban services that use it.

Determine also the contribution for additional functionalities in proportion of the use and desires for those additional functionalities.

In addition, actively explore new finance possibilities at the Flemish and European level (e.g., Plan for Digital Innovation, Flemish Virtual Museum, European Data Space, new calls of Horizon Europe, Creative Europe and City of Things).

7. Policy Recommendations on the Process Towards Sustainability

In addition to the recommendations that address the continuation of respectively the non-technological (Chapter 4) and the technological components (Chapter 6), there are also recommendations that relate to both categories of components. They focus on the course of the process towards sustainability of the CoGhent project and conditions that will contribute to a city-wide innovative culture.

- **Employ a pragmatic approach for the process of continuation**

The continuation of the selected CoGhent components requires more than the continuation of the regular operations within the city. But the current circumstances (budget, personnel) restrain the translation of the ambitions identified in the policy research, into a new grand master plan that will realise everything at once. Rather than regarding this as a disadvantage, turn this into an asset.

A pragmatic approach builds further upon existing structures and initiatives. It encourages a gradual roll-out of the heritage ecosystem and the continuation of the CoGhent-system. It takes into account the individuality of the organisations involved, including their current commitments, budgets and staffing and digital expertise, whilst offering possibilities for customisation.

- Start with a ‘coalition of the willing’
- Communicate about the (small) successes and thus generate enthusiasm for other parties to join
- Create (more) opportunities city-wide to get to know expert people and share knowledge
- Provide for the gradual addition of new functionalities in the CoGhent-system
- Allow the possibility that not all actions or initiatives that will contribute towards the continuation of the CoGhent components, must be organised collectively
- Provide procedures which offer opt-in options so that each partner has the widest possible scope to participate whilst at the same time aligning their participations with their own vision and ambitions.

- **Define a procedure that determines the post-project ownership of the output of innovative bottom-up projects**

Ghent has the ambition to be an innovative city, including supporting innovative projects that start from outside the city services and departments.

For this ambition to be operable, it is to be complemented with a procedure that defines, in advance or at the very start of such a project, what steps must be taken at the end of the project, in order to safeguard its lessons learned and its most important outputs. The procedure must determine the post-project ownership of the outputs and the responsibilities of the different partners in the project.

To establish such a procedure will encourage enterprising parties within the city to explore and exploit innovative opportunities. The ensuing culture of innovation will benefit the city as a whole.

8. Recommendations on the Research Process from a Methodological Perspective

Policy research that is concerned with processes towards sustainability, is also concerned with scalability and transferability. In the present context, this means on the one hand, enabling the upscaling of the policy research within Ghent, and on the other, enabling its transfer beyond the Ghent context.

The detailed description of the methodology (Section 2.3) serves the scalability of the research. The methodology can be used to evaluate the (non-technological) components of the CoGhent project that were not examined in the present research. The methodology can moreover be used to evaluate the alignment of (parts of) the CoGhent-system with policy visions and ambitions during the process towards sustainability, that is, when more parties use the system or when the budget is raised.

Together with the description of the methodology, the present recommendations serve the transferability of the policy research from a methodological point of view. The purpose here is to inspire other municipal authorities in Europe who have an interest in either running innovative projects or setting up trajectories towards sustainability. With relation to innovative projects, this applies in particular to complex, multistakeholder projects and projects that experiment with technology in innovative contexts, for instance, to boost social values. Trajectories towards sustainability will relate to the outputs that are generated by such innovative projects, but are also applicable to realisations that are produced in the course of other types of urban initiatives.

External, neutral party. Consider bringing into the project an external researcher as neutral partner to conduct the policy research. The position of an external, neutral partner will benefit the results of the research. An external partner can move freely between the stakeholders without, for instance, being hindered by hierarchical relations. A neutral party has no position to defend in relation to the eventual results of the policy research. It will not have preferences about which components to continue or which path towards sustainability may be more opportune than others. Be aware, however, that there are also drawbacks to engaging an external partner. More time may be needed for them to get acquainted with the project and its stakeholders. Conversely, more time may be needed to explain to the stakeholders the *raison d'être* of the policy research, before the actual work can start.

Support. Secure support for the policy research from the different parties involved in the project. Policy research often operates in a somewhat separate niche, in particular when the project of which it is part, is complex, multi-layered and concerns many stakeholders. Yet support from the stakeholders is crucial to ensure their cooperation to the policy research. Secure therefore support for the policy research from at least the commissioning party and the general project management. If necessary, ask these parties to co-clarify the *raison d'être* of the policy research to the other stakeholders. Secure as soon as possible support from those stakeholders themselves. If that is relevant for the project, connect with the different levels of the involved administrative and political authorities. Provide sufficient time in the phasing of the policy research for consultations and coordinate on a regular basis with the other initiative-organising parties in the project, not to undermine the support of the parties that are expected to participate in the policy research.

Terminology. Make sure to use throughout the policy research clear-cut definitions of the important concepts of the project. Precise terms and terminology are essential in policy research,

especially when it is (largely) conducted through a co-creative process. Make therefore sure at the start of the research process that the stakeholders agree on the definition of the most important concepts within the project. If this is not the case, determine those definitions in consultation as early as possible. Communicate the definitions widely and repeatedly.

