



UNCHARTED  
**UNCHARTED**

Understanding, Capturing and Fostering the Societal Value of Culture



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

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Deliverable number</b> | D3.7  |
| <b>Title</b>              | Report on the technologies of evaluation in cultural production and heritage management |

|                                      |                                |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Due date</b>                      | Month 33                       |
| <b>Actual date of delivery to EC</b> | 15 <sup>th</sup> November 2022 |

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

**Project Coordinator:**

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

**Technical Coordinator:**

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

**Project WEB site address:**

<http://www.Uncharted-culture.eu>

**Context:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Partner responsible for deliverable</b> | UNIBO; Goldsmiths; UB  |
| <b>Deliverable author(s)</b>               | Paolo Ferri, Andrea Carlo Lo Verso, Cristina Boari, Luca Zan, Roberta Ferrarini UNIBO; Victoria D. Alexander, Oliver Peterson Gilbert, Goldsmiths; Arturo Rodriguez Morató, Matias I. Zarlenga, Ariadna Peralta Lladó, Glòria Guirao Soro, UB. |
| <b>Deliverable version number</b>          | 1  |
| <b>Dissemination Level</b>                 | Public   |

**Statement of originality:**

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise.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

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Introduction   | 5  |
| First pair – UNESCO and the evaluation of World Heritage Sites                       | 6  |
| 1. Threatening Venice (case 2.1)   | 7  |
| 1.1 Case background  | 7  |
| 1.2 Methodology  | 7  |
| 1.3 Findings   | 8  |
| 1.4 Technologies of evaluation   | 10 |
| 1.5 Tensions and their dynamics  | 11 |
| 2. Delisting Liverpool (case 2.2)  | 13 |
| 2.1 Case background  | 13 |
| 2.2 Methodology  | 14 |
| 2.3 Findings   | 14 |
| 2.4 Technologies of evaluation   | 18 |
| 2.5 Tensions and their dynamics  | 18 |
| 3. Pairwise comparison – cases 2.1 and 2.2   | 19 |
| Second pair - Art institution and participatory practices                            | 21 |
| 4. MUDEC: Evaluative tensions in a multicultural participatory initiative (case 2.3) | 21 |
| 4.1 Case background  | 21 |
| 4.2 Methodology  | 21 |
| 4.3 Findings: phases of participatory approaches at Mudec                            | 21 |
| 4.4 Technologies of evaluation   | 25 |
| 4.5 Tensions and their dynamics  | 26 |
| 5. Kick the Dust / Reimagine Remake Replay (case 2.4)                                | 28 |
| 5.1 Case background  | 28 |
| 5.2 Methodology  | 29 |
| 5.3 Findings: Programme and Project Level Evaluations                                | 29 |
| 5.4 Technologies of evaluation   | 33 |
| 5.5 Tensions and their dynamics  | 34 |
| 6. Pairwise comparison - cases 2.3 and 2.4   | 36 |
| Third pair: Architectural and Design Business  | 38 |
| 7. A Spanish architect firm. The case of the Fabra & Coats project (case 2.5)        | 38 |
| 7.1 Case background  | 38 |
| 7.2 Methodology  | 38 |
| 7.3. Technologies of evaluation  | 39 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 7.4. Tensions and their dynamics   | 42 |
| 8. A Spanish design firm. The case of the Antoni Arola studio (case 2.6) | 44 |
| 8.1. Case background   | 44 |
| 8.2. Methodology   | 44 |
| 8.3. Findings: phases, actors, practices                                 | 44 |
| 8.4. Technologies of evaluation  | 46 |
| 8.5 Tensions and their dynamics  | 48 |
| 9. Pairwise comparison - cases 2.5 and 2.6                               | 50 |
| 10. Topic-level discussion   | 52 |
| References   | 55 |

## Introduction

This topic explores the spectrum of evaluation technologies deployed in cultural production and heritage management. The concept of technologies of evaluation has been developed by Lamont (2012) on the basis of Knorr-Cetina's (1999) definition of technologies of knowledge, namely those "social and cultural structures that channel, constrain, define, and enable the production and evaluation of knowledge" and include, relative to evaluation, "method[s] of comparison, criteria, conventions (or customary rules), self-concepts, and other types of nonhuman supports" (Lamont, 2012, p. 211).

In cultural production and heritage management, technologies of evaluation are consistently employed by professionals to support their evaluative practices and account for different value regimes that may potentially affect evaluations. In fact, through our research work in WP2, we have learned how the production of culture is an endeavour heavily influenced by multiple and possibly contradictory values: economic, democratic, aesthetic, etc. This inherent plurality of values potentially gives rise to tense dynamics between actors. Technologies of evaluation are thus needed to structure these potential tensions: evaluative tensions are not just problems to be solved, but can be leveraged to foster creative frictions and push forward learning and production processes (Stark, 2009).

The selection of case studies analysed in the present deliverable is not intended as generative of an exhaustive typology of evaluation technologies and associated tensions. In the following we rather focus onto three pairs of cases that allows for a cross-level understanding of the effects of evaluation technologies employed in the areas of heritage and cultural production.

In a nutshell, in the first pair of cases (Liverpool and Venice), we explore the complex evaluation dynamics taking place when UNESCO assesses the permanence or exclusion of problematic sites into the World Heritage list. Venice and Liverpool's World Heritage sites were in 'hot moments' (Lamont, 2012: 213) – or those times which value conflicts may be most visible – as the two sites went through a period of uncertainty involving perceived issues with their authenticity and integrity. We observe here technologies of evaluation operating at the interface between professionals, political actors, and the civil society. Thus, the level of analysis is here mostly an inter-organisational one.

The rationale to explore the second pair of cases (Mudec and KtD/RRR) is the result of axiological and organisational parallels, both cases operating within existing heritage institutions and facilitating short-term programmes with explicit participation objectives. Crucially, both organisational systems focused on the participation of under-represented groups and sought to diversify access through practices of cultural democracy. A broadly conceived conception of 'participation', encompassing both increased engagement by varied publics and a democratisation of institutional governance, is thus shared across both case studies. In this pair of cases, the level of analysis is both inter- and intra-organisational, inasmuch as we explore both the internal intricacies of evaluative practices and the interface between professionals appointed to perform evaluations and the civil society involved in participatory activities.

Finally, the third pair of cases (architects and designers) offers an analysis of how evaluation technologies are employed at the intra and inter organizational level, in firms operating in highly professionalized sectors. The cases analysed correspond to architectural and design productions in the framework of public competitions (Christmas luminaire for the city and proposal for the reconversion of a former industrial site into a factory for artistic creation) and for conventional clients (production of lamps). We explore the evaluation technologies implemented in the pre-production, production and post-production phases of the design and architecture proposals studied. In the study, we observe how certain evaluations are enacted, encoded and stabilised through a complex interplay of actors, evaluative practices, evaluative reframing, objectivations and tensions.

## First pair – UNESCO and the evaluation of World Heritage Sites

UNESCO is an agency of the United Nations aimed at promoting world peace and security through international cooperation in education, arts, sciences and culture. The founding document is the World Heritage (WH) Convention, initially launched in 1972, so far signed by 193 member states and 11 associate members, as well as partners in the non-governmental, intergovernmental and private sector. The decisional body is the World Heritage Committee, made of delegates from each 'State Party'. State Parties are nation-states that have ratified or accepted the Convention, but while UNESCO refers only to 'State Parties', the individual government authority relative to WH sites could involve other institutions in the management of the 'property', such as local governmental authorities.

The World Heritage Convention sets out the role and expectations of the State Parties. State Parties pledge 'to conserve not only the World Heritage sites situated on its territory, but also to protect its national heritage. The States Parties are encouraged to integrate the protection of the cultural and natural heritage into regional planning programmes' (UNESCO, 1978). With these systems in place, there was a rapid increase in both ratified State Parties and World Heritage sites with State Parties able to nominate proposed World Heritage sites to the intergovernmental Heritage Committee with applications evaluated by members and three international advisory bodies

1978 saw the adoption of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* where the World Heritage Committee initially outlined the selection criteria for 'inscribing' properties on the World Heritage List and the operational guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Rules concerning the procedure for disciplining the inscription in the WH List remain defined by the *Operational Guidelines* which are updated periodically, with important changes particularly in the last two decades. In short, State Parties select properties in their national territory to be considered for inscription on the WH List (the so-called tentative list); final decisions are made annually by the World Heritage Committee. When a State Party propose a property, it gives details on how a property is protected and provides a management plan for its upkeep. State Parties are also expected to protect the World Heritage values of the inscribed properties and to report periodically on their condition.

The criteria for the inclusion of sites in the WH List are based on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the site. The OUV of cultural and natural sites is defined by Articles 1 and 2 of the WH Convention, and in 1997, the WH Committee started the conversation on a new interpretation of this definition (*Operational Guidelines*, 1997). Currently, OUV is defined as 'cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity' (*Operational Guidelines*, 2021: 24). From 2005, the WH Committee adopted two sets of criteria to define OUV, one set of criteria for cultural sites and another for natural sites. Also, it is possible for a site to be listed as a mixed site (cultural and natural). Moreover, to be deemed of OUV, a site must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity, must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding, and must meet at least one of the defined criteria (*Operational Guidelines*, 2005).

# 1. Threatening Venice (case 2.1)

## 1.1 Case background

This case study draws on documentary sources to investigate evaluative practices in the struggle over the safeguard of Venice. Venice and its Lagoon is one of the early sites listed in the WHL. The UNESCO site covers 70.176,4 ha of land and lagoon that are protected and managed by 21 different entities (nine municipalities, three superintendencies, two provinces, and seven other regional and national bodies).<sup>1</sup> Such entities are represented in the Steering Committee, coordinated by the City of Venice, and are responsible for the development and approval of the Management Plan of the property. The Site Manager is the city of Venice.<sup>2</sup>

The listing, occurred in 1987, was the result of a nine-year legislative and political journey involving several actors: the State Party (Italy), Venice City Council, the Venetian civil society, and UNESCO. As declared in the Inscription History, this delay rose institutional concern, with the World Heritage Committee expressing how paradoxical it was that Venice had not been included yet on the WHL since *“the inclusion of Venice on the World Heritage List will further strengthen the coherency of the cultural policy of UNESCO”* (ICOMOS 1987). Venice was eventually listed as “Venice and its Lagoon”: the name of the site underlines the tight relation between the city (cultural heritage) and the lagoon (natural heritage). Though, the property was classified as just “cultural site”, since mixed sites did not exist in the early years of UNESCO WHL.

After Venice being listed in the WHL, more than 20 years passed without any significant exchange between UNESCO and the State Party. However, interactions between these two actors increased during the 2010s. 2013 is the year when the Retrospective Statements of OUV was adopted: the Venice and its Lagoon WH site, which was listed before the OUV criteria were established, retrospectively spelled out the criteria for having being inscribed. All six cultural criteria of the UNESCO procedure identify Venice and its Lagoon as a Cultural WH site.<sup>3</sup> Pivotal for what here matters, the property maintained the original nature of a cultural site: to be transformed into a mixed site, in fact, would have implied a new listing application to the UNESCO WHL.

## 1.2 Methodology

Few main documents collected were analytically considered: UNESCO 2016 and 2020 Report, UNESCO Decision 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, City of Venice 2015 and 2017 Report. As far as documents are concerned, we

---

<sup>1</sup> The responsible bodies for the protection and management of the property are: Veneto Region, Province of Padua, Province of Venice, Municipality of Venice, Municipality of Campagna Lupia, Municipality of Cavallino-Treporti, Municipality of Chioggia, Municipality of Codevigo, Municipality of Mira, Municipality of Musile di Piave, Municipality of Jesolo, Municipality of Quarto D’Altino, Regional Department of Cultural Heritage and Landscape of Veneto, Superintendence of Architectural Heritage and Landscape of Venice and its Lagoon, Superintendence of Archaeological Heritage of Veneto, Superintendence of Historical and Artistic Heritage of Venice and of the municipalities in the lagoon boundary area, Superintendence of the Archives of Veneto, State Archive of Venice, Diocesi of Venice, Venice Water Authority and Port Authority of Venice.

<sup>2</sup> Who is the Site Manager of Venice and its Lagoon remains still unclear to us. In the official documentation provided by UNESCO, ICOMOS or RAMSAR the Site Manager is the “City of Venice”, but no further information explains what does this mean. In the reports provided by the State Party, the Site Manager is not mentioned until the City of Venice 2017 report, signed by “The Mayor of the City of Venice, as site manager of the World Heritage Property Venice and its lagoon” (City of Venice 2017 report, p. 69).

<sup>3</sup> The six Cultural Criteria are specified as follows: “I. To represent a masterpiece of human creative genius... II. To exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; III. To bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared; IV. To be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history; V. To be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change; VI. To be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance”.

have already carried out an aggregate-level analysis. This analysis was carried out on each document to understand:

- The structure of the dialogue, with a focus on the level of consistency between the UNESCO recommendations and the responses of the site managers.
- The contents of the reports, with a focus on the argument chains employed by the actors. Recommendation-level analysis.

In addition to analysing the documents mentioned above, we conducted interviews to explore the implications of UNESCO and State Party institutional complexity on valuation processes. Specifically, we carried out interviews with a) UNESCO-RAMSAR expert of the 2016 and 2020 Missions Team (Tobias Salthe) b) the responsible of the Municipality of Venice UNESCO Office (Katia Basili), c) the President of the Venice Department of the national association Italia Nostra (Lidia Fersuoch), d) International Law and UNESCO expert Professor (Marco Gestri).

### 1.3 Findings

The beginning of the debate on the conditions of the site dates back to 2014 when civil society (led by Italia Nostra, a national association for the safeguard of historical, artistic and natural heritage of Italy) addressed to UNESCO the poor state of maintenance and management of Venice and its Lagoon. Consequent to this notification, the case of Venice and its Lagoon was discussed in the 38<sup>th</sup> meeting of the WH Committee (UNESCO Decision 38), where two decisions were taken:

First, to run a “joint” UNESCO/ICOMOS/RAMSAR reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2015, to assess current conditions of the property. Noticeable, the term “joint” refers to the interdisciplinary composition of the team, needed because of the complex nature (cultural and natural) of Venice and its Lagoon.

Second, to request the State Party to produce a progress report on the state of conservation of the property. In the case of Venice and its Lagoon, the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage used to delegate UNESCO-related tasks and duties to the local government. Through the years, especially from the beginning of this controversy, the Ministry got progressively more involved. Though, the compilation of the States of Conservation has always been delegated to the Venice City Council (specifically, the office for UNESCO).

If the State of Conservation report by the State Party (City of Venice 2015 report) resulted in a brief technical document (23 pages) on the ongoing projects and protection measures adopted, the outcome of the mission is an extensive report on the conditions of the site, published in 2016 (UNESCO 2016 report). The effectiveness of the short mission is partly based on the professional routines set up within UNESCO procedures in the involvements of professional bodies (ICOMOS, and in this case RAMSAR, with their representatives in both 2016 and 2020 reports, respectively an architect and a biologist, together with a UNESCO officer); but previous knowledge on the Venetian context is, as well, pivotal.<sup>4</sup>

What emerged from this first mission report is an overall state of degradation of the site, with severe threats to its tangible, intangible, cultural, and mostly natural heritage (in terms of threat to its environment). The report identifies several issues, but the main problems are seen to regard four areas: environmental, economic and social sustainability, and heritage conservation (plus issues in managing the site). In this document, the main concern is on environmental and social sustainability, and mainly linked to over-tourism and its unsustainable impacts on other economic activities, living conditions, depopulation and so on. The report ends up with a set of 23 recommendations to the Site Manager that should solve the issues of the site.

In the following gathering of the WH Committee, the reported state of conservation of the WH Venice site was discussed. The output of this session is the UNESCO Decision 40: for the first time Venice is threatened to be inscribed in the list of World Heritage in Danger if no substantial progresses are achieved within the following year. In fact, despite the concern for the overall condition of the site, the UNESCO Decision 40

---

<sup>4</sup> If UNESCO and ICOMOS were involved since 1987, RAMSAR started to work with the Province of Venice in 2004 for the environmental preservation of the lagoon as natural heritage.



leaves margin to future improvements on the property, that would cancel the threat of declaring Venice an in-danger site. As normal practice, UNESCO Decision 40 asked the State Party to submit an updated State of Conservation.

This time, the state of conservation (City of Venice 2017 report) was extremely different from the 2015 one, with a strong political connotation linked to recent changes at the local government, linking issues to arguments during the political campaign and the 'mayor document'.<sup>5</sup> It is not a technical reply to UNESCO Decision 40, but an actual stance against UNESCO's evaluation of the property linked to recent changes in the local government, within an extremely extensive document (636 pages). If previous (and following) States of Conservation reports were written by the UNESCO Office of Venice Municipality, the 2017 report is written by the responsible of the Tourism Department within the new City Council. Referring to the UNESCO 2016 report, the document calls out UNESCO for ignoring the real state of conservation of the site. The aim is one hand to defend the current administration, on the other to provide justification for ongoing problems. Depending on the topic considered, different reply strategies are adopted. The three most popular ones are: a) the Municipality agrees with UNESCO on values and evaluation, only justifications are provided (e.g., the wave motion); b) the Municipality agrees on values, but disagrees on the evaluation, and the actions are missing (e.g., depopulation); c) the Municipality openly disagrees on values and on evaluation, opting for different priorities (e.g., Big ships and tourism) while ignoring negative consequence for sustainable development.

The years from 2017 to 2020 are characterized by an intense sequence of UNESCO Decisions on the one hand, and States of Conservation issued by the State Party on the other. In this period, politics leaves the stage back to professionals: the reports and decisions show technical knowledge, rather than a political interest. The UNESCO Decisions 41 (2017), and 43 (2019) express concern for few ongoing activities in the WH sites, but at the same time they welcome the progresses reported by the State Party and recognize that improvements had been made in the property. The possibility of inscribing the site in the list of World Heritage in danger, though, still remains. In parallel, two States of Conservation reports by the State Party (2018, 2020-21) were produced by Venice City Council, as requested by UNESCO's decisions. These two reports (the second is integrated by a follow-up Covid19-wise document in the beginning of 2021), are respectively of 116 and 75 pages, presenting a technical description of the conditions of the site and offering further information to integrate and update the City of Venice 2017 report. During this term, the diplomatic relationship between Venice City Council (and Venice Major) and UNESCO central office were denoted by the reciprocal will of pursuing a shared solution for the WH site.

This three-year period is concluded by a second UNESCO/ICOMOS/RAMSAR joint mission, proactively invited by the Venice City Council. The following UNESCO 2020 Report, published in January 2021, is structured in 54 recommendations, depicting an even-worst scenario than in 2015. Though the discussion between experts were addressing more positively analysis and issues, no significant solutions have been taken in the period. The report criticises the performance of the site administration (State Party, Site Manager, Steering Committee, and all relevant authorities and stakeholders) and of the State Party, pointing out the absence of substantial improvements in the management of the site and the solution of existing problems.<sup>6</sup> Given the dramatic scenario described in the report, the draft proposed for decision at the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee foreseen the eventual inclusion of Venice and its Lagoon in the list of World Heritage in Danger.

During the convention, the Ethiopia's delegate Henok Teferra opposed to the inclusion of Venice in the so-called "black list", saying that the Italian government's decision on 13 July to ban large cruise ships from

---

<sup>5</sup> Important to noticed, the whole Unesco events in 2014-15 took place in the context of a political and crisis in the local government ("*Commissariamento*", a period of extraordinary administration), with new election eventually whom by the new major who in his campaign, was supporting the development of big ships and tourism in his campaign.

<sup>6</sup> "Although the State Party has addressed issues related to the governance and management system of the property, the Mission found that significant progress has not been made for improving the inter-sectoral cooperation between the different stakeholders. [...]the State Party should review the governance of the property especially the mandate of the site management team and the Steering Committee." UNESCO 2020 report (2020) pg. 6

entering the city centre followed the main recommendations of the 2020 report, as well as measurable progress were made according to the recommendations of the UNESCO Decision 43 (2019). Finally, he emphasised the ongoing dialogue between the Italian State Party and the World Heritage Centre. The diplomatic pressure beyond the Ethiopian delegate intervention — succeeded in subverting the initial draft of the UNESCO Decision 43. As a result, not only the proposal by the experts of actually inserting Venice and its Lagoon on the list of in danger suites was stopped, but also any further threat to put the site on the list of WH in danger was weakened, at least until the next WH Committee session in 2023.