Separate research categories. Consider the impact on the policy research of the different layers in multi-layered projects. In most cases, the layers will benefit from being researched separately. In particular in innovative projects that aim to realise both non-technological and technological outputs, the technology will often surreptitiously acquire a dominant position in the project. This is largely due to the clear and thus conspicuous investments that are involved in technological experiments and developments. Make sure that the policy research does not (unconsciously) replicate that bias. Therefore, define the content of a project into categories that are both equitable towards the multiplicity of the project and manageable for the policy research. In most cases, it will suffice to complement the 'natural' dominance of a category that examines the technological outputs, with a separate category that investigates all the non-technological outputs. Pay special attention to communicating about and safeguarding the non-technological results. The separate research categories will also guarantee a result orientation towards specific policy recommendations that address the technological and the non-technological outputs in their own right.

Expectation management. Communicate unequivocally about the objectives of the policy research. Also communicate unequivocally about the results of the research and how they will be used. In particular in a co-creative research process, the contributors must know from the start what will happen with their input, whether it will be made public within the project, for instance, or published in an external document, available to a wider audience. These communications must take place at the beginning of the policy research, but it is important to repeat them at every step of the research trajectory, in particular, with every new activity, where the input of the participating parties may differ from their input at the previous activity, when new parties take part, or when the results of different activities will be handled differently.

Co-creation. Secure the constructive participation of the parties that are most relevant to the policy research. When policy research is (largely) conducted through a co-creative process, the contributors will have influence on the process and the results of that process.

- **Participants.** A preliminary condition to corroborate the quality of the co-creative process, is therefore in the first place to pay the necessary attention to the selection of the contributors. Consider carefully which criterions will facilitate the most conducive workshops. Consider which participants correspond most to the criterions, including their position, their representative status and the mandate with which they can participate. Communicate these criterions to the intended participants and do so in time to facilitate their presence. If deemed necessary, make the support of the general project management explicit in the invitations for the co-creative activities. Also provide sufficient time to repeat the invitations, possibly in personal contacts with the intended parties.
- **Interaction management.** In the second place, implement good interaction management at the co-creative activities themselves. Repeat the selection criterions at the workshops, so that the participants understand the relevance of their presence. This will be the starting point of a (co-)ownership of the co-creative process and its results. In the further promotion of that (co-)ownership, exploit the dynamics of the participating group as much as possible. Organise therefore, when possible, live sessions and facilitate open discussions. Be aware, however, that the participants will mostly be people with busy agendas, engaged

in many initiatives other than the policy research. Make sure, therefore, to keep the agenda and the intended results of the co-creative activity in mind at all times. Provide some leniency for particular pet subjects or distractions, but be ready to intervene at regular intervals and reduce the discussion to the core topic of the workshop.

Structure. Shape the interaction throughout the co-creative process with structuring elements. Embedding a co-creative process in structure, aids to keep the focus of the policy research.

- **Independent, uniform structure.** Determine the structure of the policy research independently from the content of the project. In particular in multi-layered projects, where the different layers benefit from being examined separately, a uniform set of structuring elements throughout the policy research can counterbalance the complexity of the project. Using the same structuring elements in the different interactive activities, also empowers the participants to recognise the elements and thus position themselves within the process.
- **Funnel model.** Structure the interactive process according to a funnel model, that is, start with a broad scope that narrows during the course of the process. This enables both the participating group and the researcher to gain gradual insight in the extent of support for the issues under discussion. At the same time, it will also show where the support stops, hence allowing to identify the obstacles and explore the possible paths towards sustainability. A funnel model furthermore aids the policy research to work towards interim results that are recognisable for the participating group, as they experience the narrowing down at first hand. In the same way, the participants will also grant and support the conclusions at the end of the policy research.
- **Conceptual models.** Employ conceptual models to structure the interaction. This will ensure that complex issues become comprehensible and that all the relevant dimensions are covered in the discussion. Models are also instructive when the aim is either to identify what is not yet present or to complement what is present but difficult to evaluate.

An example of the use of conceptual models in the absence of concrete information, is the definition of role expectations. To consider them first on a conceptual level, facilitates a broad and detached identification of the roles that are necessary for the continuation of project results. In the next step, the thus generated role descriptions aid the participants in determining which concrete commitments they will (can) take up in the process towards sustainability. At the same time, it will be clear which role expectations have not been matched with personalised commitments. In this way, the conceptual framework reinforces the above-mentioned funnel model: it works towards the recommendations that conclude the policy research.

An example of the complementary use of conceptual models, is to use a conceptual model to transcend the concrete outputs of a project and evaluate the results on a conceptual level. In particular in innovative technological projects, a number of premature prototypes may be realised during the course of the project. The consideration of the potential for sustainability, however, must not solely depend on the evaluation of the actual prototypes, it must also take into account the intentions and the objectives of the developments. Conceptual frameworks can, in other words, create an additional level to analyse the extent and impact of innovative experiments.

- **Purpose.** Always keep the purpose of the structuring elements in mind: they are meant to be facilitating tools to the interactive sessions. Do not, therefore, let the structure stand in the way of the co-creative process.

Flexibility. In order to safeguard the intention at the core of the research process, that is, to co-create with the most relevant partners in the project, complement the structure with a flexible approach.

- **Agility.** Adopt from the start of the policy research assignment an agile approach to the design of the entire research process. It is probable that a structure for the interaction has been agreed by the commissioning party and the researcher before the start of the policy research. When during the desk research and the early consultations, however, it emerges that the project is more complex than was envisaged, demonstrate agility and adapt the structure to align optimally with the specificities of the project. Similarly, once the policy research has started, make sure to remain up-to-date with the progress and the changes in the project and to adapt to them accordingly.
- **Consultation and feedback.** Incorporate in the research process ample occasion for consultation and feedback. With a flexible approach, they will inform adjustments during the co-creative process in function of the best possible result.
- **Interactive sessions.** Apply the same flexibility during the interactive sessions. The structured part of a workshop can be designed in function of the co-creative process, yet additional opportunities for interaction that could not have been foreseen, may emerge during the actual workshops. Be therefore ready to adapt to the live circumstances, including discarding the scheduled structuring elements in favour of an interactive discussion that at that point contributes more towards the intended results.

Similarly, be aware that conceptual models or digital tools may cause discomfort. Especially with participants who are more practice-oriented or who do not regularly work with such tools, the discomfort can slide into resistance that interferes with the interaction. In many cases, it will suffice to pay sufficient attention to the introduction of the tools, provide ample guidance on how they can enrich the interaction and allow practice time. If the discomfort cannot in a relatively short time satisfactorily be overcome, let go of the structuring elements and focus instead on the co-creative interaction itself.

9. Sources Consulted

- Atkinson, Simon, *10 Mega Trends that are (re)shaping the world*, Ipsos Trends. Retrieved 2022 08 19 <https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/10-Mega-Trends-That-are-Reshaping-The-World.pdf>
- Busch, Christophe (2022), *Visietekst. Voor een veerkrachtig lokaal bestuur. Van polariteit naar verbondenheid*, Hannah Arendt Instituut. Retrieved 2022 08 22 <https://hannah-arendt.instituut/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Visietekst-Van-polariteit-naar-verbondenheid-2022-Hannah-Arendt-Instituut.pdf>
- Chung, James, Susie Wilkening & Sally Johnstone, Reach Advisors (2008), *Museums & Society 2034: Trends and Potential Futures*, Washington, D.C.: Center for the Future of Museums, American Association of Museums. Retrieved 2022 08 05 <aam-us.org/upload/museumssociety2034.pdf>
- Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums* (2010), Center for the Future of Museums, American Association of Museums. Retrieved 2022 08 05 <https://www.aam-us.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Demographic-Change-and-the-Future-of-Museums.pdf>
- Farrell, Betty & Maria Medvedeva, 'Demographic transformation and the Future of Museums', pp. 8-29.
- Merrit, Elizabeth E., 'Where Do We Go From Here: A Call to Action', pp. 30-31.
- Depreeuw, Bregt & Maarten Soete (2022), *Landschapstekening Cultureel-Erfgoed Gent*. Retrieved 2022 04 10 https://stamgent.be/nl_be/1st2022
- Dewaele Luc & Maarten Soete (2021), *Landschapstekening Kunsten – Gent 2011*, in opdracht van Cultuur Gent en Gents Kunstenoverleg. Retrieved 2022 06 29 <https://gentskunstenoverleg.be/landschapstekening/>
- Dialogic (2022), *Stand van het Nederlands digitaal erfgoed 2021. 1-meting naar aanleiding van het Intensiveringsprogramma 2019-2021*. Retrieved 2022 07 12 <https://www.dialogic.nl/projecten/stand-van-het-nederlands-digitaal-erfgoed-2021/>
- Digitaal Vlaanderen (2022), *Eindrapport Business case Digitale Collecties*.
- EU (2021), *Urban Agenda for the EU. Partnership on Culture / Cultural Heritage. Final Action Plan*. Retrieved 2022 08 04 <https://futurium.ec.europa.eu/en/urban-agenda/culturecultural-heritage/action-plan/final-action-plan-partnership-culturecultural-heritage>
- Faherty, Anna (2022), 'Why do stories matter to museums and how can museums become better storytellers'. Retrieved 2022 06 18 <https://www.museumnext.com/article/why-do-stories-matter-to-museums-and-how-can-museums-become-better-storytellers/>
- FARO (2013), *Cultureel erfgoed 2020. Hefbomen voor het Vlaamse cultureel-erfgoedbeleid. Eindrapport met aanbevelingen van de veld- en toekomstanalyses cultureel erfgoed (2009-2011)*. Retrieved 2022 08 18 <https://faro.be/publicaties/cultureel-erfgoed-2020-hefbomen-voor-het-vlaamse-cultureel-erfgoedbeleid>
- FARO (2021), *Erfgoed is*. Retrieved 2022 08 18 <https://faro.be/publicaties/erfgoed>
- FARO (2022), *De blik vooruit. Actuele trends en thema's voor beleidsplanningstrajecten*. Retrieved 2022 08 18 https://faro.be/sites/default/files/bijlagen/e-documenten/De_blik_vooruit.pdf
- IDEA Consult (2021), *Eindrapport verkennende bevraging voortraject Gent 2030 kandidaat Europese Culturele Hoofdstad*. Retrieved 2022 06 28 https://cultuur.stad.gent/sites/default/files/2021-11/Gent2030_eindrapport_23102021_1.pdf
- Jambon, Jan (2019), *Beleidsnota 2019-2024. Cultuur*. Retrieved 2022 07 13 <https://www.vlaanderen.be/publicaties/beleidsnota-2019-2024-cultuur>