## 1.4 Technologies of evaluation

### *Configuration of actors and organizations*

Rather than simplify a dialogue between two actors (UNESCO and Venice), the analysis shows that the actors in this case study can be articulated according to the institutional level considered (international, national, local) and their roles (political, administrative/technical).

Concerning the international level, UNESCO is a supranational entity that rely on technical bodies (as usual ICOMOS, plus in the Venice case RAMSAR) and a political one (the WH Committee – UNESCO decisional body). For what matters in this case, it is important to distinguish between the role of experts and the Committee in valuing and evaluating the Reports and the Decisions.

At the national level, the actors involved in the management of UNESCO WH sites are the Ministry for Cultural Heritage and Activities. In practice, though, the Ministry did not play a significant role “during” the controversy over Venice WH site. On one hand the main responsibilities were delegated to local government (Venice city office for Unesco issues); on the other, when in critical turning point, the Ministry and the Central government made important legislative acts to give signals of stopping big ships in the lagoon (just before the decision of the WH).

At the local level the main actor is the Venice City Council and its administrative apparatus. Here it is possible to distinguish between the political level, given by the elected Mayor and Councillors, and the administrative one, which has technical and professional competences. As well as for the national and international levels, the professionals can influence political decisions, but the decisional power stays in the hands of the political bodies. At the local level, it is possible to identify also the civil society, which played a pivotal role in raising international concern on the case of Venice.

### *Formality, rational elaboration, publicity and salience*

The case study is connoted by high level of formality for the dialogue between parts, which is made of written documents such as reports, laws, formal decisions, administrative papers. On the procedural level, however, the exchange between parties is far from being routinized and formalised, for the very peculiar nature of the WH site (a cultural and natural site managed as a cultural one).

### *Context and time*

In the WH sites scenario, Venice and Its Lagoon is a peculiar case. First of all, it is one of the early sites to be listed as world heritage, according to operating procedures at that time. Acknowledged as one of the pillars of UNESCO WH list, actually, it was listed without any formal procedure of assessment, carried out retrospectively in 2013, almost 26 years later. Secondly, the issues of this site were well-known since the very beginning, hence is exactly the need of protecting Venice in its fragile nature that pushed the listing of the site in the UNESCO heritage. Lastly, being Venice and Its Lagoon a vast site, with multiple natural, cultural and social aspects, the case is a picture of multi-dimensional issues that involve different disciplines.

Despite the six criteria of UNESCO that should provide a fixed picture of the values identified in the WH cultural heritage site, in the reports of UNESCO/ICOMOS/RAMSAR representatives the site is enriched by additional values that also imply environmental, economic and social aspects. More than a conflict between preservation and development (that could be found in old documents by Unesco, 1969), the UNESCO/ICOMOS/RAMSAR experts propose a problematization of the different dimensions of sustainability.

The valuation/evaluation practices were triggered by the UNESCO mission to Venice in 2015 (UNESCO report 2016), and by the subsequent Decision 40 by the WH Committee (2017). This started a controversial discussion between UNESCO and Venice City Council (made of annual reports by the municipality of Venice - Venice 2017, 2018, 2020; and UNESCO decisions - Decision 40, 41, 43, 44). The back-and-forth between the two entities ended with a second UNESCO mission in 2020 (Unesco Report 2020), and the following UNESCO Decision 44.

### 1.5 Tensions and their dynamics

Four main tensions can be identified in the Venice and lagoon case:

1. *Sustainable development vs Exploitation*: the tension exists due to the impossibility of finding feasible solutions that would benefit economic development, without compromising the ecosystem or the city fabric in its social, economic and heritage preservation. During most of the process, there is an open conflict on these topics (UNESCO 2016 vs Venice 2017), lately it transformed in a latent conflict, where the threats were eventually dropped, despite only marginal improvements at the political level (Decision 44). The tension is steady and unresolved. Despite the controversial dialogue on the topic, the only actual provision taken to mitigate this tension is the ban of big touristic ships from the San Marco Basin/Giudecca channel, which represent only a partial solution to the bigger issue of big vessels navigating the Lagoon. On the other aspects, no real solution is sought by Venice City Council.
2. *Professional vs political*: this tension undercovers a tridimensional scenario of clashes within the two main institutional actors (UNESCO and Venice City Council). This tension is given by the voicing role of professionals (UNESCO Office of the Municipality, ICOMOS, RAMSAR) in raising the multilevel issues of Venice and Its Lagoon. In the dialogue between professionals, there is agreement on the critical situation of the site, which leveraged a smooth collaboration between the parties despite the intense political debate. On the other side, the political parties (Venice City Council, Italian Government, UNESCO WH Committee) do not agree on the evaluation of the site, but despite that there is a convergence of political interests that, fed by different motivations, led to a common action. The tension between the professional and the political evaluations was tacit in the beginning, then radicalized by the election of a new City Council in 2015, then somehow normalized. Despite a long and in-depth process of valuing and evaluating across years, the UNESCO Decision 43 was driven by diplomatic interest rather than by a technical evaluation of the state of conservation of the site. The political bargain might mitigate the threat to Venice and Its Lagoon on paper, but accentuated the vulnerability of the site on the level of conservation measure. All in all: Ambiguity and bargaining, political compromise delegitimizing professionals.

|                | <b>Professional bodies</b>  | <b>Political levels</b>  |
|----------------|---|--|
| <b>local</b>   | Voicing interdisciplinary professional values<br>(Unesco Office in Venice Hall) | Loyalty to exploitation whatever sustainable<br>(Venice Govt)          |
| <b>central</b> | Voicing interdisciplinary professional values<br>(Icomos & Ramsar)              | Loyalty to cultural diplomacy affairs<br>(central Govt & WH Committee) |

3. *Organizational logic vs juridical logic*: this is the tension between the problem-solving approach led by UNESCO (identify the problem and solutions to the problem) and the juridical logic of institutions involved in the managing of the site, that has to act within boundary conditions (jurisdiction, laws, power structure, decisional power, financial resources etc.) and institutional fragmentation (not a unitary site manager; steering committee). This tension, arose within the institutions, is made hidden in the institutional formal debate, but explicit in the interviews held for the research. There is a constant tension among international institutions and the ones who manages the site, especially at the officers' level. On one side, UNESCO/ICOMOS/RAMSAR provide solutions without the power of put them into practice, on the other the local administrators face contingent pressures and boundaries in their actions, that depend on upper political choices and broader routines in current jurisdictions.
4. *Participation vs Delegated authority*: civil society is pivotal to the case but has little power in the dialogue between UNESCO and the City Council. There is unbalance of information and of representation in the evaluation dynamic. The extent to which non-institutional actors can intervene in the institutional debate is not given at the formal level, while at the press level, where public discussion arose, it is openly discussed. Interesting to notice, this actor gains a quite marginal role in the documents and in the analysis: but it was it that was triggering the whole set of events in the yearly 2010ies. This tension is not resolved and it continuously emerges in the public discussion.

## 2. Delisting Liverpool (case 2.2)

This case study focused on UNESCO's removal of the Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City (LMMC), located in Liverpool UK, from its list of World Heritage (WH) Sites. This 'delisting' was many years in the making, and crucially, it highlights values, value tensions, and evaluation processes in the arena of heritage management. The case study is based on documentary analysis, which involved a close reading of written sources, from 2004 to 2021, which shed light on (1) LMMC inscription criteria, (2) ongoing UNESCO evaluations, and (3) reaction to UNESCO's evaluation. The analysis covers UNESCO, Government agencies from the United Kingdom, Liverpool City Council, and a range of interested parties, such as developers and Liverpool-based cultural organisations.

After a brief introduction to LMMC, we discuss the values that are *encoded* in the processual documents used in the election and ultimate deletion of the LMMC site, alongside an assessment of values present in UK planning regulations. This is followed by a study of the *enaction* of values in practice. Here the case study looks to the value justifications used by various invested parties when positioning themselves within the development/preservation value opposition – an opposition central to the debate surrounding the LMMC site. We also discuss temporal changes in the alignment of actors, which heightens or diminishes ongoing value conflicts. The case study closes with an overview of findings which are relevant to the comparison across all UNCHARTED case studies.

### 2.1 Case background

LMMC was listed as a WH Site in 2004. However, 17 years later, in July 2021, UNESCO's World Heritage Committee voted to delete LMMC from the UNESCO WH Site listings. As the minutes record, the Committee noted:

the irreversible loss of attributes conveying the Outstanding Universal Value of the property along with significant loss to its authenticity and integrity [...] the State Party has not fulfilled its obligations defined in the Convention with respect to protecting and conserving the OUV, as inscribed, of the World Heritage property [of LMMC]. (UNESCO, 2021)

The decision to delist LMMC was the culmination of years of wrangling between UNESCO, local developers, and Liverpool City Council regarding the development planned for Liverpool's 19<sup>th</sup> Century waterfront. Indeed, UNESCO initially placed LMMC on the *World Heritage In Danger List* in 2012 on the grounds of a perceived rejection of UNESCO recommendations to cease planning permissions for developments seen to infringe on heritage assets. In this, UNESCO was prompted to act when Liverpool City Council granted planning permission to developments within the designated limits of the WH Site (the £5.5 billion 'Liverpool Waters' mixed-used development and the £500 million football stadium at Bramley-Moore Dock).

Our analysis shows that while the State Party (UK government and Liverpool City Council) draws on a rhetoric of 'heritage-led development', in its actions, it ultimately values the potential of the LMMC site for economic development over LMMC's role in heritage preservation. Indeed, a key element in the case is Liverpool Council's expression of neoliberal values (McGuigan, 2016) through its support of private-led, investment-orientated developers. Moreover, the tension between heritage preservation and economic development is well established<sup>7</sup>, and it plays a key role in our case; however, we also argue that viewing this conflict as a straightforward binary opposition (as it is often cast) oversimplifies complex positions of different actors involved.

The seeds for Liverpool's WH Site application were planted by the Historic Environment of Liverpool Project (HELP) Consortium in 2002. HELP aimed to support the preservation and the development of the city's built

---

<sup>7</sup> The structural tension between the values of heritage preservation and the values ascribed to socio-economic development in the context of neoliberal planning regimes is well established (Van Oers and Roders, 2014; Barthel-Bouchier, 2012; Biddulph, 2011).

environment, temporarily cojoining two opposing values via a fragile coalition (which disbanded in 2010).<sup>8</sup> Liverpool had been on the so-called Tentative List of potential UK WH Sites since 1999, responding to the World Heritage Committee's 1994 Global Strategy which had identified 'industrial heritage' as a significant gap in World Heritage Listings (UNESCO, 2015). HELP spearheaded the successful application to UNESCO for WH status for 136 hectares of Liverpool's historic built environment. As a WH Site, LMMC achieved a globally recognised heritage value. Thus, the analysis suggests that WH status is a means of value stabilisation, one that is grounded in the intrinsic preservationist values that ascribed a particular 'worth' to the site.

In recent years, many local and national governments have looked to culture-led regeneration initiatives to overcome social and economic deprivation (Sykes et al., 2013; Kinsella, 2021), an issue that is relevant in Liverpool, which has a very high level of deprivation and unemployment (Belchem, 2006). HELP positioned LMMC as 'an exemplary demonstration of sustainable development and heritage-led regeneration' (Liverpool City Council, 2003). In other words, HELP (including Liverpool City Council) valued LMMC for its regenerative potential, and for such instrumental factors as tourism, inward investment, global branding, and socio-economic benefits (Biddulph, 2011:98; Boland *et al.* 2022). This initially aligned with UNESCO's vision for WH Sites, but the differences in value regimes subsequently led to a rupture.

Instrumental values are central to (e)valuations in market-orientated 'neoliberal' planning regimes that often inform and justify local government decision making in the UK (Harvey, 1989; Baeten, 2017; Ferm et al., 2021). However, such value regimes ultimately stand at odds with the preservationist values of UNESCO's World Heritage programme. The ensuing conflict which forms the basis of our analysis can be broadly conceived as the value tension between instrumental values (development) and intrinsic values (preservation) as they are actioned in the technologies of evaluation.

## 2.2 Methodology

We axiologically coded over 100 public documents to understand (1) *encoded values* found in evaluative tools such as policies and regulations, and (2) *enacted values* found in the actions and reactions of various parties across LMMC's preservation / heritage value conflict. This axiological approach allowed us to capture the relationship between the *codified* values that are written into the mechanisms of evaluation and the *emergent* values that actors produce when they deploy evaluative mechanisms.

## 2.3 Findings

### *Encoded Values*

In looking into technologies of evaluation, we studied written frameworks from UNESCO. (We also studied analogous material from the Planning Inspectorate for England and Wales). For UNESCO, key aspects include:

- UNESCO's operationalisation of Outstanding Universal Value
- UNESCO's operationalisation of Authenticity
- UNESCO's operationalisation of Integrity
- Regulations relating to inscription to 'World Heritage in Danger' status
- Regulations relating to Deletion from the WH Site Listings

In brief, UNESCO's value regime exists to protect heritage sites from 'changing social and economic conditions' (UNESCO, 1972:1), and this is codified via its notion of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). OUV is operationalised through a sequence of criteria set out in its *Operational Guidelines*. At inscription, LMMC met 3 of the 6 criteria for OUV in cultural heritage sites.

---

<sup>8</sup> The *Liverpool Echo's* Stop the Rot campaign in 2000 underpinned the formation of the HELP Consortium in 2002. The Consortium included English Heritage, Liverpool City Council, North West Development Agency, National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside, Liverpool Vision, and the Liverpool Culture Company (Stonnard, 2003).

UNESCO's definitions of 'integrity' and 'authenticity' are evaluative benchmarks that underpin OUV and are important in value stabilisation. These benchmarks are central to UNESCO's continual monitoring of WH Sites, to gauge alignment to UNESCO criteria set out in the site's inscription. However, if UNESCO determines that sites currently do, or in the future will, fail to meet OUV criteria, two further sets of regulations can be implemented: *In-Danger Status* and *Deletion*. Evaluative frameworks embedded in each of these regulations were applied to LMMC.

Inscription onto the *List of World Heritage in Danger* exists as a 'disciplinary instrument' for non-compliance (Hølleland et al., 2018). Sites can be listed due to present ('ascertained') or future ('potential') dangers which may have 'deleterious' effects on the site (UNESCO, 2021). The criteria used relative to the *In Danger* lists are clearly located on the development / preservation value opposition, as four of the six types of threat listed in the regulations relate to development. LMMC was inscribed onto the *In Danger* list for potential threats (current plans for future development) rather than ascribed threats.

To remove a WHS from the *In Danger* status, State Parties have to produce a specific report to evidence realignment with preservationist values within the WH Site. If this report fails, the World Heritage Committee may consider deleting the site from the WHS listings. The justifications for delisting are infused with a value grammar which explicitly mentions the threat of human action (development) to the intrinsic qualities of a WH Site.

These (and other) encoded values, which are written into laws, rules, regulations, and policies, set the 'rules of the game'. They are very important technologies of evaluation; however, understanding encoded values provides only a partial picture. It is also very important to understand how different players enact these values through application of and reactions to the encoded values and independently, outside the influence of the encoded values.

#### *Enacted Values*

Turning to the performed evaluation procedures, we mapped the enactment of values through evaluative practices of various parties. Certain actors, notably UNESCO and UK government agencies, are relevant both to *encoded values* and to *enactment of values in performed evaluation procedures*. These two spaces of axiological analysis are distinct, if interdependent.

UNESCO's World Heritage Committee applies election criteria to potential sites, a crucial evaluative process. As noted, LMMC was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2004 under the UNESCO criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv), which evidenced the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. UNESCO's Heritage Committee sits at regular intervals to discuss the management of the active WH Sites and to add new sites to the WH listings. This allowed us to trace the decision-making process across nine Heritage Committee meetings where LMMC deletion has been discussed.

As noted, the majority evaluation undertaken by UNESCO in Liverpool was not focused upon actual physical activities or structures that undermine OUV but on *potential* threats related to planning proposals that had been granted permission by the local government planners. Here values are enacted by local government actors when granting such planning permissions pertaining to the encoded values in the UK's National Planning Framework (rather than those of UNESCO). There is significant ambiguity in the Planning Framework that offers both some protections to historic assets but allows for 'public benefits' of development to overrule more protectionist value regimes (Roswell, 2014; Parkinson, 2020).

In the UK, increasingly deregulated neoliberal planning regimes emphasise instrumental values, and claims about public benefits *can* be deployed against heritage preservation. Moreover, the 2000s marked an epoch shift in the regeneration and development agenda in Liverpool, moving towards an investment-orientated private-led agenda in response, in part, to the austerity measures in public finance instigated by the UK Government (Fageir, et al., 2021). This shift in values at a local and national level had direct consequences in the calcification of the development/preservation value opposition. A lack of local authority funds and subsequent the turn to the private sector to fill the gaps cut from the public sector increased the valuation of inward investment considerably and strengthened the public value of development in the eyes of the planners.

UNESCO's *State of Conservation* reports between 2005 and 2020 deployed OUV, integrity and authenticity as key evaluative technologies to justify a critique of the State Party in approving development in the WH Site. By 2012, when Liverpool's site was inscribed on UNESCO's *World Heritage in Danger List*, the report

strongly urges the State Party to reconsider the proposed development to ensure the continued coherence of the architectural and town-planning attributes, and the continued safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property including the conditions of authenticity and integrity. (UNESCO, 2012)

The 'negative factors affecting the property' which are presented as undermining LMMC's OUV remain relatively consistent across the sixteen *State of Conservation Reports* and again are in a future temporality. These negative factors are framed as four 'lacks' within planning and built environment practice in Liverpool—including the perceived absence of overall management, missing regulations on building heights, and a lack of awareness of OUV among developers and the wider public (UNESCO, 2015)—which UNESCO presented as *not* being resolved by Liverpool City Council.

However, despite the relative consistency in the critiques between 2005 and 2020, certain flashpoints exist in the value conflict between development objectives of the city and the preservationist values of UNESCO. Indeed, while UNESCO supported Liverpool's claims to OUV, authenticity, integrity in the initial LMMC application in 2004, it was unequivocal in recommending that

Authorities pay particular attention to monitoring the processes of change in the World Heritage areas and their surroundings in order not to adversely impact the property. This concerns especially changes in use and new construction [...] applying its planning procedures rigorously. (UNESCO, 2004)

Only a year after inscription, plans for a new Museum of Liverpool building, a new Liverpool ferry terminal, and a major mixed-used commercial development, all within the bounds of the World Heritage Site, inspired an UNESCO-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission (UNESCO, 2006). While the architectural and heritage community were unequivocal in their criticisms of these developments, UNESCO, perhaps surprisingly, was supportive of the contentious development:

The mission concluded that the urban development projects currently in planning or underway...were not an imminent threat to the site's Outstanding Universal Value. These conservation areas are intertwined with highly fragmented and degraded areas earmarked for regeneration, by which coherence and setting will be improved. (UNESCO, 2006)

Rodwell (2014: 9) suggests that in supporting this development, ICOMOS were 'inhibited by the insistence upon *contemporary* in the 2005 UNESCO Vienna Memorandum'. This Memorandum stated that 'interventions in the historic environment should avoid all forms of pseudo-historical design, as they constitute a denial of both the historical and the contemporary alike' (UNESCO, 2005). Therefore, despite the stability of OUV criteria, the *Vienna Memorandum* triggered a momentary destabilisation of values within UNESCO. This highlights the importance of overarching policy values on the evaluation, and ultimately valuation, of development within WH Sites.