- Jambon, Jan (2021), *Strategische visienota Cultureel Erfgoed*. Retrieved 2022 07 13
https://www.vlaanderen.be/cjm/sites/default/files/2021-04/strategische_visienota_cultureel_erfgoed.pdf
- Organisation Chart City of Ghent (2023), Retrieved 2023 02 10 [Organogram Stad en OCMW Gent vanaf 1 januari 2023.pdf](#)
- Sayer, Faye, 'Heritage and Well-being: Creating Healthier Societies Through Heritage', Retrieved 2022 08 18
<https://mcpqh.org/heritage-and-well-being-creating-healthier-societies-through-heritage/>
- Salvador Salort-Pons, 'Opinion: Museums connect our past and present', The Detroit News. Retrieved 2022 06 18 <https://eu.detroitnews.com/story/opinion/2018/05/31/opinion-museums-connect-past-and-present-dia/653231002/>
- SARC (2021), *Advies bij de strategische visienota cultureel erfgoed*. Retrieved 2022 07 13
<https://www.vlaanderen.be/publicaties/advies-in-aanloop-naar-de-strategische-visienota-kunsten-en-de-strategische-visienota-cultureel-erfgoed-advies-sarc>
- Soeterbroek, Frans (2021), *Erfgoed als middel. Over de betekenis van erfgoed voor sociaal-maatschappelijke domeinen en de implicaties daarvan voor de erfgoedwereld, in opdracht van de Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed*, Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap. Retrieved 2022 08 18
<https://www.cultureelerfgoed.nl/publicaties/publicaties/2021/01/01/essay-erfgoed-als-middel>
- Stevenson, Lauren, Elisa Callow & Emiko Ono (2009). *Interplay: Inspiring Wonder, Discovery and Learning through Interdisciplinary Museum-Community Partnerships*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation. Retrieved 2022 07 15
www.nhm.org/site/sites/default/files/for_teachers/pdf/Full_book_single_01_nhm_interplay_SINGLE.pdf.
- UIA (October 2020), *Factsheet – Administrative Project Closure Initiative*.
- UIA005-249 (2019), *CoGhent Application_v2_confirmed*.
- Van den Broek, Andries & Pepijn van Houwelingen (2019), 'Pantser of ruggengraat? Over erfgoed, identiteit en cultuurbeleid. Thematische verkenning', in: *Denkend aan Nederland. Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2019*, SCP, Den Haag. Retrieved 2022 08 18
<https://www.scp.nl/publicaties/monitors/2019/06/26/denkend-aan-nederland>
- Van Oost, O., A. Vander Stichele & G. Vercauteren, "Identiteit. Lasagne of Gentse waterzooi? Inleiding op het focusdossier 'Identiteit'", in: *faro | tijdschrift over cultureel erfgoed*, 13 (2020) 4, pp. 38-43. Retrieved 2022 08 18 https://issuu.com/faro-net/docs/faro_2020_13_4_issuu/38
- Weil, Stephen E. (2002), *Making Museums Matter*, Washington, Smithsonian Books.

Annex 1. Departments and services of the city of Ghent that are mentioned in the Policy Report, in Dutch and in English

Organogram Stad Gent	Organisation Chart of the City of Ghent
<i>Nederlands</i>	<i>English</i>
DEPARTEMENT/DIENST	DEPARTMENT/Service
BEDRIJFSVOERING	MANAGEMENT
Dienst Communicatie	Communications Service
Dienst Internationale Relaties en Netwerken	International Relations and Networks Service
Archief Gent	Ghent Archives
STRATEGIE EN ORGANISATIE	STRATEGY AND ORGANISATION
Strategische Coördinatie	Strategic Coordination
Dienst Strategische Subsidies	Strategic Grants Service
Dienst Data en Informatie	Data and Information Service
Dienst Beleidsparticipatie	Policy Participation Service
DEPARTEMENT WELZIJN EN SAMENLEVING	DEPARTMENT FOR WELFARE AND SOCIETY
Dienst Ontmoeten en Verbinden	Social Cohesion and Urban Well-Being Service [For reasons of brevity, 'Social Cohesion Service' is used in the policy report.]
DEPARTEMENT GEZONDHEID EN ZORG	DEPARTMENT FOR HEALTH AND CARE
Woonzorgcentra	Residential Care Centres
DEPARTEMENT ONDERWIJS, OPVOEDING EN JEUGD	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, UPBRINGING AND YOUTH
Educatieve Diensten	Educational Service Office
Jeugddienst	Youth Services
Dienst Kinderopvang	Childcare Services
DEPARTEMENT CULTUUR, SPORT EN VRIJE TIJD	DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE, SPORTS AND RECREATION
Cultuurdienst	Cultural Service
IVA Historische Huizen	Ghent Historic Buildings Office
Dienst Toerisme	Ghent Tourist Office
DEPARTEMENT STEDELIJKE ONTWIKKELING	DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
Dienst Stadsarcheologie en Monumentenzorg	Urban Archaeology and Heritage Conservation Service
Dienst Wegen, Bruggen en Waterlopen	Roads, Bridges and Waterways Service
Groendienst	Parks and Public Gardens Service

Annex 2. Organisations invited to the policy research workshops

In a co-creative format, contributors have influence on the research process and the result of that process. A careful selection of the participants is therefore crucial.

In consultation with the Core Management Team (CMT), it was decided to invite those parties that relate most to the policy aspects of the CoGhent project. The following criterions were taken into consideration for the selection of the most relevant parties:

- An expert helicopter perspective on the components that have been developed during the CoGhent project
- Strategic insight into the policy visions and ambitions which are the benchmark of the evaluation of those components
- The mandate to take up roles and commitments in function of the trajectory towards sustainability.

To the workshops that evaluated the potential for continuation of the non-technological components, the following organisations were invited. The organisations whose names are shown in bold, were effectively present at the workshops.

- The five cultural heritage institutions of which the integrated collections form the Collections of Ghent (in alphabetical order):
 - **Design Museum Gent.** The museum approaches the design objects in its collection as form, function and reflection on a prevailing zeitgeist. The museum is also a place for makers and users. And it examines which role design could play in the future.
 - **“Erfgoedcel”.** This is a specifically Flemish concept and role which can be understood as a heritage unit or, more precisely, a designated supporting actor for non-professional heritages organisations and projects at a municipal level. In this document, the term refers to the Erfgoedcel of the city of Ghent.
 - **Ghent Archives.** The Ghent Archives have originated from the merger of the former Archive of the city of Ghent and the Archive of the Public Commission of Societal Welfare (OCMW).
 - **Huis van Alijn.** The House of Alijn is the museum of daily life in Flanders: it explores the habits, traditions and rituals from the recent and distant past.
 - **Industriemuseum.** The Museum of Industry brings the industrial past of Flanders to life with testimonials, iconic machines and surprising facts. It also houses working printing and textile departments.
 - **STAM.** STAM is an abbreviation of “Stadsmuseum” or “Museum of the City”. It presents the story of the city of Ghent, both in a chronological trajectory that traces the development and growth of Ghent, and with temporary exhibitions that explore the concept of urbanity.
- The city services that actively contribute to the project:
 - **The Communications Service**
 - The Cultural Service
 - The Policy Participation Service
 - **The Social Cohesion and Urban Well-Being Service.** “De Dienst Ontmoeten en Verbinden” translates literally as “The Meet & Connect Service”. The Social Cohesion and Urban Well-Being Service aims to strengthen the cohesion between inhabitants in the neighbourhoods of the city of Ghent, especially where that cohesion does not emerge spontaneously. The service aims to support residents to seek connection with each other, with respect for each identity and specificity, and encourages them to engage themselves for their neighbourhood. For reasons of brevity, the policy report uses “Social Cohesion Service”.

For the workshops on the technological components, the following organisations were invited. The organisations whose names are shown in bold, were effectively present at the workshops.

- **Design Museum Gent**
 - "Erfgoedcel"
 - **Ghent Archives**
 - **Huis van Alijn**
 - **Industriemuseum**
 - **STAM**
 - **The Communications Service**
 - **The Cultural Service**
 - The Policy Participation Service
 - **The Social Cohesion Service**
- **AG District09**
 - The city Departments that are responsible for the city services involved:
 - **The Department of Strategy and Organisation**
 - **The Department of Culture, Sports and Recreation**
 - **The umbrella of the AG Art and Design and AG Heritage**
 - The political Cabinets that supervise them, being
 - **The Cabinets responsible for Culture**
 - **The Cabinet responsible for Ghent Archives**
 - **The Cabinet responsible for Data and Innovation and Digitisation.**

Annex 3. Assignment intra muros

This annex presents the verbatim responses of the participating organisations (in alphabetical order) to the assignment intra muros (See above, Sections 2.3, 3.3 and 3.4). The purpose was to determine the institutional commitments towards the continuation of the non-technological components of the CoGhent project.

For each sub-commitment, the organisations were asked whether they could commit to ("Yes"), were uncertain about ("Don't know") or declined the role ("No"). They were also asked to motivate their responses.

The summarised results of this assignment can be found in Section 3.3, conclusions drawn from them can be found in Section 3.4. Only those sub-commitments that elicited a response (which can also be a comment on a role the organisation would not commit to), are included below.

The Communications Service (CS)

Consultation and Cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the services and Departments of the city					
Role expectations	Description	Yes	Don't know	No	Motivation
Communicator	Communicates about the priorities of each organisation based on their annual plannings and project initiatives	✓			Advice and support to the communication collaborators of the city services in their communication actions based on their annual planning and project initiatives, according to the service model of the Communications Service* (*) The Communications Service today offers no services to the museum AGs. The general public and internal media channels of the city are available on request and after diligent consideration (socials, press releases, city magazine, Mia, etc.)
Communicator	Engages the most suitable channels to share city-wide concrete actions and best practices	✓			Idem
Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations					
Ambassador	Triggers the field actively and accessibly with cultural heritage, with the triggers linked as concretely as possible to the reality of the envisaged target group(s)			✓	Is key task of the owners / policy services
Communicator	Creates an overview of the existing communication channels			✓	Concerns theme and sector-bound channels
Communicator	Facilitates the choice for the optimal communication			✓	Idem