The 2005 *Vienna Memorandum* was supplanted in 2011 by UNESCO's new instrument, the *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape* (UNESCO, 2011). This restabilised more preservationist values regarding the status of contemporary developments within WH Sites. Indeed, this change provided the basis for moving Liverpool's WH Site to the *In-Danger* list in 2012 (see Rodwell, 2019). An ICOMOS-UNESCO reactive mission to Liverpool took place in 2012 in response to the new planning application for a new development, 42% of which was situated within the LMMC site (ICOMOS, 2011). The proposed *Liverpool Waters* site was marketed as largest regeneration scheme in Europe. It would occupy a predominately disused area and included plans for residential units, offices, tourist facilities (including a cruise liner terminal) and car parking (Wilding, 2012).

Despite opposition from the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), English Heritage, and various civic heritage groups, Liverpool City Council had granted planning consent to *Liverpool Waters*.



This points to the influence of neoliberal planning regimes in the UK (see Ferm et al., 2021).<sup>9</sup> In response, UNESCO stated its concern that the development would undermine OUV (UNESCO, 2012). At this point, Liverpool and UNESCO drew on increasingly divergent values, and the World Heritage Committee decided to ‘inscribe [LMMC] on the *List of World Heritage in Danger*, with the possibility of deletion of the property from the World Heritage List, should the current project be approved and implemented’ (UNESCO 2021). In this way, UNESCO offered a clear ultimatum to Liverpool, with the aim to instigate a value realignment in the LMMC site.

The 2014, 2015, and 2016 *State of Conservation* reports and associated World Heritage Committee Minutes all agree to retain the Liverpool site on the List of World Heritage in Danger; however, 2017 onwards marked a distinct change in tone. Recommendations moved away from measures which would move the Liverpool site off the *In Danger* list and towards measures which would stop the site’s imminent deletion from the WH listings. However, such disciplinary technologies did not reverse Liverpool’s approval of the Liverpool Waters development. There was a strong tension between UNESCO’s interventionist objectives and the market-led values of Liverpool City Council, and from UNESCO’s vantage point,

the stated inability of the State Party to control further developments, clearly reflect inadequate governance systems and planning mechanisms that will not allow the State Party to comply with Committee Decisions and will result in ascertained threat on the OUV of the property.’ (UNESCO, 2019).

As a result, UNESCO delisted LMMC in July 2021 for not complying with the demands UNESCO set out to avoid deletion. Despite some acquiescence to UNESCO’s demands by the State Party, UNESCO’s evaluation was that the proposed Liverpool Waters development contravened the valuation criteria encoded by UNESCO. However, the Liverpool Waters development did match valuation criteria employed by actors in Liverpool City Council. This suggests the existence of an ultimate value disunity underpinned by two opposing value regimes and which are operationalised by different technologies of evaluation.

The key tension described in the case is a binary opposition between development and preservation. Two caveats are needed to understand how this tension is enacted in Liverpool. First, this overarching tension exists in settings across the globe and is well-understood as a clear opposition. Nevertheless, the binary obscures nuance. For instance, development may involve a rapacious orientation focused only on profits and rents to be had from new construction; in contrast, it could involve a strong social element (such as jobs creation or affordable housing), environmental concerns (sustainability), or sensitivity to heritage (as in heritage-led development). In Liverpool, the City Council, developers, and local cultural organisations framed the proposed Liverpool Waters project as providing socio-economic benefits to a deprived area of the city (aspects which were apparently outside the scope of UNESCO’s evaluations in Liverpool). It was also cast as being designed sensitively around existing heritage (by the City Council, the UK Planning Directorate, and the developers themselves), as well as being judged a significant threat to such heritage (by UNESCO and some British heritage bodies). Similar nuances are found on both sides of the binary opposition.

Second, while the binary value tension can be seen as enduring, it is also important to note the temporal dimension in the case. There are moments when the tension was hidden or suppressed, such as in the formation of HELP Consortium or at the moment that LMMC was inscribed as a WH Site. Alignment occurs when players set aside disagreements to reach a common goal and also when some players (e.g., commercial developers) are temporarily absent from the game. At other moments, the tension is heightened, when players’ interests change or when a new (or dormant) player joins the game.

---

<sup>9</sup> Three Heritage Impact Assessments were conducted for the proposed Liverpool Waters development. As Patiwaal et al. (2020) show, two of these supported the development and one was critical of it. The positive Heritage Impact Assessments were commissioned by Liverpool City Council and by Peel Holdings, the developer, while the negative Heritage Impact Assessment was produced by English Heritage. This demonstrates that technologies of evaluation are tied to the value regimes of their commissioners and serve as advocacy; they are not impartial evaluations.

## 2.4 Technologies of evaluation

### *Configuration of actors and organisations*

In the case report above, we have focused mostly on values encoded by UNESCO and UNESCO's enactment of these values through the application of codes via evaluation procedures, to shed light on technologies of evaluation in the case. Broadly speaking, UNESCO and a range of UK heritage bodies subscribe to a value regime of heritage protectionism. In contrast, UK and local government bodies are immersed in a market-oriented or neoliberal value regime. Cultural organisations in Liverpool and local and national media are not involved in formal evaluation of the WH Site or local development; however, they are part of the ecosystem of public opinion.

### *Formality, rational elaboration, publicity and salience*

There is a high level of formality with significant written material prepared by both UNESCO and the State Party. While judgement criteria, such as OUV, Authenticity and Integrity are set out as rational and clearly elaborated as encoded values, when these values are enacted through actions (evaluative technologies), a degree of loose coupling and ambiguity arises. The decisions taken here are made public and most parameters in the case are publicly debated (including through more informal channels, such as press releases and stories in the news); however, some aspects of decision-making are necessarily taken behind closed doors. The tension between development and preservation is highly salient; however, the value of being granted WH status is not agreed upon across parties.

### *Context and time*

The Liverpool case provides an entire arc, through inscription, danger to, and deletion from WH status of the LMMC site from 2004-2021. The wider context involves the UK governments embrace of austerity policies and a reinforcing of neoliberal ideology. The case shows instances of heightened and lessened (but never absent) tensions across the timeframe. LMMC was deleted due to the threat perceived in the future (via planned development) rather than extant threats to the site.

## 2.5 Tensions and their dynamics

The main tension in this case is economic development vs heritage preservation. There are subsidiary tensions that align with the main tension: instrumental values vs intrinsic values and market-led (neoliberal) logics vs logics that support various interventionist modes or that advocate the protection of some realms of human experience from the marketplace. And to oversimplify, as binaries do, a further subsidiary tension involves temporality, wherein development implies an orientation toward the future and heritage preservation and orientation toward the past. Moreover, Encoded values act to stabilise pre-existing value dimensions, with UNESCO criteria for OUV and evaluation (authenticity and integrity) stabilising a pre-existing discourse of heritage preservation. Relatedly, but in conflict with UNESCO, UK Planning legislation helps to stabilise certain aspects of neoliberal rationalities that underpin a range of values relating to economic development.

Ultimately, the key tension, between some form of development and some form of preservation, pre-existed the case and remains after it finished. The tension is largely stable and unresolved. However, the tension waxes and wanes over time, as actors occasionally come together as the tension is suppressed or ignored or when actions of one or more actors reignite the tension. The strength of the binary tension often elides more nuanced differences among actors, for instance, in terms of positioning within a development or preservation (or mixed) approach.

### 3. Pairwise comparison – cases 2.1 and 2.2

#### *Technologies of evaluation*

Our axiological reconstruction of the World Heritage Site controversies in Venice and Liverpool sheds light on UNESCO's technologies of evaluation and how these were operationalised across the two sites. Our core conclusion is that the values that structure UNESCO's evaluative approach to World Heritage Sites are unstable, contested, and socially constructed. Despite some similarities in UNESCO's overarching evaluative practice, socio-political, institutional, and spatial-temporal dissimilarities in the two cases culminated in two very different outcomes in Venice and Liverpool. The core historical distinction centres on the consequences of UNESCO's evaluation of the threat of human action to the integrity of the sites and the reactions of the State party: Venice was threatened with inscription on to the World Heritage In-Danger list but ultimately was not listed, while Liverpool's World Heritage site was relegated to the World Heritage In-Danger list in 2012 and subsequently deleted from UNESCO's World Heritage Listings in 2021. These distinctions are illustrative of how valuation and evaluation are always subject to their conditions of production and how technologies of evaluation are socially, and politically, constituted.

There are clear contextual differences between the two sites, and both are atypical in respect to other World Heritage sites rendering their evaluation within UNESCO's rhetoric of worth and associated technologies of evaluation problematic. It is unsurprising that Venice is a World Heritage site, the city being one of the most notable in the world and a global centre for heritage discourse and heritage tourism. However, despite being classified as a 'cultural site', the World Heritage site in Venice comprises the city *and* its lagoon thereby introducing a variety of ecological values, alongside the concern for preserving its historic built environment. Moreover, Venice has the extraordinary status of being integral to the evolution of UNESCO's World Heritage programme. Indeed, it was one of the early sites to be formally listed (1987), though its formal criteria for inscription were retrospectively defined in 2013 to align with transversal World Heritage Site practice. Liverpool, by contrast, was only awarded its World Heritage site in 2012 on the unusual grounds of its mercantile industrial heritage, a more contentious form of heritage which lacks the globally recognised value of Venice's pre-industrial heritage assets. Crucially, while the Venice site encompasses the entirety of the city and the lagoon, the Liverpool World Heritage Site is only a portion of the entire city of Liverpool, much of which is subject to significant post-industrial deprivation, and does not contain any natural assets.

#### *Tensions and their dynamics*

The evaluations undertaken by UNESCO in the two sites - Venice and its Lagoon (2014-2021) and Liverpool (2012-2021) - drew on differing value regimes across opposing socio-economic contexts and temporalities. In Venice, the values which structured the evaluative criteria and subsequent recommendations were multiaxial, operationalising social and ecological values alongside values associated with heritage preservation. Meanwhile, in Liverpool they were overdetermined by a singular, reductive value opposition: development versus preservation. This tension between multiaxial values and a singular value opposition had significant impacts for the technologies of evaluation. For example, social values were clearly apparent in UNESCO's evaluation of Venice (e.g., depopulation and social sustainability) but this social value regime was notably absent in the assessment of Liverpool, which was solely predicated on the mono-value of heritage preservation as a bulwark to development.

This tension between a pluralistic value regime and a singular value opposition could be traced to a clear temporal difference across the two cases. In Liverpool the *threat* of development identified by UNESCO exists in the *future*, only indexed through planning documents rather than extant structures. In Venice, however, the tangible social-economic impacts of tourism threatened the integrity and authenticity of the city in the present moment. To take on the terminology of UNESCO, Venice was predicated on current or 'ascertained' dangers while future or 'potential' dangers were identified in Liverpool. Disciplinary evaluation was therefore *reactive* in Venice and yet *preventative* in Liverpool where tangible dangers had not yet been made manifest.

UNESCO's evaluation is designed to instigate a productive interaction with the State Party to facilitate value alignment. However, it became clear that the State's investment in World Heritage status would appear to be greater in Venice than in Liverpool. This is evidenced by the proactive engagement of senior officials and

ministers in Italy and the relative indifference of Central Government in the UK, in the face of a pro-development local council. In the UK there appears to be a greater orientation towards the socio-economic values advocated by the developers and planners who are themselves interpolated within the dominant neoliberal planning discourse in the UK. The tangible externalities of the proposed development, to say nothing of the primacy of accumulative market-logics and the power of the developer lobby, were ultimately *valued* as being of greater worth than the preservationist values associated with World Heritage Site status.

This contrasts with Venice where the World Heritage site could be valued in a variety of ways, ranging from actors advocating sustainability to lobby groups interested in the exploitation of (cultural) tourism. This diversity of values in Venice demands a deconstruction of the actions and motivations of stakeholders and interest groups. A Hirschman (1970)-based interpretation allows investigating 'the game' between professionals and political representatives at different levels. Through such an analysis of the Venice case, a contradictory dynamic was recognised, which could be framed as 'caring too much to actually care'. In other words, politicians in Italy cared so much about Venice's status (mostly in terms of its reputational value in cultural diplomacy) that they acted to *stop* listing Venice as an In-Danger site, despite heritage professionals presenting in-danger status as a mechanism to increase awareness of the threats to Venice.

Ultimately, a positive dialogue emerged through the convergence of positions between professionals, both inside the City administration (the UNESCO office of the City), and the Icomos & Ramsar experts, *voicing* (similar) professional & sustainable values. In parallel, an unexpected converging alliance also emerged at the decisional level between the Local & Central Government and UNESCO World Heritage Committee - each searching to avoid inscription to the In-Danger list. This can be framed according to a *loyalty* attitude, though motivated by different values (economic exploitation by Local Government; cultural diplomacy/national reputation for Central Government, and sustainable heritage preservation for UNESCO). The result was a disrupting politicisation of the decision, against professional recommendations and values, which was questioned by the heritage community and gave rise to a scandal amongst experts about the politicisation of UNESCO.

In the case of Liverpool, a more agonistic axiological situation can be found: a lack of convergence between economic and heritage values rendered *loyalty* increasingly impossible, value dislocations were widely *voiced*, and yet a distinction emerged between *exiting* and *ejecting*. Informed by broadly economic value regimes, Liverpool's officials were not willing to adhere to the value regime demanded by UNESCO but, crucially, it was UNESCO that *ejected* Liverpool. One could assume that both parties would have welcomed the retention of a modified World Heritage Site, if a compromise could have been reached within the febrile value dynamics of the situation. However, unlike in Venice, the overarching *value* ascribed to a World Heritage Site in Liverpool was not deemed significant enough by either UNESCO or the State Party for a more conciliatory approach to be taken up to avoid deletion.

## Second pair - Art institution and participatory practices

### 4. MUDEC: Evaluative tensions in a multicultural participatory initiative (case 2.3)

#### 4.1 Case background

This case study focuses on the intercultural participatory activities at the *Museo delle Culture* of Milan (Museum of Cultures, Mudec hereafter). The history of Mudec began at the end of the 1980s, when the Municipality of Milan acquired a former industrial site to be regenerated for cultural purposes. From the beginning, the site was envisioned to host a museum that could accommodate the rich ethnographic collections of the Municipality. Already from 1999, the museum's project adopted an open museological approach targeting the migrant communities of the city. Although the museum is currently managed through a Public-Private Partnership agreement (more details in D2.4), participatory activities are orchestrated by the public partner, namely the Municipality of Milan, in collaboration with external associations or individuals.

The purpose of the case study is to analyse how participatory approaches evolved from 1999 to now, with a specific focus on evaluative practices and related tensions. It must be noted that a large part of this story relates to the conceptualization process of Mudec. Indeed, the process that led to the opening of the museum was rather prolonged: from 1999 to 2010 there have been only a few debates and rhetorical actions, in 2010 the construction of the museum's building began, and the organisational activity started to be ingrained on active participation. In 2015 the museum opened and therefore those preparatory activities finally translated into an actual cultural offer. From that moment onward, there has been a continuous effort to produce participatory events at the museum.

#### 4.2 Methodology

Our empirical materials consist of 22 interviews with people variously involved with the museum's participatory initiatives (average interview time: 1h10m). We have also conducted three on-site visits to attend some of the events where we engaged in informal conversations with the main actors and accordingly took ethnographic field notes (20pp). Additional qualitative data was collected for this purpose, including official documents, catalogues, programs, organisation charts and internal notes (total 669 pp.).

Our methodological approach is a longitudinal and holistic single case study design (Pettigrew, 1990). Analytically, we adopt a temporal bracketing procedure (Langley, 1999) to better grasp the processual nature of the phenomenon under investigation.

#### 4.3 Findings: phases of participatory approaches at Mudec

##### *Phase 1. Early conceptualizations (1999-2011)*

In 1999 the Culture division of the Municipality of Milan drafted the so-called "Dossier Ansaldo", a document outlining the first museographic project meant to host the ethnographic collection owned by the Municipality. The main idea was to create a space (named then "the Centre of Cultures") which, while displaying the objects of the collection, could become a venue for intercultural exchange and integration. However, in those early stages there was not yet a concrete idea on how to realise this project, other than claiming that the cultural offer would have been interesting for people and visitors with an extra-European background.

The project then stalled for a decade because of administrative delays relating to the construction of the museum building. Only in 2009-2010, a scientific committee composed of renowned anthropologists (Marc Augé was the president), museologists, and curators further developed the Centre of Culture concept. The members of the committee looked at participation as a valuable approach to enhance the value of the collection and realise the intercultural project of the museum:

A living museum capable of interacting with the communities inhabiting the territory faces a difficult task. But, hopefully, it might display the objects, the material culture, as a device of encounter. The collection's objects reflect, in anthropological terms, the role that the material culture may play as the ground of dialogue. [Minutes of the scientific committee, 2010].

More concretely, this value was to be enacted through a narration of the collection's items meant to be inclusive and non-traditional:

We believed that artworks were not to be exhibited in a didactic way, entailing some level of knowledgeability higher than the average visitor. [...] We thought that many were afraid of going to museums because they assumed museums are for privileged, superior people. Thus, first of all, we focused on language that was to be reframed as playful and theatrical. [Interview, former member of the scientific committee]

However, all these intentions were never put into practice. In 2011, the appointment of Stefano Boeri as culture councillor changed radically the approach to participation to be enacted in the museum. Later on, when MuDEC was inaugurated, the museum hosted the ethnographic collection owned by the Municipality, but the display of the collection was a rather traditional one, and for its preparation there was no participation of people with a migratory background.

#### *Phase 2. Bottom-up participation (2011-2015)*

Despite rumours on the fact that Boeri wanted to make MuDEC a museum of modern arts, his main intervention to the MuDEC project was twofold. On the one hand, he decided to reduce the spaces allocated to the display of the ethnographic collection. On the other hand, he promoted the establishment of the City-World Forum (*Forum della città mondo*) – an informal aggregation of more than 600 associations of people with a migratory background. In his view, these steps would have meant a rebalancing between the curatorial and the participatory activities to be undertaken at MuDEC:

What I've done is rebalancing the proportion between the weight of the permanent collection – which was supposed to occupy 85% of the museum's space according to the former scientific committee – and the "alive and changing" cultures that in the new setup will occupy the 50% of the museum. It is inconceivable that the young people in Milan, Italian or international ones, can recognize themselves in ancient artworks displayed according to continent-based groupings. That would be disrespectful to the intelligence and creativity of all the cultures that inhabit our city. [Corriere della Sera, 18/01/2012]

In a nutshell, Boeri's vision completely detached participation from the curatorial activities relating to the display and conservation of the ethnographic collection. Participation was thus identified with the activities of the City-World Forum, in which members of diasporic communities were fully empowered in planning and managing participatory initiatives even though they did not possess specific museology or curatorial competencies.

Initially, the members of the Forum met in rooms of the city hall to plan the initiatives to be performed at MuDEC (which was still under construction). These meetings have been described as very dynamic and non-bureaucratic. After the museum's opening (2015), the Forum's members were given access to two spaces at MuDEC where to perform their initiatives and run their meetings.

Through its fluid organisational setup, the City-World Forum organised more than 70 events performed during the first year after the museum opening within and outside the museum's premises. These events consisted of book presentations, film projections, laboratories, and conferences, all having at their centre issues connected to the foreign communities living in the city. Importantly, none of these initiatives was linked to the objects of the ethnographic collections, signalling the radical detachment from the early conceptualization phase.

These activities were supported by the Network and Cultural Cooperation Office of the Municipality (just Network Office henceforth), an office of the Municipality's Culture division which, though not formally entitled to museum management, acted as the interface between the associations and the museum's

administration. To create a legitimate organisation that could legally speak and act on behalf of the Forum, the Network Office spurred the formation of a second-level association, the City-World Association.

However, the formal structure of the Association hampered instead of enabling the formulation of a cultural offer coming from the communities. In fact, the Association was governed through a steering committee, supposed to make decisions regarding the participatory activities but, according to the members of the Association and Municipality staff, this structure slowed down all the decision-making processes:

This steering committee was established. It was a heavy body because every area of the world was supposed to be represented by both male and female members. This committee, formed by 15 people, took every decision by absolute majority voting. It was very tiring; any project could stall for a very long time. Why so? Because this mechanism of direct participatory democracy was extremely burdensome. [Interview, Network Office administrator]

This created an evident conflict between two ways of valuing participation. According to a first view, the value of participation increases if more people are involved, the diversity of their background is magnified, and the initiatives carried out are of different kinds. Instead, the second view emphasised organisational efficiency: to be good, participation has to be manageable. In the view of some members of the Forum and the Association, this tension could not be solved because managing complexity proved very difficult in a situation where associations' members were unpaid volunteers, and the municipality employees had a 9 to 5 schedule.