	channel(s) for cultural heritage				
Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund					
Ambassador	Brings the powerful story of the city to as many places as possible, with reference to the innovative cultural heritage initiatives in the neighbourhoods, the strengthening of the cultural infrastructure and the silo-transcending connection between different policy domains			✓	Key task owners / policy services Can be incorporated by the Communications Service into the corporate communication and content strategy, but it cannot be included in the daily activities, as the motor of the advocacy must lie with the policy services
Communicator	Shares the project sheets that were submitted to the CoGhent Co-Creation Fund			✓	Key task owners / policy services
Communicator	Communicates about the cultural heritage offer in function of co-creation			✓	Key task owners / policy services At the start of the new Fund, consultation with and advice by the Communications Service in relation to the channel strategy is possible
Communicator	Supports more online presence			✓	Idem
Communicator	Makes the new competition as widely known as possible			✓	Key task owners / policy services

Design Museum Gent (DMG)

Consultation and Cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the services and Departments of the city					
<i>Role expectations</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Motivation</i>
Ambassador	Promotes the best practices on as many forums, consultation sessions and meetings as possible	✓			Collaborators and the head of the public service of the museum communicate about their experience of good collaborations at consultation moments in the city and at other network moments
Communicator	Communicates about the priorities of each organisation based on their annual plannings and project initiatives		✓		Is only possible if a structural consultation organ or partnership is brought into existence where the services and heritage organisations can meet one another
Communicator	Engages the most suitable channels to share city-wide concrete actions and best practices			✓	DMG shares and communicates own projects together with the relevant partners, but does not do so at a broader level
Enforcer	Sustains the agendas in the consultation forums			✓	Must be taken up by the coordinator of an overarching structural operation
Facilitator	Puts a snowball effect on individual network results			✓	DMG will document and anchor the individual networks

Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Promotes a city-wide perspective; employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations; launches concrete suggestions for consultation and cooperation in relation to cultural heritage			✓	Must be city-wide, within the Department of Culture for instance. A museum collaborator cannot keep the overview at city-wide level
Memorialist	Captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire			✓	Depends on a structural consultation organ, which could secure, share and disseminate the expertise of the various participants. DMG does secure own best practices and projects and communicates about those
Organiser	Is responsible for the practical organisation of the network event		✓		Depends on the practical choices and the available space
Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations					
Ambassador	Triggers the field actively and accessibly with cultural heritage, with the triggers linked as concretely as possible to the reality of the envisaged target group(s)	✓			Collaborators of DMG who work with the public do so starting from the own collection, by seeking connection with target groups. If possible (and appropriate), this takes places in collaboration with neighbourhood workers or other city services
Communicator	Shares best field practice cases	✓			DMG communicates about own experiences of neighbourhood initiatives via various communication channels and platforms (e.g., FARO). At the international level we use the available opportunities to share best practices, among our peers (AAD) or via ICOM Voices
Communicator	Shares the 'calls' city-wide			✓	DMG does not have the appropriate communication channels to reach a city-wide public. This requires the structural organisation of cultural participation at a higher 'city-wide' level (cf. labs in other cities). At the Flemish level this is realised by organisations such as FARO
Coordinator	Coordinates the pitching sessions at the network event			✓	Needs to be taken up by the coordinator of an overarching structural operation
Enforcer	Sustains the agendas in the consultation forums			✓	Idem
Facilitator	Encourages the sharing of knowledge			✓	Idem

Facilitator	Puts a snowball effect on individual network results			✓	Idem
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Promotes a city-wide perspective; employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations; launches concrete suggestions for joint outreaching work with cultural heritage			✓	Idem
Memorialist	Captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire			✓	Idem
Organiser	Organises the workshops			✓	Idem
Organiser	Is responsible for the practical organisation of the network event			✓	Idem
Originalist	Triggers the organisations and associations with out-of-the-box perspectives for outreaching initiatives	✓			DMG wants to initiate innovative outreaching trajectories, organise, research and document them
Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund					
Ambassador	Brings the powerful story of the city to as many places as possible, with reference to the innovative cultural heritage initiatives in the neighbourhoods, the strengthening of the cultural infrastructure and the silo-transcending connection between different policy domains			✓	This can only be taken up at a broader (city-wide) level, cf. the already present stimulating funds at the Department of Culture
Ambassador	Convinces the organisations and services to deposit a (limited) part of their resources in the Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund			✓	
Coach	Guides the project applications for existing and future finance options via information sessions throughout the city			✓	
Communicator	Shares the project sheets of the projects that were submitted to the CoGhent Co-Creation Fund			✓	
Communicator	Communicates about the cultural heritage offer in function of co-creation	✓			DMG communicates which of the own collections are available and how they can be re-used for co-creation
Communicator	Supports more online presence			✓	DMG can share the calls via online communication channels
Communicator	Makes the new competition as widely known as possible			✓	Idem
Facilitator	Facilitates the sharing of knowledge about existing			✓	

	finance options at the consultation forums				
Facilitator	Facilitates the extension of existing co-creation initiatives			✓	
Financier	Explores the possibilities of and brings in extra resources			✓	
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Summarises the existing financing possibilities; promotes a city-wide perspective; employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations; launches concrete suggestions for co-creation			✓	
Memorialist	Secures the project sheets of the projects submitted to the CoGhent Co-Creation Fund			✓	
Memorialist	Reaches out with inspiring examples of the re-use of cultural heritage	✓			DMG communicates about existing examples of the re-use of the own collections
Organiser	Organises the new competition			✓	

Erfgoedcel (EC)

The Erfgoedcel Team found it difficult to work with the defined individual commitments (the reason of which it explains below) and therefore opted for a clarification of how the various roles connect with its own mission and initiatives. It also does not define its communication in reply to the assignment as a formal commitment, but rather as a “conversation starter” with the partners.

“The Erfgoedcel is a service partner for everyone who wants to engage with cultural heritage and who does not have a professional heritage background. Target groups are (among others): heritage associations, church councils, city guides, volunteers, neighbourhood groups, self-organisations, volunteer associations, individuals, etc.

(1) The Erfgoedcel core role is to strengthen the above mentioned groups in their engagement with heritage, both before and behind the screens.

(2) The operation of the Erfgoedcel is very much neighbourhood-oriented, in collaboration with local players. The objective here is to extend heritage awareness.

City services are in relation to both (1) and (2), one of the target groups/partners and there have already been very successful collaborations. Heritage associations are the core partners, which the Erfgoedcel meets at various forums.

(3) The operation of the Erfgoedcel is mostly demand-oriented. City colleagues are welcome to receive advice, relevant referral, brainstorm, possibly training and the sharing of good practices. The Erfgoedcel also likes to connect heritage players with other services.

In the future, the Erfgoedcel will communicate its offer more pro-actively. Especially via the new website (to be launched Spring 2023) and the Newsletter, practices and experiences will be shared, through testimonials, trainings and calls. This carries farther than the own projects. The objective is to stimulate and trigger others to initiate action and initiatives themselves.

In all cases, the Erfgoedcel has the broad target group in mind, that is, mostly people outside the city structures. Therefore, it is difficult to take up concrete commitments in this assignment in relation to the specific target group of the city services. We do think that our actions fulfil part of the needs of the exercise towards sustainability. The website will, for instance, give an overview of heritage organisations, trainings, results and methodologies, calls (such as Heritage Day) and other projects. It will also highlight subsidy channels and successful subsidised projects, in order to function as a catalyst for new heritage project applications. This relates to the third focus (3), about which the consultation with the Department of Culture is ongoing. In addition, concrete meetings are also planned.

All these tools and channels can be employed by the city services, as one of our target groups and stakeholders. It does not belong to our mission, nor does the available time allow us to organise structural consultations between the city services, although the Erfgoedcel of course wants to support them and it wants to contribute to ensuing collaborations. Starting from the website, the meetings and the communication needs, we envisage for instance an important role for Mia, the intranet channel that can share information city-wide and that can develop into a place of experience with relation to neighbourhood heritage work. It is opportune that such a channel is carried by different players to evolve into a real-live platform/network that invites real meeting.

The Erfgoedcel's main objectives are, on the one hand, to inform the mentioned target groups broadly and on the other, to guide specific cases of individual questions. The questions and concrete actions about sustainability lie somewhat in the middle of those objectives and are rather city service-specific. We therefore see the role for the Erfgoedcel mainly in relation to the second policy recommendation via the tools mentioned. We are also curious about the further conversations with all the services and partners. Hopefully there is enough time to organise those."

Ghent Archives (GA)

Consultation and Cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the services and Departments of the city					
Role expectations	Description	Yes	Don't know	No	Motivation
Communicator	Engages the most suitable channels to share city-wide concrete actions and best practices	✓ ✓			On the different forums in which we participate (e.g., GentsArchievenOverleg) and project consultations (Square Kilometre STAM, Ghent Mapped with the University): sharing of initiatives, information and practices
Facilitator	Encourages the flow of information	✓			Idem
Facilitator	Puts a snowball effect on individual network results	✓			
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Promotes a city-wide perspective; employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations; launches concrete suggestions for consultation and cooperation in relation to cultural heritage	✓			Role for Erfgoedcel?

Memorialist	Captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire	✓			Keep contact with the services and institutions involved, engage them in student projects, stages, cultural heritage projects, ...
Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations					
Ambassador	Triggers the field actively and accessibly with cultural heritage, with the triggers linked as concretely as possible to the reality of the envisaged target group(s)	✓	✓		Educational collaborators take initiatives to reach target groups in order to engage them with archive and heritage
Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund					
Communicator	Shares the project sheets that were submitted to the CoGhent Co-Creation Fund				Via our channels we will share the possibilities of use of our collections
Communicator	Makes the new competition as widely known as possible	✓			Share the competition via our channels
Memorialist	Secures the project sheets of the projects submitted to the CoGhent Co-Creation Fund	✓			As part of the archive service, which is the core task of Ghent Archives
Memorialist	Reaches out with inspiring examples of the re-use of cultural heritage	✓	✓		Share on our website and via our channels

Huis van Alijn & Industriemuseum (HvA & IM)