One thing which is usually overlooked is that all what we have done in the Forum was, in 70-80% of the cases, performed on a voluntary basis. The associations may not have all the needed competencies, but if you [the Municipality] want to work with them, you must consider that those people have other jobs during the weekdays and they participate in the project because they believe in it, they do it for an ideal, but they are volunteers. Therefore, timewise, they will never be at the same level of a public administrator. [Interview, former member of the City-World Forum and City-World Association]

These tensions accumulated to a point (2016) in which the Association signed a second convention with the Municipality through which it relinquished the spaces that the previous convention granted them. In a situation of scarce resources, therefore, the size and the scope of participation were given up for the sake of organisational efficiency.

### *Phase 3. Steering participation (2016-2019)*

With the involvement of the City-World Association and Forum waning, the Network Office took over the planning of participatory activities, while maintaining the "City-World" label of the Forum and Association. During this phase, different participatory practices were experimented. Accordingly, different kinds of actors were involved in the planning process: the general coordination of the *Network Office*, in fact, was supported both by renowned experts who endorsed the appropriateness of activities, and by diasporic associations involved through ad-hoc collaborations no longer mediated by the City-World Forum and Association.

The "Milano Città Mondo" (MCM, Milan City-World) program was then inaugurated: a yearly program of events (conferences, film screenings, performances, and exhibitions) constituting the bulk of participatory activities for the following years. Differently from the events organised up to that moment by the Forum, these events were now orchestrated around a mono-ethnic focus dedicated each year to a foreign community living in Milan (Eritrean/Ethiopian; Chinese; Egyptian; Peruvian). The first edition of the program included only one event, but the next ones were more articulated in types and number of initiatives. During this phase, different organisational arrangements were employed to make participation happen: direct assignments to artists for the curation of an exhibition; call for proposals to associations coordinated by a scientific committee; ethnographic action research meant to dig into and engage with the communities.

To sum up, during this phase the Network Office's evaluative practices increased their level of formality. While in the previous phase the Office was providing logistic support acting as gatekeeper between the associations and the museum, now it assumed a coordinating role aimed at: i) choosing the foreign

community to focus upon during each year's edition of the palimpsest; ii) activating the initial contacts with members and organisations belonging to that community; iii) issuing the call for proposal to assign some resources for organising the events; iv) overseeing the general planning of the initiatives.

#### *Phase 4: Critical participation (2020-)*

After four editions of the MCM program, the Network Office accepted the culture councillor's proposal of organising a program of events dedicated to women, a transversal theme which would not fit with the former monocultural approach. This fortuitous but crucial event triggered a self-critical rethinking of the approaches experimented thus far, considering the benefits of a transversal approach:

We acknowledged that cultures are not the tiles of a jigsaw that while fitting together remain impermeable to each other. Rather, they are threads that come from far away and that, by meeting here with one another, intertwine and always weave together new textures. [Preface to the volume published after the City of Women program]

The monocultural approach, by contrast, was now perceived as potentially detrimental in terms of social inclusion of the foreign communities:

Initially, every association proposed, for instance, the screening of the ethnic movie, the presentation of a particular book, a course of marinera, or of Chinese calligraphy... I mean, everyone had his own projects, and that was excellent because the idea was like "we won't talk on your behalf. You will narrate yourselves". But if you propose only folkloristic things, this implies that the quality is not very high, and you would appear as a foreigner who does cheap things... [Interview, Network Office administrator]

In short, the focus on the community dimension (e.g. the community of Chinese people in Milan) could potentially lead to static and essentializing representations, with a level of quality unfit for a modern museum. In this phase, the quality of participation, intended as the refined and theoretically informed representation of foreign cultures, emerges as an additional evaluative criterion. Therefore, from now on, the participatory initiatives at Mudec began to focus on diasporic subjectivities.

These changes in the approach to the representation of cultures led to new strategies for the appointment of participating actors. The passage from the community dimension to the subjective one, in fact, allowed for the direct involvement of relevant actors in the planning of events: from now on, the *Network Office* began to grant decision-making power to individuals with diasporic backgrounds (migrants or second-generations) and not necessarily to diasporic groups organised as associations. Quite often these individuals were highly educated and competent on the themes addressed during the events:

By adopting transversal themes, multiple viewpoints are needed. Fundamentally, to give voice to these subjectivities involved in the projects, it is necessary to put them in the position of deciding the contents, and the modalities [...] Also in the previous editions, dedicated to single countries, of course, the proposals and viewpoints of the subjects involved were taken into account. But it was done following a logic of representativeness according to which only the privileged association which already had some contact with the institutions could speak in the name of the whole community [Interview, expert on gender studies coordinating the City of Women program]

These subjects are now included in so-called control rooms: teams created on an ad-hoc basis for the planning of the yearly programs. This modality partly recovers the participatory approach observed during phase 2, based on devolving full decision-making power to people with a migratory background. The difference here lies in the more intellectual approach with experts in charge of guaranteeing adherence to the general theoretical framework. In general, we assist in this phase to a meshing of the roles and positions which were previously associated with distinct actors. External experts, diasporic subjects, and the network office staff collaborated closely for the definition of the programs, imbuing meanings and themes that were explicitly meant to enact the value of participation:



Those among us who followed this entire process closely were not “schooled” on anything of this. None of us. We proceeded by attempts and mistakes, we grew along with these projects also thanks to our mistakes [Interview, Network Office administrator]

#### 4.4 Technologies of evaluation

Despite the multiple evolution of the participatory approaches enacted during Mudec’s history, we devise some continuities in the ways in which the initiatives have been evaluated.

##### *Configuration of actors and organisations*

The actors involved can be categorised into the following groups: administrative staff of the Municipality; external experts; people with migratory background. Each of these groups brought into the participatory activities different evaluation criteria which affected the selection of events and initiatives to be produced: the municipality staff focused upon organisational efficiency of the participatory processes; groups with migratory background emphasised the democratic and emancipating value of participation; experts oversaw the quality level of the participated initiatives. The differences from phase to phase consists mostly in the variation in the centrality of each of these groups and in the progressive overcoming of the boundaries between one group and the other.

During phase 1, curators and experts in museology and anthropology outlined the museum concept. In phase 2, people with a migratory background were the main protagonists: organised through the fluid set-up of the Forum, they were in charge of defining the participatory offer of Mudec, although with no specific competencies in curatorship or anthropology; on the other hand, the municipality staff of the Network Office contributed mainly with administrative competences, which were needed to support to the activities of the Forum. In phase 3 the Network Office staff took over most of the decision-making power, delegating part of it to external experts; the associations of migrant communities in this phase supplied the main contents of the participatory programs, but they were not engaged in the overall supervision of the activities. During phase 4, we observe the hybridization of profiles, which entails the capability of understanding and mixing distinct evaluative regimes. Not only experts and people with migratory background collaborated most closely: indeed, the same people with migratory background were experts in specific disciplinary fields. Similarly, the administrative staff of the Network Office had developed, by phase 4, an expertise in participatory activities on top of traditional administrative competences.

##### *Formality, rational elaboration, publicity and salience*

During the whole period under our analysis, participatory initiatives have been mostly subject to informal evaluation, actualized through the subjective judgement of the various groups of actors. For example, the inclusion of a certain event into one of the yearly programs might happen by first receiving the proposal from an association responsible for performing the proposed activity and then judging the congruity of this initiative with the overall program: if no particular problems were devised, the activity would have been included in the program. Our evidence points to a rather loose and open evaluative system. There have been only a few cases in which one of the proposals were neatly rejected.

This kind of informal evaluation characterises different moments of the decision ark: the selection moment – when initiatives are to be included into the cultural offer of the museum – , and the post-hoc evaluation – meant to assess the benefits that the initiatives have produced.

In the selection phase, in particular, we have evidence that, when proposals arrived at the subjects in charge of taking the decision (e.g., the external experts), those subjects were not just expressing their judgement on the appropriateness of the proposed initiative, but got involved in trying to refine those initiatives, make them workable, and potentially engaging for the public. Thus, the evaluation moments tend to blend into valuation processes.

The only formal evaluation tool used in the planning phase is represented by calls for tender issued by the Network Office to recruit the experts. This tool was mainly used when monetary compensation was given to

experts through a legal contract. Thus, the use of formal evaluation tools was mostly related to reasons of legal legitimacy. Nonetheless, most part of the evaluative processes taking place during the selection of initiatives and events has an informal character.

For what concerns the ex-post assessment of participatory initiatives, there is no method used to formally measure the impact and benefits emanating from the programs. We argue that, in this case, there have been informal meta-evaluation moments, consisting of re-examining the participatory approaches experimented thus far. In one case, this has been conducted explicitly through an ethnographic research, included as an initiative of the last MCM edition examined here (2021), aimed at assessing the benefits that the participatory initiatives performed in the previous years produced among the people that had been engaged. This initiative, though consisting in an explicit self-critical exercise, did not use formal evaluation metrics nor adopt a set of explicitly stated criteria to assess the outcomes of the participatory programs of Mudec. More generally, these meta-evaluation moments represent the junctures between the different phases. By putting under scrutiny how cultural participation had been enacted, tensions between value regimes emerge, and opportunities for change are created.

#### *Context and time*

The overall story of participatory practices at Mudec points out a prolonged and discontinuous process. Evaluation of proposed initiatives had been an iterative exercise, to be performed year by year during the phase of programs' planning. As mentioned above, the subjects entitled to perform these evaluations changed through time, but nonetheless they all adopted an informal approach. Through the multiple iterations, however, an organisational learning process took place. The self-evaluation performed in the last phase of our analysis is the result of this accumulated experience.

#### 4.5 Tensions and their dynamics

As anticipated above, the variety of actors involved at Mudec and the changing configurations of relationships among them animated tensions on multiple dimensions. In particular, we distinguish between *conceptual* and *operational* tensions. Conceptual tensions pertain to the more abstract evaluative criteria advanced by each group of actors in order to promote their specific understanding of the participation value. Operational tensions pertain to the practical approaches adopted by the actors to concretely enact the participation value. Operational tensions often take place in the form of open conflicts and disagreement between actors on how to better implement participation. Conceptual tensions are more latent, even if they typically underpin the operational aspects.

Our evidence highlights how different kinds of tensions prevail in different phases. In the first phase, the main tension was a conceptual one, between the materiality of the collection on the one hand and the disengagement from the traditional museum environment on the other hand. In phases 2 and 3 we have a mainly operational tension between the different organisational arrangements that had been experimented in performing participation: on the one hand participation was conceived to be best realised through the fluid and open arrangement of the Forum; on the other hand, in the Municipality's view, participation was conceived to be best realised through an efficient and manageable organisational set-up.

In phase 4, we observe again a conceptual tension based on the idea that participation is most adequately enacted if it respects the representativity principle as embodied by subjectivities rather than communities. These two opposed perspectives reflect an underlying tension between "high" and "low" cultural offer: producing participatory programs that focus on one ethnic group may give rise to folkloristic representations that are detrimental to the very participation value; the current approach is explicitly tuned to avoid these potentially unwanted results of the participatory initiatives. However, the experts (migrant or not) working to these last editions of the program are very aware of all the limits intrinsic to the approach they promote now. Informants told us to be worried that these recent, theoretically informed, initiatives are largely not attractive for an audience of people with migratory background, since they may target those who have an adequate education level needed to grasp the deep sense of the initiatives. So, if these initiatives entail a strong participation of people with migratory background in the planning of activities, they happen not to be

best geared to directly serve and benefit the majority of those citizens who share the same foreign background. What is interesting to underline is the shared level of awareness achieved in the last phase, which concerns the features of the participatory approach and its main limitations.

## 5. Kick the Dust / Reimagine Remake Replay (case 2.4)

The *Kick the Dust* programme (KtD) is a contemporary response to the challenges of democratising heritage participation and professionalising its evaluation. It was funded by the UK National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) and ran from 2016-22. We studied one project funded by KtD, *Reimagine, Remake, Replay* (RRR) in Northern Ireland, to capture the operation of an entire organisational system and its attendant valuations and evaluations of participative heritage activities.

### 5.1 Case background

*Kick the Dust* emerged as a direct response to identified ‘lacks’ within ‘the heritage sector and what their needs were in terms of engaging young people’ (Interview, NLHF Representative).<sup>10</sup> The *Young People and Heritage Report* (2015) undertaken by the National Lottery Heritage Fund evidenced that

- Young people are under-represented as audiences, participants, and volunteers.
- Young people value heritage less than adults and are less likely to participate.
- Opportunities for young people to take on leadership roles or have genuine influence over decision-making is rare.
- There is a lack of diversity and inclusiveness, resulting in heritage sites, spaces and collections being less relevant and less accessible. (HLF, 2015)

As our interviewees suggested, this 2015 report underpins the values encoded in the *Kick the Dust* programme, as it aimed to increase the participation of young people from diverse backgrounds and to reframe governance structures to secure future audiences for heritage. Notably, the NLHF report strongly advocated for ‘more young people in our decision making [through] an “ambassador approach”’ (Interview, NLHF Representative). Further, interviews with NLHF revealed another perceived lack evidenced in the 2015 research: ‘the lack of really good evaluation in terms of youth engagement with heritage. We found that it was often very anecdotal and very poor’ (Interview, NLHF Representative). Thus, improving evaluative practice within the heritage sector, particularly regarding youth engagement, was positioned as central to any ensuing funding programme.

Launched in 2016, KtD was designed to distribute £10million of National Lottery funding to heritage and youth organisations to support the engagement of young people (aged 11-25) across the UK, and subsequently awarded 12 grants of £500,000-1,000,000. The award process relied on a team of seventeen young ‘heritage ambassadors’ (aged 16-25) to choose the successful projects. KtD-funded projects were part of an organisational system that not only relied on young people within the governance of projects, but also aimed to increase the effectiveness of project evaluation.

Such evaluation was crucial at both programme (KtD) and project (RRR) level, with mandatory inclusion of professional commercial evaluators at both levels. Indeed, an intended legacy of the KtD programme was to improve evaluation practice across the sector. As stated in a public report on KtD’s first year of operation: ‘The programme evaluation is working closely with the awarded projects to assess the impact of the programme, improve project evaluation and encourage reflective practice, and contribute to the evidence base on the value of youth engagement with heritage’ (KtD, 2019). Indeed, prospective KtD projects were encouraged to set between 3-7% of their budget to commission evaluation support, for instance, from companies such as Renaisi (a commercial evaluation agency that provided bespoke one-to-one consultancy support to project teams).

Reimagine Remake Replay, one of the 12 KtD funded project consortiums, received £949,600 to enable young people to engage creatively with heritage and museum collections through creative media and digital

---

<sup>10</sup> Following the emphasis on a ‘participative turn’ in heritage policy since the 1990s, cultural and heritage organisations have sought to instigate proactive engagement with diverse publics under the frame of ‘participation’ (Bonnet and Négrier, 2018; Rowe & Frewer, 2000; Simon, 2010).. However, it remains that participative activities are difficult to evaluate - evaluations of participation and its impact often deployed to serve advocacy purposes within instrumentalised funding frameworks ( Jancovich and Stevenson, 2019).

technologies. The RRR Consortium was led by Nerve Centre, a creative media arts centre in Belfast, and comprised actors from three umbrella heritage and culture bodies who managed the project: National Museums Northern Ireland, the Northern Ireland Museums Council, and Northern Ireland Screen. RRR project activities were located in eight museums and heritage sites: Ulster Museum, Ulster Folk Museum, Fermanagh County Museum, North Down Museum, Mid and East Antrim Museum Services, Newry and Mourne Museum, Causeway Coast and Glenn Services, and the Tower Museum (Derry).

Prior to the advent of Covid-19, RRR offered in-person activities, such as 3D model making and VR programming courses. However, social distancing and lockdown measures implemented to counter the pandemic resulted in the closure of all RRR venues and the cessation of all in-person programme activities in 2020 and 2021. The organisation responded with a rapid transformation to remote delivery and a remodelling of programme activities online. A return to 'normal' modes of programme delivery followed the ending of social distancing measures in 2022, although a digitally hybridised operating structure was retained.

The stated aim to improve evaluation practice, along with programming shifts during the pandemic, makes KtD/RRR a particularly suitable case-study for understanding evaluative technologies in the heritage sector.

## 5.2 Methodology

Two research strategies were used to generate findings: (1) we coded both KtD policy documents (total 171 pp) and official and internal evaluation measures for written evidence of the values that structured the organisational system, and (2) interviewed six actors from different levels of the organisational system (funding body, *NLHF*; programme, *KtD*; project, *RRR*, and evaluation consultancies, *Renaisi* and *Ruth Flood Associates*) to understand how technologies of evaluations were deployed in practice.

## 5.3 Findings: Programme and Project Level Evaluations

### *Programme level*

Our axiological analysis of the evaluative guidelines produced at the outset of the KtD programme found that three main values attributed to participation, encoded into the programme objectives which structured the technologies of evaluation. These are **Engagement** (operationalised by KtD as incentivising participation by young people in heritage), **Diversity** (operationalised as increasing the range of participants in heritage across varied socio-cultural axes), and **Collaboration** (operationalised as instigating sustained collaborative working with young people in heritage institutions, particularly in governance roles). Table One shows the barriers to youth engagement, the objectives of the heritage sector, and what KtD planned as programme outcomes, the codified quotations extracted from KtD's founding theory of change. We draw the three key values (engagement, diversity, and collaboration) from our analysis of the material in table 1.

| <b>Barrier identified</b>  | <b>Sectoral Objectives</b>   | <b>Planned KtD Programme Outcomes</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Current engagement limited to school visits and work experience.</i>            | <i>Heritage needs to create more and a greater range of opportunities for young people to engage with heritage.</i>  | <i>Young people will take up more opportunities to volunteer and share their talents in a range of heritage organisations. Young people will learn about heritage in a range of engaging, creative ways.</i>                            |
| <i>Heritage is not designed with young people in mind.</i>                         | <i>Heritage needs to create more opportunities for young people to have a voice in the management of heritage, including opportunities to shape and inform the creation of heritage content.</i> | <i>Young people will play a positive role in managing and maintaining heritage. New interpretation is directly influenced by young people or designed specifically to engage young people.</i>  |
| <i>Governance schemes prevalent but target usual suspects.</i>                     | <i>Opportunities for young people to play a role in governance need to be made more inclusive and accessible to a wider range of young people.</i>   | <i>Young people will play a role in governance. Young people from all backgrounds feel that their opinions/perspectives are valued. Young people from all backgrounds feel represented and influential.</i>                             |
| <i>Heritage is not communicated in a youth-friendly way.</i>                       | <i>Heritage needs to use a wider range of communication styles and methods to engage young people, and create opportunities for young people to inform communication content.</i>                | <i>Heritage is better communicated.</i>   |
| <i>Young people do not feel connected to heritage.</i>                             | <i>Heritage content needs to be more inclusive, and reflect a greater diversity of stories, histories, and perspectives.</i>   | <i>Heritage content is more inclusive and diverse. Young people's perceptions of heritage will change. Heritage is more relevant to a diverse range of young people.</i>  |
| <i>Heritage staff do not feel confident working with young people.</i>             | <i>Heritage needs to build strong relationships with organisations that can bring specialist skills in working with young people with greater needs and barriers.</i>                            | <i>Heritage staff feel supported and challenged by youth work and other partners. Heritage staff feel empowered and that they have the skills to engage young people. Heritage staff will gain confidence in engaging young people.</i> |
| <i>Young people do not feel they are welcome in heritage spaces.</i>               | <i>Heritage staff need to change attitudes and perceptions of young people and create a safer, more welcoming environment.</i>   | <i>Young people feel safe, welcomed and included. Young people feel respected by heritage staff. Heritage staff feel that young people make a positive contribution to heritage.</i>  |
| <i>Young people do not feel represented in the sector.</i>                         | <i>Heritage needs to create more career pathways for young people, more opportunities to develop young people's skills and talents, and create more paid training roles.</i>                     | <i>More inclusive heritage sector. Young people will practice new skills, some as part of paid training opportunities.</i>  |
| <i>Financial costs and physical access needs create barriers for young people.</i> | <i>Heritage needs to be free for young people to access and increase understanding of any physical access barriers that might be preventing young people from engaging.</i>                      | <i>Heritage is more accessible to young people.</i>   |

*Table 1. KtD Barriers, Objectives, and Outcomes*

*Source: KtD/Renaiss Year One Evaluation Appendix (2019). (All table entries are quotations from the Report.)*

A fourth value, **Reflexivity** (operationalised as increasing evidence-based practice and professionalising evaluation in the heritage sector) also emerged in interviews with KtD staff. As the KtD lead recalled ‘I think as a whole the heritage sector does not find evaluation very easy, so it is simply reinforcing why evaluation is important and getting beyond counting’ (Interview, NLHF Representative). This links back to the recognised failure of the sector to deliver effective evaluation outlined in the 2015 NLHF report.

The reflexive practices across the KtD programme connect to the use of specific evaluative technologies. Interviews with representatives of Renaisi and KtD, alongside documentary analysis, allowed us to identify the standardised technologies of evaluation instigated as a mandatory component of funding (Table 2).

| Technology of evaluation            | Description  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Participant Survey                  | A Renaisi developed standard question bank to capture the experiences of participants.                               |
| Project Output Tool                 | Annual data collection tool: participant numbers, demographics, etc.   |
| Project Team survey                 | A survey conducted with project staff at lead organisations.   |
| Consortium partner survey           | A survey conducted with consortium partners to understand the direct impact of the KtD projects.                     |
| Youth Engagement in Heritage Survey | A survey conducted with consortium partners to understand the wider impact of the projects outside the KtD projects. |
| Case studies                        | Case studies of four of the twelve funded projects.  |

*Table 2: Technologies of evaluation at KtD programme level*

These officially sanctioned evaluation technologies, administered by Renaisi and enacted by commercial project evaluators, were accompanied by internal modes of reflection or technologies of evaluation such as ‘blog posts, dissemination plans, [and] annual consortium events’ (Interview, Renaisi Representative) which were not sanctioned by KtD. Indeed, it is important to recognise that Renaisi, as an official evaluator at a programme level, had a central role in determining the KtD evaluative system (itself determined by the core values encoded in the KtD objectives) and in the raising the standards of evaluation across the programme: ‘being involved in the programme and project-level evaluation [...] it is clear that they are using the data more proactively. A more rigorous approach to learning’ (Interview, Renaisi Representative). At programme level, evaluation served primarily as a performance indicator which was increasingly professionalised through the work of private-sector commercial evaluators.

#### *Project level*

Moving to the designated outcomes of the individual funded projects, namely Reimagine, Remake, Replay, our analysis shows that the values of engagement, diversity, and collaboration were stabilised through active encoding in individual project-level objectives. Reflexivity as a prioritised value was also evidenced by the formality of the official evaluation practices within these projects. Such stated objectives are important, given that they state the intention to turn values into tangible processes within the context of the heritage institution. However, to gain an understanding of these values in action, we explored how RRR evaluated itself at project level through in-house evaluation and via a professional evaluation agency (Ruth Flood Associates). Notably, Covid-19 changed the values and valuations of the organisation. New ‘lockdown values’ of sociality and emotional regulation emerged as additional rationales for action during the height of the pandemic when the RRR project was delivered remotely (see Alexander and Peterson Gilbert, 2022). Nevertheless, the official evaluation criteria, as encoded in the programme-level (KtD) objectives and technologies of evaluation, remained constant throughout. In other words, the official evaluation did not reflect this expansion in project-level values. As a Nerve Centre representative noted

the overall priorities stayed very much the same—in terms of quality of engagement, giving skills to young people, and empowering people connecting with heritage. It is very much the

same but the type of engagement, the delivery in programming changed massively because of that programming. (Interview, Nerve Centre Representative)

It was clear that KtD and Renaisi were keen to retain the pre-Covid focus in their evaluative criteria in order to increase the value of such criteria post-pandemic:

Covid has affected the delivery of Kick the Dust activities and had a big impact on people's lives, but I can understand why the Fund didn't want to get too heavily focused on Covid, they wanted something that would capture, it would try and capture the non-Covid elements so the work would not feel too dated. (Interview, Renaisi Representative)

Therefore, a value tension emerged between the relative priority of the static values encoded in the programme-level technologies of evaluation and the shifting value priorities under the extremity of a global pandemic.

More practically, it was clear that the officially sanctioned technologies of evaluation were more suited to programme-level evaluations. These official technologies had limited impacts in the project-level activities, although they did stabilise (or discipline) an overarching value regime predicated on engagement, diversity, and collaboration. Notably, the data generated through official evaluation was often distributed too late to influence the practice of the actors within individual project consortiums.

While professional evaluation was a mandatory facet of participation (and funding) within KtD, actors on the 'frontline' sought to refine their practices and maximise the ongoing impact of their work through internal technologies of evaluation deployed informally at project-level. The formal evaluation required by KtD and NLHF served an advocacy purpose in that it evidenced the 'impact' of National Lottery Heritage funding. In this way, official evaluation existed in tension, at least in a processual sense, with more informal adaptive technologies of evaluation that the individual project actors used on a more daily basis. As a Nerve Centre representative told us:

After every session, we do post project surveys with the young people to capture their experience of the programme and how they have engaged with heritage towards those core aims in Kick the Dust. The majority of those questions were set by Renaisi, we've added a few of our own just to help us with our own practice and development, and then facilitator feedback forms.

This adaptive relationship with structural technologies of evaluation (the 'bolting on' of additional, questions) had implications for the stabilisation of values in enaction: the shifting from an evaluative rationality predicated on retrospective impact in the programme-level evaluation to an evaluative rationality in project-level evaluation centred on maximising impact in the relative present.

However, the project-level evaluation often moved beyond adaptation of existing technologies of evaluation to the use of specific technologies of evaluation which are explicitly devised by frontline staff to maximise immediate reflection on their practice:

I really need feedback. I need specific feedback from the actual content of the programme [...] I felt like our original feedback form wasn't going to capture that [...] So I did create a form with maybe six different questions. (Interview, RRR Representative)

These short-term evaluative measures found in the facilitator feedback forms were less tied to the core values encoded in KtD evaluative frameworks and more closely associated with refining the practices of the session leaders. In addition, project leaders developed other technologies of evaluation in order to understand the immediate impacts of individual sessions. For instance, interviewees told us how word clouds could offer a visualisation of the 'change' instigated through participation in a single session (see Figure 1).





Figure 1: Word clouds used as modes of reflection by RRR practitioners  
 Source: Extract from RRR internal evaluation data, shared with authors.

RRR staff used these methods to evaluate emotion more often during the height of the Covid-19 crisis, evidencing the increased prioritisation of emotional regulation as a project value during the Covid-19 crisis.

Further, it was clear that project leaders also conceptualised a wide variety of promotional materials as potentially evaluative, notably blogs and videos in which participants reflected on their experiences more informally. The KtD evaluative programme also used such materials, for instance Renaisi used blogs and videos to supplement their own evaluation. However, at the programme level, the goal of evaluating this ‘asset-based’ material is to evidence impact and advocate for future funding rather than to allow project members to reflect on practice. Indeed, the question of post-funding legacy emerged in many interviews at programme and project level. Interviewees saw the material traces of RRR and KtD left in these online blogs and videos as important indexes of time-limited actions (projects/programmes). Actors across the organisational system noted that the official, public evaluative reporting was also a means of recording a relatively transient programme for posterity.

Indeed, a tacit value which emerged in interviews was **Justification**. We found that evaluation at programme and project level was a means to show value for money within a neoliberal funding environment in which social impacts and non-heritage externalities indicate a successful return on public investment. As a representative of National Museums Northern Ireland noted ‘we could take that learning and go to something like our Department, The Department for Communities, and say look at this, this is the impact that it had’ (Interview, NMNI Representative). Players in the ‘game’ of short-term project-based heritage funding in the UK are keenly aware of the importance of legacy and how *positive* evaluation justifies not only the worth of the present project, but that of other, prospective projects in the future. However, our analysis suggests that this justification ‘game’ stood in tension with a more self-critical approach to evaluation. Such possibly *negative* evaluation could radically improve practice over time, but which must be hidden because the dominant neoliberal funding discourse renders negative reflection potentially dangerous.

## 5.4 Technologies of evaluation

### *Configuration of actors and organizations*

The organisational system comprised a central funder (NLHF) and a funding programme (KtD) with professional programme-level evaluators (e.g. Renaisi) who developed and oversaw evaluation. Twelve project-level consortiums were funded, each with a professional evaluator. For our study, we looked at RRR which comprised four consortium partners and eight heritage and museum sites where the RRR activities took place. This organisational system is arranged hierarchically in terms of funding and evaluation, as well as collaboratively across partners and was overseen by professional evaluators (Ruth Flood Associates). Consortium members and heritage/museum sites (predominantly state-funded organisations) also deployed their own institutionally specific technologies of evaluation to suit their own funding objectives. It is notable that we did not find tensions between the specific evaluations undertaken by individual organisations and the evaluative criteria and processes associated with KtD. We suggest that this is because both sets of evaluative technologies are subject to the justificatory funding discourses discussed above.

### *Formality, rational elaboration, publicity and salience*

At a programme level there was a high level of formality. The values of engagement, collaboration, and diversity are encoded in the KtD evaluation criteria. KtD objectives have had direct impacts on the development of the official evaluative practices undertaken by individual projects. Formal technologies were largely deployed as advocacy for future programmes and projects. At project level, however, both official evaluation (relative to the core values) and more informal technologies of evaluation which, particularly under the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, linked to alternative values of sociality and emotion regulation were present. Informal or ad-hoc evaluation also related to KtD values, but informal evaluation was used to improve day-to-day practice as the project unfolded.

### *Context and time*

KtD ran from 2016 to 2022 with funded projects from across the UK. Our study of RRR in Northern Ireland follows the project through its lifespan from 2017-2022, noting changes due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Moreover, KtD is a project funded by the NLHF, a heritage funding body overseen by the UK National Government and supported by a National Lottery. The influence of market-based or 'neoliberal' approaches to cultural policy is evident in the KtD/RRR case, most notably in the finding that evaluation serves as an advocacy tool to justify NLHF investment in the KtD programming and exists as an evidence base for future funding.

## 5.5 Tensions and their dynamics

### *Value stabilisation*

Values remained stable throughout the lifetime of the programme. The setting of explicit objectives at the outset of the KtD programme stabilised the core project-level values (**engagement, collaboration, and diversity**), which in turn determined the success measures encoded within the official technologies of evaluation. Similarly, the processual value of **reflexivity** was also stabilised through KtD's emphasis on evaluation practices and the presence of professional evaluators across the organisational system. Additional values (notably, **sociality** and **emotion regulation**) were introduced at project-level and were recognised in the more informal modes of evaluation, particularly during the Covid-19 period. However, these additional values did not destabilise the core KtD values nor were the additional values captured by KtD's formal evaluation measures. Finally, the value of **justification** remained stable across the programme, and across all state-funded programmes in the UK, through a funding policy discourse predicated on evidenced impact.

### *Tensions within the case*

A key tension within the case is between officially sanctioned and informal technologies of evaluation. Official technologies are set at the programme level to be used at both programme and project level, and by the heritage organisations as well as private companies who provide evaluation. As noted, such evaluation occurs on a long time-horizon and is most useful for demonstrating 'impact', which justifies the receipt of funding and provides a basis for further grant applications. Informal evaluation occurs at project level, especially within individual partners and by frontline staff, who actually deliver activities to young people. Such informal or ad hoc measures provide feedback to staff to allow ongoing changes in the delivery of activities and to make them more effective or enjoyable for participants. Many of these informal evaluations are not captured for future use.

In addition, the case study points to wider tensions, such as the influence of neoliberal policy in non-profit spaces, and the challenge to heritage organisations of participation and democratisation, especially the inclusion of young people as audience members and decision-makers. The crisis of Covid-19 temporarily shifted project-level value priorities away from the specific core values of KtD (engagement, diversity, collaboration, and reflexivity) in favour of wider notions of emotional regulation and sociality. Crucially, these

lockdown values were not captured by the technologies of evaluation developed at the outset of the KtD programme, as such values were not encoded as performance indicators.

### *Tension dynamics*

The tension between official and informal modes of evaluation is likely to exist in all types of funded projects that require formal evaluation. A key question which is not resolved in this case study is the degree of loose coupling between the official and informal evaluations (here, the two link at points but are decoupled at others). Similarly, tensions in the rationale for undertaking evaluation itself, ranging from funding justification and advocacy to refining delivery practice, can be found across the UK heritage sector at large, particularly in the context of evidence-led policymaking and neoliberal funding logics. Indeed, the reliability of technologies of evaluation in the domain of marketised or 'neoliberal' heritage funding regimes could be questioned due to the tension between self-preservation and self-reflexivity in evaluative reporting. Finally, tensions around heritage participation and democratisation were addressed during the KtD programme, but it is uncertain whether the long-term impact of these interventions will exist beyond the limited lifetime of KtD. Young people may remain distanced from heritage initiatives without further interventions to overcome the inherent tensions in democratising heritage participation.

## 6. Pairwise comparison - cases 2.3 and 2.4

The RRR/KtD and MUDEC case studies interrogate the evaluation of participation in heritage institutions. Despite the common participative focus of the programmes, our analysis revealed the existence of two distinct technologies of evaluation informed by differing organisational, political, and cultural contexts. In the following section, we summarise the technologies of evaluation deployed in each case and then present some concluding remarks on the value distinctions between RRR/KtD and Mudec.

### *Mudec's Technologies of Evaluation*

Actors involved in participatory activities at Mudec always considered participation as intrinsically valuable. However, what participation entails was never explicitly stated, nor was how to best achieve it. Indeed, our understanding of the technologies of evaluation at MUDEC is mainly based on key actors' ex-post oral reconstructions and on an analysis of how participation has been enacted. The presence of formal and periodic reporting is, on the other hand, quite limited.

In our view, the main evaluative criteria emerging from the narratives collected rotates around the appropriateness of the proposed participatory initiatives – i.e. how activities would fit a museum context. However, what actors deemed appropriate changed through time. In Phase 1, participatory initiatives were considered valuable if linked to the interpretation of the collection. In Phase 2 participation was mostly associated with the value of representativeness embodied by the aggregation of many foreign cultures joining the Forum. In Phase 3, participation was importantly associated with its manageability. In Phase 4, participation was instead linked to emancipation of subaltern cultures, expressed through high-culture initiatives that would fit a museum context. Overall, the emergent and incremental understanding of the meaning of appropriate cultural participation allowed heterarchical forms of evaluation to emerge through time, which were multi-axial, adaptive and, crucially, shot through with internal and external tensions between human subjectivities.

This extreme flexibility originated in a context where there was little demand for hierarchical accountability, due to the segregation of participatory activities from collection management, the low level of funding, and the involvement of voluntaries.

### *KtD/RRR's Technologies of Evaluation*

For KtD/RRR, formal evaluations were predicated on the tangible impacts of a bounded initiative with stable evaluative criteria and hierarchical technologies of evaluation clearly stated from the outset. The values which were encoded in the technologies of evaluation existed in two clusters: those associated with broadening participation (engagement, diversity, and collaboration) and those associated with accountability (reflexivity and justification).

The complex nature of the KtD system and its highly varied project-level tributaries demanded a more directive management to achieve the objectives for which it was granted funding. Formal evaluation measures were thus a disciplinary mechanism to ensure that project-level actors aligned with the values encoded in KtD funding deliverables. Moreover, the scale of State investment in KtD (£10 million) demanded evaluative practices which evidenced impact and value for money - KtD operating under the dominant market-based or 'neoliberal' policy discourse. Indeed, the emphasis throughout the KtD programme on improving evaluative practice is the result of the necessity of comparative evidence of impactful outcomes within a highly competitive funding environment, a rationality which determines all evaluations, and ultimately valuations, within the UK context.

The RRR project-level evaluation was subject to the disciplinary technologies of the programme-level evaluations. However, unofficial technologies of evaluation emerged in project-level activities to enable actors to gain rapid feedback on their individual activities. This was a response to the time lag present in the official evaluation's slow feedback loop. Therefore, a core evaluative tension in the KtD/RRR case study is one of a processual distinction between official evaluation practices predicated on advocacy and informal evaluation measures which sought to refine delivery in real time.

### *Concluding Remarks*

The organisational arrangements at the basis of each case can be conceptualised as ‘open systems’ (Scott & Davis, 2015), not only because they are designed to involve a wider conception of civic society through the participatory initiatives, but because they both make use of external actors to validate the quality of the proposed events and evidence adherence to the stated principles of participation. However, there are certain differences regarding both the relative stability of values and evaluations across the two cases and, in particular, the relative dynamism of value conflicts driving organisational action.

Evaluative conflicts were never acute in the KtD/RRR case, nor did the organisational system go through any major structural transformation, as found in Mudec. Minor processual tensions did exist between official and informal technologies of evaluation, particularly in response to the additional values produced as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. However, this tension did not impact on the overall functioning of the official evaluation technologies. These technologies were set at the outset of the programme and designed to capture certain sanctioned values encoded in a static organisational system. In Mudec, the dynamic was more active, with continuous experimentation of different participatory practices representing the motor of organisational change. Through the exploitation of tensions, actors negotiated different evaluative approaches and continuously adjusted their collective understanding of ‘participation’. Interestingly, our comparative analysis suggests that Mudec’s experimental attitude to participatory practices and its lack of evaluation was the result of the relative paucity of public money involved and associated *limited* accountability. However, the high levels of funding and the necessity of evidencing the impact of expenditure found in the KtD/RRR case study demanded more formulaic evaluative criteria, which determined programme and project outcomes.

Both cases demonstrated reflexive approaches toward evaluating participation. At KtD/RRR, evaluative reflexivity was encoded at programme level and enacted at project level – a direct response to recognised limitations within the heritage participation sector. Conversely, at Mudec, evaluative reflexivity emerged as the endpoint of a prolonged interrogation of what participation entails. Through the self-critical approaches developed in the last editions of the MCM programme, actors at Mudec realised the importance of evaluation. This (self)evaluation, however, was not performed by outlining precise criteria and metrics, but through a more holistic approach based on ethnographic research. Reflexivity is thus, in both cases, an important element for mitigating or embracing the value tensions implicated in participation.

In KtD/RRR, the logic of justification had a neutralising effect: potential value tensions, in the form of negative evaluation, were obscured because of their possible harmful consequences for the project’s success measures and associated funding mandate. On the other hand, the high level of informality and the scarcity of resources characterising Mudec allowed internal criticisms to surface unburdened by justification. This evaluative openness triggered an intense and ongoing process of organisational learning which refined competencies on participatory approaches.

## Third pair: Architectural and Design Business

### 7. A Spanish architect firm. The case of the Fabra & Coats project (case 2.5)

#### 7.1 Case background

We study a case of functional-cultural production in the architectural field. We focus on analysing evaluation dynamics leading to more consensual or conflictual results in architectural production. The selected architectural project for our analysis is the Creative factory and Centre for Contemporary Art Fabra & Coats (F&C) in Barcelona (Spain).

The project selected consists of a transformation of an old industrial building into a new centre for the creation and exhibition of music, theatre, and dance in the neighbourhood of Sant Andreu in Barcelona. The original building was constructed in 1910 and occupied 14,000 m<sup>2</sup>. The building is owned by Barcelona City Council and managed by the Barcelona Institute of Culture (ICUB). ICUB commissioned the conversion of the industrial building into a creation factory through a public competition and within the Creation Factory Programme<sup>11</sup>.