Consultation and Cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the services and Departments of the city					
<i>Role expectations</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Motivation</i>
Communicator	Communicates about the priorities of each organisation based on their annual plannings and project initiatives	✓			Will communicate their own priorities based on the annual planning and project initiatives
Communicator	Engages the most suitable communication channels to share city-wide concrete actions and best practices			✓	Not as city-wide initiator; will communicate within own network
Facilitator	Encourages the flow of information		✓		
Facilitator	Puts a snowball effect on individual network results		✓		Not sure about the implications; will share and strengthen own network
Memorialist	Captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire	✓			When applied to own practices

Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations					
Ambassador	Triggers the field actively and accessibly with cultural heritage, with the triggers linked as concretely as possible to the reality of the envisaged target group(s)	✓			
Communicator	Facilitates the choice for the optimal communication channel(s) for cultural heritage		✓		Not sure of the meaning
Communicator	Shares best field practice cases	✓			
Communicator	Shares the 'calls' city-wide	✓			
Facilitator	Puts a snowball effect on individual network results		✓		Do not understand; ready to share and strengthen own networks
Memorialist	Captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire		✓		Evidently, we capture and share our own practices, but not those of others
Originalist	Triggers the organisations and associations with out-of-the-box perspectives for outreaching initiatives	✓			
Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund					
Coach	Guides the project applications for existing and future finance options via information sessions throughout the city	✓			We can co-guide information sessions funded on our own expertise
Communicator	Communicates about the cultural heritage offer in function of co-creation		✓		We can actively co-communicate (but not coordinate the communication)
Communicator	Makes the new competition as widely known as possible	✓			Actively co-communicate

The Social Cohesion Service (SCS)

Consultation and Cooperation of the cultural heritage institutions with the services and Departments of the city					
Role expectations	Description	Yes	Don't know	No	Motivation
Ambassador	Promotes the best practices on as many forums, consultation	✓			Towards other fieldwork partners, at neighbourhood level

	sessions and meetings as possible				
Communicator	Engages the most suitable channels to share city-wide concrete actions and best practices.	✓			Internal and external communication about concrete actions
Facilitator	Encourages the flow of information	✓			(Part of) regular exchange towards other field workers/methods and among own neighbourhood workers
Facilitator	Puts a snowball effect on individual network results		✓		Not clear. Networking at neighbourhood level is key task
Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Promotes a city-wide perspective; employs his/her associative capacity to connect people and organisations; launches concrete suggestions for consultation and cooperation in relation to cultural heritage	✓			Key role of the service: 'weaver' of neighbourhood organisations and citizens' groups in function of specific actions that support social cohesion. Neighbourhood workers have the freedom to work with cultural heritage. They must be encouraged and triggered in this respect.
Memorialist	Captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire	✓			Internally, within own service, towards field workers
Organiser	Is responsible for the practical organisation of the network event		✓		As party in a larger collaborative partnership
Outreaching heritage work by neighbourhood scouts, community workers, neighbourhood key figures and associations					
Ambassador	Triggers the field actively and accessibly with cultural heritage, with the triggers linked as concretely as possible to the reality of the envisaged target group(s)	✓			Yes, as partner organisation in a neighbourhood-oriented activity
Communicator	Creates an overview of the existing communication channels	✓			As part of the communication in relation to an activity or trajectory
Communicator	Shares best field practice cases	✓			As part of the follow-up actions of an activity, in order to inspire the field workers
Facilitator	Encourages the sharing of knowledge	✓			Tailored to our field workers. Heritage is one of the domains, topics and themes that can be used by the field workers to work on social cohesion, to bring groups together
Facilitator	Puts a snowball effect on individual network results	✓			

Helicopter / Bridge Builder / Connector	Launches concrete suggestions for joint outreaching work with cultural heritage	✓			At neighbourhood level, in function of specific collaborations and trajectories
Memorialist	Captures the best practices and brings them regularly back to the fore in order to inspire	✓			Internally, towards field workers and partner organisations
Organiser	Is responsible for the practical organisation of the network event		✓		As partner
Originalist	Triggers the organisations and associations with out-of-the-box perspectives for outreaching initiatives	✓			
Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund					
Ambassador	Brings the powerful story of the city to as many places as possible, with reference to the innovative cultural heritage initiatives in the neighbourhoods, the strengthening of the cultural infrastructure and the silo-transcending connection between different policy domains	✓			Yes, at neighbourhood level, towards other field work partners
Ambassador	Convinces the organisations and services to deposit a (limited) part of their resources in the Cultural Heritage Co-Creation Fund		✓		With the cultural capital as inducement, in relation to own financial resources ... and with the consent of the policy manager
Communicator	Communicates about the cultural heritage offer in function of co-creation	✓			At neighbourhood level, provided by another actor
Communicator	Supports more online presence	✓			When relevant, taken up in the social media at neighbourhood level
Communicator	Makes the new competition as widely known as possible	✓			At neighbourhood level, oriented towards small associations and citizens' groups
Facilitator	Facilitates the extension of existing co-creation initiatives		✓		On condition of opportunity for social cohesion at neighbourhood level
Memorialist	Reaches out with inspiring examples of the re-use of cultural heritage	✓			Starting from actions and trajectories at neighbourhood level

STAM

“The description of Connector/Bridge Builder is most in line with the mission of STAM: STAM explores as museum what makes Ghent, Ghent and the city, the city. It connects people of today with history and looks at the future of the city. STAM turns residents, users and visitors into involved parties and generously enters into partnerships.

Connecting is part of our core operation and we will continue to focus on this.”