The competition programme included a centre for artistic creation, an art school, a centre for interpreting industrial heritage, a museum of work, and a centre for contemporary art exhibitions. In the interviews with the architect responsible, we were able to identify three phases in the development of the project, namely: (a) phase 1 (2010 to 2011): preparation of the competition and development of the central space linked to the creative hub (b) phase 2: (2013 to 2016) Development of the Centre for Contemporary Art; and (c) phase 3 (present): relocation of the Contemporary Art Centre to a new floor of the building and creating a new space for a music school.

#### 7.2 Methodology

The architectural creation and production process of the F&C refurbishment project has been analysed through three phases: Pre-production, Production and Post-Production. The pre-production phase includes the actors, forms of (e)valuation, and tensions that appear at the moment of the definition of the competition rules, as well as the evaluation process of the architectural projects presented. The production phase focuses on the actors involved in creating, designing, and constructing the winning architectural project: architects, acoustic consultants and building companies. Finally, the post-production phase focuses on the living practices and the evaluations and assessments generated by F&C users and resident artists.

We use semi-structured interviews and document analysis as information-gathering techniques. The gathering units used are the discourses and documents (written reflections, notes, publications, programmes, etc.) of the actors involved directly and indirectly in the architectural processes analysed. We interviewed a total of 9 people involved in the different phases of the F&C project, namely:

- Pre-production: one of the people responsible for the ICUB in elaborating the rules of the public competition, an ICUB architect and an external architect who participated as members of the competition jury, and a heritage consultant.
- Production: the two architects responsible for the winning architectural project and an acoustic consultant.
- Post-production: the coordinator of F&C and an artist-in-residence.

The interview technique had a guide that included dimensions and sub-dimensions of analysis and their correlation to research and interview questions. We adapted the guide according to the role of the interviewee in the analysis. Our model of analysis was a content analysis based on ATLAS.TI software. We first defined a series of crucial codes to enable fragments of the documents to be analysed according to our

---

<sup>11</sup> The Creation Factories Programme is a public policy programme that seeks to promote cultural creation in Barcelona.

conceptual framework. Secondly, we established a co-occurrence of codes that allowed us to elaborate network relationships between the codes used, facilitating our analysis.

### 7.3. Technologies of evaluation

#### *Configuration of actors and organizations*

A cultural production involves a plurality of actors beyond the direct creators of the cultural product. This plurality of actors constitutes a network of cooperation that makes cultural work possible (Becker, 1984). In architectural production, the creation of the idea, its execution and the supporting tasks are performed by different social actors. In F&C, the architectural guidelines were defined in the pre-production phase before the intervention of the architects and then continued by the responsible architects during the project's development. The construction of the project was carried out by a building company and other advisors under the supervision of the responsible architects. Finally, the users made the last adjustments to the building (and continue to be made) in the post-production phase.

The architectural **pre-production** phase -in the framework of a public competition as in the case of F&C- is centred on the tasks related to elaborating the competition rules and evaluating the architectural projects presented to the public call for proposals. The social actors directly involved in this phase were, on the one hand, the Institute of Culture of Barcelona (ICUB) and advisors in the field of heritage conservation. The ICUB led the process of drawing up the competition rules with the assistance of the heritage advisors. On the other hand, a jury of experts made up of architects, and ICUB staff evaluated the projects submitted to the competition. Many indirect stakeholders were involved in this stage: heritage associations, former employees of the F&C, neighbourhood organisations and artists. All these actors represent the different interests around the F&C future use. The heritage associations and the former workers of the F&C demanded the integral preservation of the site without significant alterations. Neighbourhood organisations and the artistic sector focused their demands on creating local public facilities (schools, workshops) for neighbours and spaces for artistic production, respectively.

The architectural **production** phase of an architectural project - within the framework of a public competition- is linked to interpreting the competition rules, the conception and design of the architectural project and its constructive development. The architects were the central actors in this phase, with the advice and collaboration of other actors equally crucial for the execution of the project, such as the structural facility, acoustic advisors and building companies.

Finally, the **post-production** phase is linked to the practices of inhabiting by the users (members of the F&C coordination staff) and the resident artists. Although these actors are usually considered mere users, their practices make the final adaptation of the building in terms of habitability, functionality, and comfort.

#### *Formality, rational elaboration, publicity and salience*

(E)Valuative practices are inscribed in every conscious or unconscious decision made by social actors in the different moments of a creative process, such as the publisher *editing moments* (Becker, 1984; Moeran & Christensen, 2013). *Editing moments* are the choices made by different actors at different moments in their creative work. These 'moments' are based on intersubjective agreements and disagreements about a set of references against which an entity (in this case, different aspects of an architectural proposal) is compared and on negotiations about criteria and legitimate judgement (including conflicts and power struggles).

The **pre-production** phase is defined by the practices and actions involved in elaborating the guidelines for the architectural competition rules and evaluating the architectural projects submitted to the competition. Within this framework, the ICUB established a series of evaluation mechanisms of relatively low formality to understand the various needs of the possible use of the F&C. The first valuative assessment that ICUB carried out was the need for artistic creation and production spaces that had been strongly demanded in Barcelona since 2006 by various artistic collectives and associations, which gave rise to the creation of the Creation Factories Programme. The evaluation devices used to understand their needs were based on round-table

discussions and interviews with the artistic sector. Artistic practices were also developed to test the functionality and usefulness of the building before elaborating on the bases.

The idea of using the site for cultural and artistic creation emerged also in different artistic events and practices held in F&C before its transformation. Based on the artistic necessities, the ICUB evaluates others Creation Factory's experiences already working in Barcelona (such as Hangar, La Central del Circ or El Graner) and outside the city (such as the Matadero in Madrid). These other Creative Factory's experiences were evaluated to establish the functions of F&C concerning artistic creation and production, deciding to include the industrial site in the framework of the Creation Factory Programme. Finally, another critical aspect that the ICUB assessed was the local necessities. As in the case of the artistic sector, the mechanism used to assess them was based on round-table discussions with the neighbourhood associations and the association of former F&C workers. The generation of local facilities and the preservation of the factory site without many alterations were the decisions taken after this evaluation.

The decision to preserve the industrial building led the ICUB to engage an external heritage advisor to evaluate which building elements should be preserved and in what form. The mechanisms for evaluating the condition of the building, carried out by the heritage advisory team, acquired a high degree of formalisation. From a historical and qualitative approach, the elements to be preserved were evaluated based on their relationship to the architectural ensemble, their character, morphology, function, and context. Based on this evaluation, the heritage advisory team concluded that it was necessary to preserve the structure and character of the building without significant alterations to its structure, function, and morphology. The result of this evaluation is a dossier that included "*all the elements to be preserved*".

The most significant degree of formalisation in the evaluation mechanisms was during the architectural jury. The jury team made up of ICUB members and external advisors (mostly architects with a recognised trajectory) implemented a scoring system divided into two phases. The first phase focused on evaluating the technical solvency of the projects. The technical solvency made it possible to pre-select the projects that could participate according to the professional background of the architects in charge. The second phase concerned evaluating the pre-selected projects to choose the competition winner. For this selection, the jury used a scoring system based on two critical criteria for the competition promoter (the ICUB): the adaptation to the existing building (respecting its identity) and the functionality of the programme (based on flexibility), which had to consider a facility that included a space for artistic creation, a museum of the history of the workers' movement, and a music school (later a Contemporary Art Centre was added to this facility).

In the **production** phase, evaluative practices acquire a lower level of formality. The evaluations are related to the criteria used by the architects responsible for their architectural decisions: "*we evaluate as we build*". In the ideation phase of the project, the architects evaluate the competition rules and the space of the existing industrial site. The first design decisions were based on these evaluations: to preserve the site as intact as possible and to generate an intervention flexible enough to allocate diverse and changing activities.

The selection of a minimal, although flexible architectural intervention led the architects to evaluate different possible construction systems, among which they found the nautical sail system to be the most suitable. This type of intervention allowed the preservation of the character of the industrial site to be resolved without significant alterations while generating flexible and changing spaces for the development of its activities. This decision led the architects to design flexible structures for various artistic, exhibition and educational activities.

The flexible infrastructure used by the architects was a challenge to the sound insulation of the spaces. The acoustic advisors evaluated the noise and reverberation generated in the flexible installations based on a series of sound tests according to formal and rational criteria. Based on the results of the tests, they recommend the insulation of the spaces.

The users of F&C (resident artists and ICUB staff) permanently carry out micro-evaluations *in-situ* in the **post-production** stage. The users evaluate as they inhabit the space, so these practices are implicit. There are also more formalised instances of dialogue and exchange between the resident artists and the ICUB staff to



evaluate the functionality of the space concerning its actual uses. In these instances, the need for using and adapting the space that emerges from the artistic practice developed by the resident artists is evaluated.

The residents evaluate and assess the characteristics that make up the comfort, functionality, acoustic characteristics and, to a lesser extent, formal and morphological aspects of the space. From these *in-situ* evaluations, developed in living and residing in F&C, recommendations and minor spatial modifications emerge that bring the process of spatial creation and production to a close.

### *Value stabilization*

Value stabilization refers to the degree a valuation process contributes to fixing the value of cultural works or actors to make it “uncontroversial or transportable across contexts” (Lamont, 2012). In this section, we will analyse how the decisions taken in the different contexts of the development of the architectural proposal -derived from the evaluation practices carried out by the different intervening actors- enact and stabilise valuations that define the salient characteristics of the F&C building.

From our analysis, we observe that two valuational principles are enacted and stabilised throughout the whole process of creation and production of F&C: **heritage identity** and **functional flexibility**. The principle of heritage identity is associated with assessments of the importance of preserving the F&C industrial site as an element of local memory and identity. The principle of functional flexibility, on the other hand, is related to evaluations of the change and adaptability that the site must have to develop diverse and changing artistic activities. Although contradictory, these values are articulated and materialised in F&C's architectural proposal.

### **Stabilising the value of heritage identity**

The former F&C workers were the first enactors to keep the F&C industrial building as intact as possible after its closure and acquisition by the City Council, affirming its importance as a place of memory of the culture of work and the neighbourhood. When the ICUB took over F&C, they understood its heritage value and its centrality to the identity of the neighbourhood of Sant Andreu, which led them to hire a heritage advisor to catalogue the building. The heritage advisor's assessment emphasises the factory's centrality in formal, historical, and social terms and enacts two ways of preserving the building. The first is the preservation of the whole complex without significant alterations, preserving the parts by understanding their functional relationship with the whole: *"F&C is a formally potent complex (...), which allowed the maintenance of the formal criteria without losing what this whole set of systems of the industry is"*. The second recommendation is to respect the functionality of the building and its capacity, as an industrial building, to adapt to new technologies and functions: *"in practical buildings such as industrial ones, this is possible (...) its historical reference does not prevent there being a redefinition, for example, of some interior elements. Why? Because the way it will be restructured is consistent with how it has already been restructured in the past"*. Preservation of the built ensemble and its elements, and the potential for adaptation and change for new functions without altering its identity, define the central foundations of the F&C competition rules and the criteria used for the evaluation of the architectural projects submitted to the competition.

The architects who won the competition ended up stabilising these assessments in the architectural project they submitted to the competition. The decision to keep the structure of the building intact emerges from the evaluation and interpretation of competition rules and from analysing the existing building. *"The power of the space and its character meant we did not project against the building. [We did not need to force] the building to put the programme inside or give it the shape we wanted. (...) Faced with a compelling building, you cannot play the boxer because it will knock you down, but you have to play the judoka"*. This interpretation of the building and the competition rules led the architects to develop an architectural proposal that did not alter the whole (based on flexible structures). The responsible architects made only two significant modifications: defining the main entrance (which the factory did not have) and moving some elements on the top floor so there would be enough space to develop dance activities. In this way, the project and constructive development of the building ends up stabilising its heritage identity.

## Stabilising the value of functional flexibility

After assessing the artistic and neighbourhood needs, the ICUB envisages a programme for artistic creation that includes facilities for the neighbourhood (such as workshops and schools). The idea of creating an art centre and space for the neighbourhood necessity was justified by the ICUB based on a discourse centred on democratising principles. *"It was demanded that [F&C] should be a space accessible to all (...), the factory had to be an open space (...) it could not be 100% exclusively for creators and artists, but there also had to be space for the public"*. For this reason, a programme is sought that catalyses the most significant number of needs in its functions and that, at the same time, could contemplate changes. Regarding the terms of reference for architectural competition rules, the democratising valuation was translated into a programme that promoted the generation of flexible spaces adaptable to different needs.

When evaluating the competition rules, the architects who designed the winning architectural project realised that the number of elements that the programme demanded implied an architectural resolution enabling change and flexibility in the spaces. This interpretation of the requirements of the bases led the architects to elaborate an architectural response based on the assembly of flexible and changing structures in which all the required functions could be fitted without altering the identity of the building. They found the answer in the nautical sail system: *"This was a new programme (...) and you conclude that not everything they ask for fits, and you say: 'let's propose a flexible strategy', a mobile system (...) from here we looked for analogies about construction systems that are more or less light and that can be changeable, that's when we connected with the nautical sail system"*. This functional and flexible resolution that did not alter the structure and character of the factory site was positively valued by the jury evaluating the architectural competition over other types of projects where more rigid architectural resolutions were proposed. Flexibility (with the preservation of the site) was one of the central dimensions that the jury considered when evaluating. These processes stabilise the functional flexibility of the building, although less strongly than the heritage identity.

### 7.4. Tensions and their dynamics

The stabilisation of heritage identity and functional flexibility took place through a chain of evaluative practices, evaluative adjustments (according to the context) and materialisation (as the catalogue of elements to be preserved, the competition rules, the architectural project and the finished work itself). However, the process of value stabilisation described above was not lacking tensions. Although these tensions were neither explicit nor central, rather minor internal dissonances, they appeared in the different phases of the development of the architectural proposal of F&C.

*Democratisation-Functional Flexibility vs Artistic Excellence-Functional Specificity.* This valuational tension was identified in the pre-production phase in the context of elaborating the competition rules. The actors involved in this tension were the neighbourhood associations, the artistic sector and the ICUB staff. We can classify this tension as weak and latent between, on the one hand, the actors who advocated an artistic use of the building (the artistic sector and part of the ICUB) and, on the other hand, those actors who sought a less specific use of the space that was more open to the community (the neighbourhood sector and part of the ICUB). Although F&C is inscribed as a Factory of Creation, part of the ICUB team intended to generate a facility accessible to all citizens, with equipment that was not only artistic. The tension between democratisation and artistic excellence was translated in spatial terms into the search for a flexible and open programme (including other activities) and a specific one (focused on artistic activity). This latent tension is resolved without conflict in the elaboration of competition rules where flexibility prevails over functional specificity.

*Heritage Identity - Functional Flexibility vs Artistic Heritage.* This value tension was identified in evaluating the architectural projects selected in the pre-production phase. The actors involved in this tension were the members of the competition jury. The valuational tension is manifested in the criteria used when selecting the winning project of the competition. One sector of the jury was inclined to select projects in which the architectural resolution prevailed over the integral preservation of the site and functional adaptability. Another sector of the jury favoured the selection of projects where there was more respect for the proposal's

heritage identity and functional flexibility. This tension manifested itself in a discussion on whether the heritage restoration should be more historical (respecting the identity of the building and its functions) or more artistic (where there would be greater importance on the architects' intervention in defining the character of the building). The scoring criteria of the competition ultimately resolved the differences raised, leading to the selection of an architectural project that was more respectful of the heritage identity of the existing building, more flexible and open to change.

*Heritage Identity - Functional Flexibility vs Technical Efficiency - Cost Adequacy.* This value tension is identified in the context of the constructive development of the project in the production phase. The actors involved in this tension are the architects responsible for the project and those involved in part of its material development: acoustic advisory and building companies. The tensions detected are not significant (e)valuative controversies but rather what Ignacio Farías (2015) calls epistemic dissonances: different perspectives on the same project. These epistemic dissonances were detected when the acoustic advisory team raised the need to adapt the flexible structure into which the venue spaces were divided to achieve better acoustic insulation or when the relationship between costs and materials was discussed between the architects and the construction companies. Although these discussions raised underlying tensions between heritage identity - functional flexibility and technical or economic efficiency, they ended up being resolved in favour of the architectural proposal drawn up by the architects responsible, who incorporated these recommendations, but without altering the essence of the proposal.

*Heritage Identity - Functional Flexibility vs Comfort - Artistic Excellence.* Here we cannot strictly speak of tensions. Instead, it is about how users interact and, in doing so, attempt to modify the space's encoded values tactically. The resident artists are the ones who, by inhabiting the space, express their concern about questions of comfort (for example, in terms of air conditioning) or functionality of the space (better distribution of places, more storage space) to guarantee better artistic performance. In doing so, they put well-being and artistic excellence values first. These values generate some tactical responses, as Michel De Certeau (2000) points out, which modify the space, and which oppose one of the central values of F&C: functional flexibility. The resident artists seek a place of belonging, less flexible and more stable. In their small tactical interventions in the space, they close the production cycle of F&C.

## 8. A Spanish design firm. The case of the Antoni Arola studio (case 2.6)

### 8.1. Case background

Estudi Antoni Arola was founded in Barcelona in 1994 by Antoni Arola (born in 1960). It is a well-known design studio that has won several important awards, including the Spanish National Prize of Design in 2003. While the studio has designed a variety of objects, including furniture and packaging, it has over time specialized in the design of lighting.

In this area, the studio has recently won two significant competitions that constitute or focus of interest. The first one is the project for the public Christmas lights of Barcelona for the year 2021. The project was selected through an open call organized by the city council and the local professional design association ADI-FAD (Associació de Disseny Industrial – Foment de les Arts i del Disseny). The second project selected is the lamp *Làmina*, produced and commercialized by Santa&Cole, which won a Silver Medal for lighting design at the Delta Awards in 2020. The Delta Awards are organized by ADI-FAD and are based on a selection process made by an independent expert committee and an international jury.

### 8.2. Methodology

We conducted seven interviews with different actors in different organizations involved in the two selected projects by Estudi Antoni Arola (see table 1).

| Num. | Organization  | Actor  |
|------|---|--|
| 1    | Studio Antoni Arola (design enterprise)                                   | Chief designer   |
| 2    | Ximenez (industrial production enterprise of the Christmas lights)        | General manager  |
| 3    | Ajuntament de Barcelona   | Director of the economic promotion department responsible of the Christmas Light project |
| 4    | Ajuntament de Barcelona   | Christmas Lights technical responsible   |
| 5    | Adi-FAD (association of industrial designers organizing the Delta awards) | Coordinator  |
| 6    | Delta awards – 1 <sup>st</sup> selection phase                            | Member of the expert committee   |
| 7    | Delta awards – 2 <sup>nd</sup> selection phase                            | Juror  |

Table 1. Interviewees

We lack the perspective of publishing companies that produce the lights designed by the studio Antoni Arola since they rejected to collaborate. We also did some documentary research at the Museum of Design in Barcelona (see bibliography).

After collecting data from interviews and documentary research, we proceeded to the content and discourse analysis of the interviews and the documents. We were attentive to the potential plurality of values embedded in the evaluative practices that emerge during different phases of the selected projects (preproduction, production, and postproduction).

### 8.3. Findings: phases, actors, practices

The production of luminaries plays out in different phases, engaging different actors and involving different practices and values. In this section we present the different phases and the actors, practices and values that intervene in each.

### *Preproduction phase*

In the preproduction phase, the initial creative idea by the designer is differently shaped if it has a previous promoter/client (as in the Christmas light project) or if it is an idea of his own initiative (as in the *Làmina* lamp). However, the creative process of a new project is always informal and non-linear. Like an artist, the designer works with manual tools (a notebook and a pencil), intuition and previous experience of materials and of the collaboration with the promoter/client. He also collaborates with other actors that help him decide if the project is technically feasible, economically viable and if it matches his values; particularly beauty, as seen in valuations, since he considers that usefulness/utility is already accomplished in our highly technically developed societies. For example, other studio members help him not only with their reactions and opinions, but also with informatic tools and physical or virtual models. These tools are ambiguous. On the one hand, they can reduce freedom and improvisation (creativity), as they represent exactly how the project will materialize. On the other hand, they help the designer control expectations and reduce failure, and also give him new ideas.

Adapting to the requirements and tastes of promoters/clients always plays a role in the creative practice. Although most clients participate through dialogue with the studio, it is particularly interesting how the city council acts as a promoter that constricts creation in the Christmas light project. The city council uses two main tools based on bureaucratic norms. The first tool is the design contest based mostly on subjective decisions regarding aesthetics. The selection of the winner (Antoni Arola's studio) is divided in different phases: 1) a selection of portfolios by ADI-FAD, according to aesthetic criteria (originality, beauty), 2) selection of the three finalists by ADI-FAD and the city council and 3) the final decision by political representatives of the city council, aiming at having only one winner for the three main streets (a risky decision, as a technician stated). The second tool is opening a tender for the production, installation, dis-installation and storage of the Christmas lights. This tender follows objective criteria that allow budgetary control.

Interestingly, another practice after the contest of design and before the tender of production is organized by the city council: they organize a previous meeting with industrial companies that want to participate in the tender to discuss with the designer and reduce future problems of production and installation. Ximenez, with international experience, suggests that the city council's engineers and technicians evaluate the feasibility of the designs in order to anticipate and reduce conflicts and difficulties. This strategy is followed in other countries where they work.

### *Production phase*

After the creative process and the selection of designs, there is a relatively unproblematic phase of production for both selected projects. In the *Làmina* lamp, the designer and the editing company discuss and try materials that could be pertinent to the design. In the Christmas lights, the industrial company presents some material boundaries to the designer, but these are also easily accepted. For example, LEDs have predetermined lengths and wires can support predetermined weights that affect the final figures. After this dialogue, the industrial production of lights can be pursued.

Practices change considerably between the two selected projects. In the Christmas project, more practices and actors are involved. Firstly, there is a pre-installation discussion. Engineers evaluate the feasibility of the project and its safety. It is a collaborative practice, since an external engineering studio hired by Arola, the city council engineers and experts, and the Ximenez engineers works out a solution, especially for the complicated design of Plaça Catalunya. Here the role of the engineering studio is technical, pragmatic, and its know-how allows to go beyond the design phase where "paper stands everything". The designer Arola is very satisfied with this result.

Secondly, and in parallel, the city council is devoted to creating a narrative and expectation around the Christmas lights. Here, politicians put pressure on technicians, since they want to promote the new city lights, as they consider them good publicity for their party and also economic benefits for shopkeepers.

Thirdly, the installation of the Christmas lights is done by workers of Ximenez but with Arola's supervision. Here important conflicts emerge, as we will see. Although COVID increased tempos of installation, thus being an unexpected benefit, tempos are still too short and reinforce these conflicts.

#### *Postproduction phase*

After all those practices, the Christmas lights and the *Làmina* lamp converge again, based on postproduction practices of reception. In the Christmas lights, more emphasis is put on citizens as users, so reception is very informal. In the *Làmina* lamp, clients must buy the lamp in order to use it and, since this lamp is awarded a Delta prize, critics also intervene. This practice is much more formal, divided in phases and involving more people. For this awards, ADI-FAD appoints 1) a committee of experts (around 10 people specialized in different areas of design) that makes a pre-selection of projects presented to an open call, and 2) an international jury with 5-7 designer members that choose the best projects of each category to be awarded a Delta (gold, silver, bronze). The expert committee puts its emphasis on respect to the instructions of the call for projects. Its members make sure that the projects match the conditions and that they are eligible for an award. The following pre-selection is based on the aesthetic qualities of the projects, their use of technology and other criteria that explicitly appear in the call. As each member has its own criteria, the pre-selection phase involves discussions and even rounds of voting. The international jury afterwards makes its choices of awards in a similar way, that is through discussion aiming at consensus. Since each member of the jury has its own specialization, the weight of their opinions may change from one project discussed to another.

Finally, in the Christmas lights project there are other practices involved, such as supervision during the exhibition, dis-installation and storage after. In both cases, mid-term informal evaluations take place. The city council and the designer reflect on their participation in the next Christmas lights. Regarding the lamp, the designer finds some defects in his design and thinks there is no magic formula to understand its success.

## 8.4. Technologies of evaluation

### *Configuration of actors and organizations*

It is important to note that, since the main actors are often complex organizations, within them there are individual, personal actors. The design studio is organized as a crafts atelier, with a simple and implicit hierarchy around the designer. There is division of labor, but the team members work together along the process.

Ximenez is a big company devoted to the production, installation, and handling of decorative lighting for Christmas and other festivities. It is the biggest one in the Spanish market, with 18% of commissions in the international market. As a complex organization, it presents vertical integration, high functional differentiation in departments, and clear hierarchies in different regions.

The city council is another complex organization. It is organized around multiple departments that collaborate in the Christmas lights project, led by the department of economic promotion. In each department, there are multiple hierarchies of both politicians and technicians. In economic promotion, politicians decide to promote the new design contest for the Christmas lights, but technicians decide how this contest takes place and supervise all the process.

ADI-FAD is a Catalan association managed by a small group of people including a president, a coordinator and a person in charge of treasury. For the annual Delta Awards for design, ADI-FAD appoints external collaborators to serve in the pre-selection by the expert committee or in the award-giving selection by the international jury.

### *Levels of formality, rational elaboration, publicity and salience*

All phases are mainly subject to informal evaluation/valuation. However, in the processes involving a formal selection procedure (e.g. the Delta awards and the Christmas lights contest), more objectivized criteria and regulated procedures play a role. Despite a general informality, some actors show a considerable degree of

rational elaboration and public expression of values they try to preserve and enhance through their work (e.g. at Ximenez).

In the studio, different valuations intertwine and develop during the preproduction and production of luminaries. Creativity and intuition are values that foster a good design, but they must be reconciled with pragmatic values such as feasibility. These concrete values are also framed by more general or abstract values that guide the valuations of the studio along the process of design. For example, beauty is the main value that Arola looks for in his designs, usually related to his orientation towards minimalism. To evaluate if beauty is accomplished in his designs, the designer relates them to the warmth of light, which creates a pleasant experience to the user. Since this experience enhances the user's desire to keep Arola's creations, durability is also another indicator of accomplishing beauty. However, once the project is accomplished, during his informal evaluations of postproduction, he always sees defects to his creations. For example, dust accumulates in some parts of the lamp; the Christmas lights are not in "perfect order to create a single work" as he imagined, because of the installation by the industrial company.

In these valuations, beauty is usually opposed to economics, consumerism, and obsolescence. For this reason, Arola criticizes the industrial company that seeks profitability and the city council that only wants propaganda to enhance consumerism. Regarding utility, as already mentioned, Arola argues that this value is always covered in our modern societies, being not his main concern.

In the preproduction phase, representatives of the city council create a narrative surrounding the new contest. They look for a design that transmits ideas such as modernity, secularity, integration, or a Mediterranean way of life. These ideas are related to the "Marca Barcelona", a concept that wants to show Barcelona as a city of design, creativity, or innovation. Despite this narrative, the economic principle is the main interest and the main principle to evaluate the success of the Christmas lights. The idea behind the new contest is to seduce citizens and non-citizens to visit the city during this period and, by walking around, consuming at the city center. In addition, this strategy is important as political promotion.

These principles are materialized through quantitative criteria and valuations in the call for projects of the design contest and the tender for the production of the lights. For example, during the selection of Arola's design in the preproduction phase, the jury members of the city council talk about how his design captures their values of modernity or secularity, and that it is also beautiful. However, pragmatic, quantitative, and economic valuations prevail in all this pre-production phase controlled by the city council. For example, although qualitative criteria guide the selection of Arola's design, it is also a simple design that allows an easy installation and reduces future conflicts as discussed in the next section (pragmatic valuation). Regarding the tender of production and installation, Ximenez must respect economic limitations and it is valued through scoring, that is, through quantitative valuations. These valuations are mainly based on economic criteria, but they also include other criteria such as respecting sustainability.

At Ximenez, all valuations are guided by three main principles. Firstly, the commission must be profitable in economic terms. It is then important to efficiently use human, material, and time resources during the production phase. Secondly, in this production phase, the project must be feasible and, for this reason, Ximenez knows that they must dialogue with other participants, contributing to the project with their know-how. They are particularly suited to guide the pre-installation and installation phases, their main areas of expertise. Thirdly, and most important, the project must respect safety. To accomplish these values, Ximenez thoroughly controls the process with administrative and technical programs and memorandums. We consider these procedures part of a rational elaboration with a considerable degree of formality.

The Delta Awards are a more formal valuation mechanism operating during the postproduction phase. The valuation principles are different for the expert committee in charge of the pre-selection and for the international jury deciding the final award-winning projects. For the expert committee, respect of the instructions of the call for projects is the main principle. Just after that, committee members look at the innovations presented by each project in terms of aesthetics, technology, sustainability or originality. Once the pre-selection is done, the international jury decides which project wins which award. In this phase, all projects meet the minimum standard, so the valuation principles of aesthetics, technology, sustainability or originality come to the forefront.

### *Contexts and time*

As previously shown, different actors are distributed along the process, changing considerably from one project (Christmas lights) to the other (the *Làmina* lamp). Further sections, interestingly, point out that timings, which are very strict in the Christmas light project, play an important role in increasing the power of some actors (e.g. in the context of installation between Ximenez and the studio Antoni Arola).

### *Value stabilization*

In the Christmas lights project, the strict timings help some actors stabilize their values. Although beauty was encoded as the most important value for the designer in the preproduction phase, and other actors verbally accepted its centrality, short timings of installation benefit Ximenez to impose efficiency in the production phase, which reduces the harmonic beauty that Arola was looking for. Since the city hall does not intervene in this conflict, we might consider that, although they framed this contest as a way to promoting Barcelona as a city of design, economic promotion prevails more than the artistic values of design.

Contrarily, along the process of the *Làmina* project, the artistic values of beauty and durability of a good design stabilize from the preproduction and production phases, when the studio works in collaboration with the editing company, until the postproduction phase, when this lamp gets external recognition at the Delta awards. This process of stabilization is explained in the next section in relation to tensions.

## 8.5 Tensions and their dynamics

Tensions and conflicts arise in different phases. In the pre-production phase, the work of the designer does not present important tensions or conflicts. He dialogues with studio members and the editing company (in the case of the *Làmina* lamp). In commissioned works, such as in the Christmas lights contest, the studio must adapt to external criteria. However, all these interactions are not conflictive. Conflict appears only, sometimes, with clients who “do not know what they want”, and for whom he is forced to present several proposals before they accept one.

In this phase, the city council must solve the classic tension between objective and subjective criteria when preparing the call for projects for the design contest and the tender of production and installation. The difficulty of including subjective criteria that enhance creativity in public tenders where budgetary control prevails, they find a solution consisting of the externalization of the design contest to ADI-FAD and giving them the power in order to preserve creativity-related values. Interestingly, since they combine aesthetical principles with pragmatic principles during the selection of Arola’s design, ADI-FAD and the city council anticipate and avoid possible future conflicts, as Arola’s selected design is simple and feasible. Contrarily, production and installation are controlled through the tender based on quantitative criteria that reduce discussion.

Since editing companies share aesthetical valuations with the designer, conflicts do not arise in the *Làmina* lamp during the production phase. By contrast, the production and installation phases are considerably conflictive in the Christmas lights project. The tensions that arise oppose values tied to technical efficiency and to aesthetics. Although Arola recognises Ximenez expertise regarding installation, and he accepts some pragmatic criteria suggested by Ximenez (e.g. regarding LED length or wire weights), he criticizes the final installation in Plaça Catalunya because he finds Ximenez’s work “shoddy” and not preserving the harmony and unity of his design. He talks about a frustrating and harsh conflict. On the other side, interestingly, Ximenez does not perceive any particular conflict in this project compared to others outside of Barcelona. The city council, as mediator, does not want to talk about any conflict (although implicitly they recognise some tension during the installation phase) and expresses satisfaction with the final result.

The different perceptions during the installation might be related to the different values, expectations, and roles of actors. For example, the designer is responsible during the creation phase, and he seeks beauty. However, he loses control of his work during the installation phase, when Ximenez is not particularly concerned about beauty since they care about economic profitability related to feasibility and safety (although they try to respect the original design). The city council is more concerned about creating a



narrative that increases economic profitability in Barcelona during the Christmas period, and their role as promoters and mediators reduces conflicts emphasizing good results of the initiative.

These conflicts highlight different balances of power regarding actors and organizations. The studio Antoni Arola, a small organization, must collaborate with two large organizations: the Ximenez company of lights and the city council of Barcelona (and to a lesser extent ADI-FAD, that collaborated with the City Hall). Although the studio has considerable autonomy because all other actors try to respect its initial design, we found out that Ximenez has more power to impose its criteria. Maybe that's why the degree of dissatisfaction considering the final result is much higher for Arola. The city council has the main power as the promoter, in charge of selecting the winner with ADI-FAD, etc. The city council also imposes budgetary and temporal limitations that affect the production and installation of the Christmas lights. However, it does not interfere with these two actors (Antoni Arola, Ximenez) if they succeed in installing the lights before the inauguration. Despite the relative autonomy that the city council gives them, both the designer and the industrial company criticize the role of the city hall when conflicts emerge, since they expected more mediation.

In addition to that, this conflict during installation demonstrates that time plays an important role and helps Ximenez impose their criteria. All actors agree that the aesthetic criteria of the initial design must be preserved and consider that this is the designer's responsibility. However, technical efficiency and economic values, defended by other actors such as Ximenez, gain importance along the process. For example, although the work done by Ximenez dissatisfies Arola, Ximenez finds an advantage in imposing his search for benefits or efficiency, since short timings favour that: once lights had been installed, it became inefficient to modify them because the opening date was too close.

Here, then, we find another way to rationalize the discussions. All those different values were imposed through dialogue, but the rational elaboration that helps participants impose these values arises from practical/temporal actions and needs that reinforce technical arguments by Ximenez and reduce aesthetical values that would require more time.

During the installation phase, other invisible conflicts arise. Inside the city council, the most important tensions arise between different departments. For example, the department of economic promotion in charge of the lights must dialogue and convince the department that takes care of trees if they want to use them to install lights. In addition, politicians put pressure on technicians, who are however satisfied with their autonomy.

Some conflicts arise also during the post-production phase. The Delta Awards competition consists of two phases that show different levels of conflictuality. The first pre-selection phase is low on conflict: the actors in charge have clear instructions to follow and they are pragmatic in doing what is asked from them. In order to avoid conflict, they establish procedures to select the projects that go to the next phase. They use, for example, colour codes to classify the projects from best to worst according to the instructions of the call and to a general appreciation of their quality, and they vote. In the case of this procedure not being sufficient, members of the committee can discuss specific projects, but generally all members agree on the results of the classification and the voting rounds. A moderator is present, but only intervenes in case of conflict, mainly controlling speaking turns. The second phase of the competition is final, it ends with the decision of which projects win the gold, silver and bronze Delta Awards. Each member of the international jury intervening in this phase has his/her own specialization in categories (lighting, packaging, furniture etc.) and has, therefore, more say in projects of his/her category of reference. Jury members discuss the projects and try to find a consensus about the distribution of awards. Here, again, a moderator is present but does not generally intervene.

## 9. Pairwise comparison - cases 2.5 and 2.6

The architectural and design productions selected represent functional cultural productions developed by low-complexity professional firms, where a craft production model prevails. Both cases were analysed by considering the process of cultural production from a broad point of view, including the pre-production, production, and post-production stages. This processual perspective on cultural production allowed us to understand more clearly the relationship between evaluative technologies, value stabilisation processes and the resulting tensions.

### *Configuration of Organizations and Actors*

The selected architecture and design projects encompass a plurality of actors. The pre-production phase involves the public administration, the juries of architecture and design competitions and a series of indirect actors (potential consumers and stakeholders interested in the future of the projects analysed). In the production phase, organisations dedicated to the design of the project (architecture and design studios) and its material development (construction companies, companies dedicated to the production, installation, and handling of decorative lighting, etc.) are involved. In the post-production phases, the central actors are the users and critics. The difference between the two cases resides in each actor's centrality during the production process's development.

In the case of the architectural project, the public administration (represented by the ICUB) leads the pre-production phase. The ICUB precisely defines the guidelines of the competition rules, acting as a catalyst and articulator of other actors (acoustic consultants, neighbourhood, artistic associations, etc.) to guarantee the proposal's central idea. On the contrary, in the case of the design of lamps and the city's luminaire, the pre-production phase is led by the design studio in collaboration with the clients or promoters.

This equation is inverted in the production phase. The architectural studio takes leadership during the production process, subordinating the other social actors to execute what is established in the project. On the contrary, in the case of the design of the city's luminaire, the companies in charge of the material development of the design acquire centrality, coming into tension with the ideas put forward by the designers.

### *Levels of Formality of the technologies of evaluation*

The evaluation technologies used along the production process in both cases entail a combination of formal assessment devices and, more or less, informal evaluation practices. Some formal devices appear at the moments of assessing the architectural and design proposals presented in both the public competitions and the awarding of prizes.

The pre-production phase is characterised by evaluative practices that range from low to high levels of formality. The less formalised evaluative practices (roundtables, interviews, analysis of other similar experiences) were implemented to identify the different claims and needs around F&C and the consumer's preference in lamp design. The more formalised evaluative practices were developed during the cataloguing of the industrial heritage of the building and the evaluation of the architectural and city light design proposal submitted to the competition.

The production and post-production phases were characterised by an *in-situ* evaluation (inscribed in the practices of designing and inhabiting). During the material development of the proposals, evaluative technologies acquire, in both cases, a relative formality to ensure the technical efficiency and cost adequacy of what is produced. In the post-production phase, the evaluations emerge from the experience of using the space and are manifested in the meetings and discussion tables set up by the organization's coordinating staff as complaints. What is evaluated here is the space's comfort, functionality, and technical efficiency. In the case of lamp production, post-production instances are characterised by more formal technologies such as awards, where aesthetics, technology, sustainability, or originality are evaluated.

### *Tension dynamics and value stabilization*

The promotion, stabilisation and evaluative tensions in architecture and design vary according to the type and function of the evaluative technologies implemented throughout all phases of the production process (pre-production, production, and post-production).

Greater specificity in the evaluation technologies employed in the pre-production phase of F&C allowed the ICUB to include a multiplicity of demands on the future use of the factory site as well as requirements for the preservation of a series of previously assessed heritage and identity values of the building. The ICUB encoded both these identity values and these demands in the spatial functionality and characteristics of the architectural competition rules and the criteria for evaluating the architectural proposals presented in the call. The architects interpreted and transformed the historic building into an architectural project that embodied the values established in the pre-production phase. This process allowed the stabilisation of the values of heritage identity and functional flexibility with a low level of conflict.

When assessment devices operating in the pre-production stage are based on more abstract models that lack sufficient legitimacy and specificity, the disputes between actors become more explicit, as happens in the case of the Christmas luminaire competition. Here, the designers' central ideas of the luminaire are respected in their creative autonomy. However, tensions cannot be avoided when these ideas are adapted and materialised in the production context. The technical efficiency and cost-effectiveness criteria of the company responsible for the material development of the luminaire ultimately prevailed over the designers' aesthetic ideas to guarantee results within the stipulated time frame.

The absence of tensions appears when the assessment devices are located in the post-production phase, linked to the consecration of ideas or concrete products, as in the case of the lamp design presented to the ADA-FADI prize. In this case, the design firm enacted aesthetic valuations associated with ideas about good design and beauty in the exploratory phase of pre-production. Reinforced by the formal assessment in the post-production stage, these values finally stabilised at the end of the project, avoiding any tension and controversy.

Beyond differences in value stabilisation, the tensions detected in the cases of architectural and design production analysed do not represent major (e)valuation controversies but rather epistemic dissonances: different perspectives on the same projects.

## 10. Topic-level discussion

In this deliverable, we analysed diverse evaluative technologies with the aim of understanding tensions relating to how different actors in the field of heritage management and cultural production construct, measure, compare and rank the values they attribute to culture. Our sample includes formalized advocacy-led measurement (RRR), ex post and informal assessments (Mudec), world-wide known but locally contested accreditation systems (UNESCO in Venice and Liverpool), and a variety of assessment devices associated to decision making in cultural production processes (Architecture and Design).

Looking across this set of technologies, a first topic-level remark concerns their different ability to make tensions visible.

In this regard, the RRR case shows how the most formalized and coherently developed system neutralises tensions. Embedded in a neoliberal logic of fierce competition for funding, at RRR the evaluative technology is used instrumentally to selectively highlight positive outcomes with the aim of securing monetary resources in the next call for funding.

On the other hand, less pre-defined technologies of evaluation are more capable of making tensions salient and visible, thus demanding an active response from actors involved. For instance, UNESCO procedures rely on expert judgement to assess authenticity and integrity. Further, they are organized around the confrontation between the evaluator and those responsible for the object of evaluation. In the Mudec case, we showed a fluid situation where every actor can have a say, thus multiplying the perspectives involved, and, therefore, the possibility for tensions to emerge.

Finally, in the field of cultural production, formally defined evaluation technologies operating in the pre-production stage tend to objectify valuations in uncontroversial guidelines (competition rules and scoring) that neutralise potential conflicts when they are based on previous evaluative consensus at the local level. On the other hand, when these evaluation technologies rely on more abstract models or conventions in the pre-production stage, creator's ideas achieve formal prevalence in the production process, but without avoiding tensions when these ideas are adapted and materialised (Christmas luminaire case). There are no evaluative tensions, on the contrary, when the production process is carried out in the absence of any pre-production evaluation mechanism and those mechanisms only appear at the post-production stage for assessing and consecrating products (Lamp case).

Narrowing down the analysis to contexts where tensions are allowed to surface, sometimes becoming openly conflictual, a second topic-level remark relates to how actors structure the relationship between the evaluative criteria. Two mechanisms have been observed: polarisation and integration.

Polarisation refers to situations where actors frame the tension as binary opposition between alternatives. In Liverpool, UNESCO framed the situation in terms of preservation vs development. With regard to the Venice case, the Ministry of culture officials interpret the potential enlisting of the city onto the heritage in danger list as a shame vs fame opposition, against a view by professionals that see the inscription as a way to get more attention to the site. In a particular moment of the recent history of Mudec, the municipality faces the problem of fostering either diversity or manageability, aims that directly conflict with each other, when dealing with the challenges of migrant participation.

Integration, on the other hand, happens when actors exploit conflictual situations to re-frame the relationship between the evaluative logics involved. We encountered integration attempts in some cases analysed. In Venice, we observed an unexpected alliance between professionals at the municipal and international level (i.e. UNESCO) based on the multi-axial concept of sustainable development, which incorporates environmental, social, economic and heritage preservation perspectives. In the early stages of the Liverpool case, the Historic Environment of Liverpool Project temporally aligned the views of the city council and various local actors, at the same time that UNESCO's search for Industrial Heritage sites aligned its interests with Liverpool's. At Mudec, the decision to articulate participatory activities around a subjective dimension channels diversity and makes it manageable. In this way, in Mudec, an initial polarisation evolves into an integration.

In the cases of architectural and design production, the tensions detected are not significant (e)valuative controversies but rather epistemic dissonances: different perspectives on the same project. In this sense, the term evaluative integration is more appropriate here. Integration can occur either through re-framing values between the different contexts in the production process (pre-production, production and post-production) or value adaptation in each context. The F&C's architectural production case, in which specific values such as heritage identity and functional flexibility transform and stabilise throughout all the different contexts of the process (drawing up the competition rules, competition mechanisms and the development and construction of the architectural project), exemplifies the first alternative. In the city's Christmas luminaire case there is an adjustment of a specific valuation, such as aesthetics, to other values, such as technical efficiency or economic costs in the production phase, which exemplifies the second alternative.

Moving from what has been presented above, with our third topic-level remark we propose that the structure between evaluative criteria has an impact on tension dynamics and resolution.

Evidence shows that polarisation leads to conflict resolution by ejecting (Liverpool) or temporarily silencing (Venice) one of the poles of the controversy. In Liverpool, the tension between preservation and development pre-dated UNESCO's listing of LMMC as a WH site, and this tension persists. However, UNESCO 'solved' its problem with the Liverpool site by removing it from its sphere of concern via delisting. In Venice, politicians downplay the "heritage in danger" problem to a reputation issue embedded in a cultural diplomacy agenda, ignoring the deeper problematisation offered by professionals. In other words, a long-term sustainability issue is reduced to a short-term ranking problem. The aforementioned solutions are, however, only temporary. The "hot moments" are provisionally frozen, but the tensions remain, waiting for the next conflictual round. On the other hand, as shown in the Mudec case, integration reframes the tension such that the two poles are no longer regarded as opposite. However, the same case teaches us that integration-led solutions are not definitive as they are based on a continuous and self-reflective critical assessment that can foster new tensions and new integration attempts. To simplify, polarisation will propose the same tension repeatedly, integration will lead to the emergence of new tensions. But the cultural production cases also show that integration tends to eliminate tensions when it ends by consecrating results.

The last topic-level remark focuses on how the features of the technologies of evaluation and the context shape tensions' visibility, structure and dynamics.

As already mentioned, the interplay between a neoliberal context and a high formalization of the evaluation technology leads to the neutralization of tensions (RRR case).

On the other hand, an intermediate formalization of the evaluation technology in a context characterized by power imbalances between actors leads to polarisation. For instance, in Liverpool, UNESCO was at a disadvantage compared to the commercial interests of the developers, as the World Heritage List accords only a symbolic status in the context where the State Party weighted potential economic and social benefits more heavily. In Venice, the power of politicians outweighs that of professionals.

Unstructured technologies of evaluation in a context where power is equally distributed favor integration approaches. We have shown how at Mudec formal evaluations never really developed. This was possible in a context characterized by few resources compared to the other cases, the involvement of volunteers, and no demand for hierarchical accountability. It must be specified, however, that participatory activities at Mudec are segregated from collection management (under the control of the municipality) and the organization of temporary exhibitions (under a private for profit actor). As we have shown when analysing the Mudec in WP2, at a museum level the power imbalance between actors is great, leading to a polarisation of values (economic vs participation vs preservation). This contrasts with findings on RRR from WP2, in which we found that individual actors did not express tensions among values, as they resolved these within themselves at the point of deciding to participate.

It is also useful to link back to findings in WP1 on the strength of neoliberalism in different European countries. We characterized the United Kingdom as 'Dominant' with respect to market-oriented cultural policies, whereas Italy was characterised as 'Resistant'. This is relevant to our findings in which for both Liverpool and RRR, neoliberal discourses shaped actions, such as national and city-level planning regimes and

the use of evaluative materials for advocacy purposes. In contrast, in Italy, the Venice case displayed an orientation to 'cultural diplomacy' rather than neoliberalism, and in MuDEC, neoliberal discourses, somewhat surprisingly, did not materialise.

In cultural production cases evaluation technologies have different functions at distinct stages of the production process: they frame valuation at the pre-production stage and stabilise values at the post-production one. The evaluation technologies of the pre-production stage exert more or less structural influence on other valuations throughout the production process depending on their anchorage in local or more abstract evaluation frameworks. This leads to differential degrees of value integration. To the extent that the core values of production processes are not well established at the pre-production stage, the social and technical contexts (the timing of the process, for example, in the city's Christmas luminaire case, or the power balance of the actors involved) take on special importance in determining the level of conflict and the nature of the integration achieved. Finally, as in the case of MuDEC, also in the Lamp case, the predominance of informal evaluation mechanisms in a context of balance of power between the actors, favors integration, in this case reinforced by a consecration mechanism at post-production.

## References

- Agustí, L. and Négrier, E. (2018). The participatory turn in cultural policy: Paradigms, models, contexts. *Poetics*.66: 64-73.
- Angulo, V., Escoda, N., Arqué, G., Blasi, J., Rousaud, A., Senén, G. (2020). *ADI Book 2020*. Barcelona: Experimenta Libros; Adi-Fad ed.
- Arola, A. (2007). *Diez años luz: Ten Light Years*. Barcelona: Santa & Cole.
- Baeten, G. (2017). Neoliberal Planning. In Gunder, M., Madanipour, A., and Watson, V. (2017) *The Routledge Handbook of Planning Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Barthel-Bouchier, D. (2012). *Cultural Heritage and the Challenge of Sustainability*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Becker, Howard S. 1984. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Belcham, J. C. (ed.) (2006). *Liverpool 800: Culture, Character and History*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Pres
- Biddulph, M. (2011). Urban Design, Regeneration, and the Entrepreneurial City. *Progress in Planning*. 76(2):63-103.
- Boland, P., Hastings, T., Boland, P., McKay, S., Majury, N., & Galway, N. (2022). The Politics of World Heritage Sites: City Planning, Bird Shit Architecture, and European Impunity. *Territory, Politics, Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2022.2092204>
- Bond, S. (2012) Assessment of the potential impact of the resubmitted outline planning application relating to the Liverpool Waters master plan on outstanding universal value at Liverpool Maritime Mercantile WHS for English Heritage. Taunton (UK): Heritage Places.
- City of Venice (2015) State of conservation report by the State Party. Retrieved 5 August 2022
- City of Venice (2017) State of conservation report by the State Party. Retrieved 25 July 2022
- City of Venice (2017) State of conservation report by the State Party. Retrieved 25 July 2022
- City of Venice (2018) State of conservation report by the State Party. Retrieved 25 July 202
- City of Venice (2020) State of conservation report by the State Party. Retrieved 26 July 202
- De Certeau, Michael. 2000. *La Invención de Lo Cotidiano 2: Habitar, Cocinar*. edited by L. Giard. México: Universidad Iberoamericana.
- Department of Culture, Media, and Sport [UK Government] (2015). State of Conservation Report for the Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage Site
- Department of Culture, Media, and Sport [UK Government] (2016). State of Conservation Report for the Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage Site
- Department of Culture, Media, and Sport [UK Government] (2017) State of Conservation Report for the Liverpool Marine Mercantile City World Heritage Site
- Department of Culture, Media, and Sport [UK Government] (2018). State of Conservation Report for the Liverpool Marine Mercantile City World Heritage Site
- Department of Culture, Media, and Sport [UK Government] (2019). State of Conservation Report for the Liverpool Marine Mercantile City World Heritage Site
- Department of Culture, Media, and Sport [UK Government] (2020). State of Conservation Report for the Liverpool Marine Mercantile City World Heritage Site
- Fageir, M., Porter, N., & Borsi, K. (2021). Contested grounds; the regeneration of Liverpool waterfront. *Planning Perspectives*. 36(3): 535–557.
- Fageir, M., Porter, N., and Borsi, K. (2015). Regenerating Liverpool Pier Head waterfront: The role of urban design. *City, Culture and Architecture*. 1(1): 21–38
- Farías, Ignacio. 2015. 'Epistemic Valuation Dissonance: Reconfiguring in Architectural Practice'. In *Moments of Valuation: Exploring Sites of Dissonance*, edited by Ariane Berthoin Antal, Michael Hutter, and David Stark, 271–89. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Ferm, J., Clifford, B., Canelas, P., & Livingstone, N. (2021). Emerging problematics of deregulating the urban: The case of permitted development in England. *Urban Studies*. 58(10): 2040–2058.
- Francioni, F., Vrdoljak, A. F. (2020), *The Oxford Handbook of International Cultural Heritage Law*, Oxford Handbooks, Oxford Academic. Retrieved 30 August 2022

- Frey, B., and Steiner, L. (2011). World Heritage List: does it make sense? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 17 (5): 555–573.
- Gaillard, B., and Rodwell, D. (2015). A failure of process? Comprehending the issues fostering heritage conflict in Dresden Elbe valley and Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage sites. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*. 6(1): 16–40.
- Government of Italy (2021) Decreto-Legge 20 July 2021, n. 103. Retrieved 25 July 2022
- Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*. 71(1): 3–17.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Heritage Lottery Fund [National Lottery Heritage Fund] (2015) *Young People and Heritage Report*. London: HLF
- Hirschman, A.O. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty. Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA
- Hølleland, H., Hamman, E., & Phelps, J. (2019). Naming, shaming and fire alarms: The compilation, development and Use of the List of World Heritage in danger. *Transnational Environmental Law*. 8(1): 35–57.
- Hoyle, B. (2000). Global and local change on the port – city waterfront. *Geographical Review*.90(3): 395–417.
- ICOMOS (1987) *Advisory Body Evaluation (ICOMOS)*. Retrieved 22 July 2022
- Italia Nostra (2019) *Italia Nostra’s Dossier on the 2018 Report on the State of Conservation In accordance with the Decision of the World Heritage Committee 41 COM.7B.48*. Retrieved 26 July 2022
- Italian Permanent Embassy at UNESCO, Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Activities and Tourism,
- Jancovich, L. and Stevenson, D. (2019). The “problem” of participation in cultural policy. In: Eriksson, B, Stage, C and Valtysson, B, (eds.) *Cultures of Participation: Arts, Digital Media and Cultural Institutions*. Routledge Research in Cultural and Media Studies. Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 167-184
- Kinsella, C. (2021). *Urban Regeneration and Neoliberalism*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. (1999). *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Harvard University Press.
- Labadi, S. and Logan, W. (2016). *Urban Heritage, Development, and Sustainability: International Frameworks, National and Local Governance*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Lamont, Michèle. 2012. *Toward a Comparative Sociology of Valuation and Evaluation*. *Annual Review of Sociology* 38:201–21. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-120022.
- Langley, A. (1999). Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 691–710.
- Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium: FACT (Foundation for Art and Creative Technology); Liverpool Biennial; Liverpool Everyman and Playhouse theatres; Liverpool’s Royal Court; National Museums Liverpool; Royal Liverpool Philharmonic; Tate Liverpool; Bluecoat; Unity Theatre; DaDaFest; Merseyside Dance Initiative (2021). Letter to UNESCO. Available at <https://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/news/press-releases/key-cultural-voices-respond-liverpool-brink-of-losing-world-heritage-status>
- Liverpool City Council (2009). *Liverpool maritime mercantile city world heritage site – Supplementary planning document consultation draft, March 2009*, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.
- Liverpool City Council (2012). *Heritage impact assessment of Liverpool Waters on the outstanding universal value of Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage site*. Liverpool (UK): Liverpool City Council.
- Liverpool City Council (2013). *Liverpool Local Plan 2013–2033: Policy HD2 Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage Site*. Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.
- Liverpool City Council (2017). *Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage site management plan*. Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.
- Liverpool City Council / Department for Culture, Media, and Sport [UK Government] (2003) *Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City for Inscription on the World Heritage*. Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.
- Liverpool City Council / Department for Culture, Media, and Sport [UK Government] (2018) *Desired State of Conservation Report for the Removal of the Property from the List of World Heritage in Danger*.



- Liverpool City Council / English Heritage (2017) Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage Site Management Plan 2017-2024. Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.
- Liverpool Waters (2012) Liverpool Waters heritage impact assessment: assessment of potential effects on the Liverpool World Heritage site. Liverpool: Liverpool Waters.
- McGuigan, J. (2016) Neoliberal Culture. London: Palgrave
- Moeran, Brian, and Bo T. Christensen. 2013. Exploring Creativity: Evaluative Practices in Innovation, Design, and the Arts. Cambridge University Press.
- National Lottery Heritage Fund / Renaisi. (2019) Kick the Dust Year One Evaluation. London: NLHF
- National Lottery Heritage Fund / Renaisi. (2019) Kick the Dust Year One Evaluation: Appendix. London: NLHF
- Patiwael, P. R. Groote, P. and Vanclay, F. (2020). The influence of framing on the legitimacy of impact assessment: examining the heritage impact assessments conducted for the Liverpool Waters project, Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal. DOI: 10.1080/14615517.2020.1734402
- Pettigrew, A. M. (1990). Longitudinal Field Research on Change: Theory and Practice. *Organization Science*, 1(3), 267–292.
- Rodríguez, Á.; Roig, I.; Zabalbeascoa, A. (2004). Premios Nacionales de Diseño 2003. Barcelona; Madrid: Fundación BCD; Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología
- Rodwell, D. (2014) Negative impacts of World Heritage Branding: Liverpool - an unfolding tragedy? In Hølleland, H. and Solheim, S. (2014) *Between dream and reality: Debating the impact of World Heritage Listing*. Oslo: Representeralen. pp. 19–34.
- Rodwell, D. (2015). Liverpool: Heritage and Development – Bridging the Gap?, in *Industrial Heritage Sites in Transformation: Clash of Discourses* (editors Heike Oevermann and Harald A. Mieg). New York and London: Routledge, pp. 29–46.
- Rowe, G., & Frewer, L. J. (2000). Public Participation Methods: A Framework for Evaluation. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 25(1), 3–29.
- Santa & Cole (2001). *Iluminación = Lighting*. Barcelona: Santa & Cole.
- Simon, N. (2010). *The Participative Museum*. Santa Cruz: Museum 20
- Stark, D. (2009). *The Sense of Dissonance. Accounts of Worth in Economic Life*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Stonard, J. (2003) The Historic Environment of Liverpool Project. *Context*. 78:25-26.
- Sykes, O. and Alexander, N. (2021) The scale of the century? – the new city regionalism in England and some experiences from Liverpool. *European Planning Studies*, 29:11. 2056-2078
- Sykes, O., Brown, J., Cocks, M., Shaw, D. And Couch, C. (2013), A City Profile of Liverpool, *Cities*, 35: 299–318.
- UNESCO (1987) 11COM VIIA - Inscription: Venice and its lagoon (Italy). Retrieved 21 July 2022
- UNESCO (2013) 37COM 8E - Adoption of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value. Retrieved 2 August 2022
- UNESCO (2014) 38COM 7B.27. Retrieved 27 July 2022
- UNESCO (2016) 40COM 7B.52. Retrieved 22 July 2022
- UNESCO (2017) 41COM 7B.48. Retrieved 25 July 2022
- UNESCO (2019) 43COM 7B.86, 8B.46, 8D. Retrieved 25 July 2022
- UNESCO (2021) 44COM 7B.50. Retrieved 27 July 2022
- UNESCO / ICOMOS. (2006) Report of the Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom), 18-20 October 2006
- UNESCO / ICOMOS. (2011) Report on the Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City, 14-16 November 2011
- UNESCO / ICOMOS. (2015). Report of the Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City, UK. 24–25 February.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Criteria for Selection. Retrieved 22 July 2022
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre. State Parties. Retrieved 05 May 2022
- UNESCO. (1972) Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Paris: UNESCO.

- UNESCO. (2005) 29 COM 5D - Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape, 10-11 October 2005.
- UNESCO. (2006) 30COM 7B.93 - State of Conservation: Liverpool - Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (2006)
- UNESCO. (2007) 31COM 7B.121 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (2007)
- UNESCO. (2008) 33COM 7B.130 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (2008)
- UNESCO. (2009) 33COM 7B.130 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (2009)
- UNESCO. (2011) 35COM 7B.118 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (2011)
- UNESCO. (2012) 36COM 7B.93 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (2012)
- UNESCO. (2013) 37COM 7A.35 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (2013)
- UNESCO. (2014) 38COM 7A.19 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (2014)
- UNESCO. (2015) 39COM 7A.43 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (2015)
- UNESCO. (2016) 40COM 7A.31 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (2016)
- UNESCO. (2017) 41COM 7A.22 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (2017)
- UNESCO. (2018) 42COM 7A.7 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (2018)
- UNESCO. (2021a) 43COM 7A.47 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (2021)
- UNESCO. (2021b) 44COM 7A.34 - Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (2021)
- UNESCO/ICOMOS/RAMSAR (1989) State of conservation report. Retrieved 2 August 2022
- UNESCO/ICOMOS/RAMSAR (2016) Report of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/Ramsar Reactive Monitoring mission to the property of Venice and its Lagoon (Italy), 13-18 October 2015. Retrieved 5 August 2022
- UNESCO/ICOMOS/RAMSAR (2021) Report of the joint WHC/ICOMOS/Ramsar Advisory mission to Venice and its Lagoon (Italy), 27-31 January 2020. Retrieved 26 July 2022
- Van Oers, R. and Roders, A. (2014) Bridging Heritage and Sustainable Development. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainability*. (1)1: 5-14.
- Wilding, M. (2012). Liverpool set for heritage showdown. *Building Design*. April 2012: 6-7.