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1. Synopsis report of all stakeholder consultation activities

The stakeholder consultation activities described in this synopsis report were conducted in the context of the evaluation of the European Heritage Label action. The stakeholder consultation activities carried out for this evaluation sought to collate evidence-based information and stakeholders’ views based on the five mandatory evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, and EU added value). The relevant stakeholders were mapped at the early stage of the evaluation and are described below.

3.1 Consultation methods and target groups

The stakeholder consultation methods used consisted of a wide-ranging interview programme, focus groups and an open public consultation (OPC). The contractor worked to triangulate different sources and combine distinct approaches whenever the evidence was insufficient or inconclusive. Table 1 below provides details on the types of stakeholders engaged for each consultation method.

Table 1. Type of stakeholder consultation and stakeholders engaged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder consultation</th>
<th>Type of stakeholders engaged</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-level interviews</td>
<td>• European Commission officials (DG EAC and other DGs – RTD, HOME)</td>
<td>Q2 / 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Members of the European panel of experts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth interviews</td>
<td>• National coordinators</td>
<td>Q1, Q2 / 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managers and senior staff members from labelled and pre-selected but non-selected sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders of other actions (e.g. the European Routes of Industrial Heritage; the European Institute of Cultural Routes etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• External experts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>• National coordinators</td>
<td>Q1, Q2 / 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managers or senior staff members from labelled sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders of local or national networks, institutions and organisations related to the labelled sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open public consultation</td>
<td>The online consultation was open to any interested party or individual over a period of 12 weeks, available in three EU languages (English, French and German)</td>
<td>Q1, Q2 / 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Summary of the type and number of stakeholders consulted

2.1. Interviews

The interview programme encompassed high-level and in-depth interviews (see Table 2 below). In total, the programme involved 76 interviews. The interview programme included the EHL action’s key stakeholder groups, including Commission officials, members of the European
panel, national coordinators, and managers of the labelled sites. Depending on the question at hand, the interview programme was used either to supplement other sources of evidence with experts’ views or to gain insider insights in cases when other data sources were scarce.

**Table 2. Interview programme: high-level and in-depth interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Commission officials</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the European panel</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National coordinators</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers or senior staff members from the labelled sites</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers or senior staff members from pre-selected but non-selected sites</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders from other initiatives in the field of cultural heritage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External experts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total completed</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.2. Focus groups**

The focus group programme included both site-specific and national-level focus groups. In total, 10 focus groups were carried out under the evaluation. Table 3 below presents a summary of the focus groups implemented. The focus group programme involved different stakeholders that were selected based on the location and scope of the specific focus group. The participants included national coordinators, the managers of the labelled site and representatives from local schools, municipalities and tourism agencies. The focus group programme was used either to supplement other sources of evidence or to gain insider insights in cases when other data sources were scarce.

**Table 3. Focus group programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Number of focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site-level focus groups</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National-level focus groups</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total completed</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.3. Open public consultation**

The open public consultation (OPC) on the evaluation of the EHL action was open for 12 weeks (launched on 1 March 2018 and closed on 28 May 2018). The questionnaire was made available online in three EU languages (English, French and German).

The consultation aimed to contribute to the evaluation by gathering views of all interested citizens and organisations on the role that cultural heritage can play in bringing European citizens closer to the Union, specifically through the EHL action. A second aim was to receive additional information about the operation and results of the action during the first six years since its creation (2011-2017), which could not be gathered through desk research and other methods of data collection.

In total, the OPC received 103 responses (one response was not valid). The consultation respondents originated from 22 different EU Member States, with most coming from France (N=15), Slovenia (N=11), Belgium (N=8) and the Netherlands (N=8). Two respondents
indicated that they responded from outside the EU, namely from Madagascar and Serbia (Figure 1).

**Figure 1. Respondents’ country of residence (N)**

![Graph showing respondents' country of residence](image)

*Source: the PPMI consortium, based on the open public consultation, N=102.*

The public consultation gathered a balanced type of respondents. Most of them were individuals in their personal capacity (51%, N=52) and slightly less (49%, N=50) responded in their professional capacity or on behalf of an organisation. In terms of the age, the consultation respondents were mostly 35-44 years-old (N=27) or 55-64 years-old (N=22). The least represented age groups in the OPC were respondents aged 65 or above (N=8) and youth aged 24 or under (N=8).

Among professional respondents, the largest group represented public authorities (at national, regional or local level: N=28) and the second largest group represented research/academic organisations (N=19). Contributions from private companies were relatively scarce (N=9), as well as responses from international organisations (N=1). A large share of respondents indicated that they belong to other type of organisation (N=29). Among these, most of respondents were either from museums, libraries, student associations or a political party (Figure 2).

**Figure 2. Replies from organisations, by type of organisation (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organisation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authority (national, regional or local)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/academic organisation</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private company</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organisation (e.g. OECD,...)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: the PPMI consortium, based on the open public consultation, N=102.*

The level of knowledge of the EHL action differed among the respondents. Most of OPC respondents (N=55) stated that they had general knowledge of the EHL action. Less than a third of respondents (N=29) had detailed knowledge of the action. Almost one out of five (N=18) respondents had no knowledge of the action (Figure 3).
A quarter of respondents (N=25) stated being involved in the action, which corresponds to the share of respondents, who reported having detailed knowledge of the action. Among the respondents that reported involvement within the scheme, most of them were beneficiaries of the action (N=9), staff members at the EHL sites (N=7) or national coordinators (N=6). Yet, three quarters of all OPC respondents (N=77) were not involved in the EHL.

Figure 4. Respondents' role or involvement with the EHL

Source: the PPMI consortium, based on the open public consultation, N=102.

3. Summary of the consultation results

3.1. Relevance

Stakeholders consulted via all methods – interviews, focus groups, and the OPC – largely emphasised the relevance of the EHL action and its general objectives to the current needs of EU societies. Widening the geographic scope of the label beyond the EU, as well as involving all Member States was also discussed.

High-level interviewees perceived the EHL to have potential in highlighting the European dimension in general and the European dimension of the specific cultural heritage. In other in-depth interviews, the interviewees mainly shared a similar opinion that cultural heritage and the EHL can promote European integration, cohesion and intercultural dialogue. In terms of EHL’s relevance to the current EU needs, only a minority of the site representatives answered the question positively. Other site representatives did not see themselves in a position to define the EU needs and answer this question.

The interviewees generally expressed that the action should include all EU countries into the scheme. Some of the interviewees also perceived advantages in widening the action’s geographical scope to non-EU countries and even non-European countries. A similar opinion was also shared by participants in some national focus groups who discussed the limitation of the EHL to EU Member States. According to these participants, the action cannot contribute well to the European cohesion as there is also European cultural heritage in non-EU countries that currently cannot participate in the action. There was a consensus among focus group participants that it would be necessary to widen the geographical scope to countries which are participating in the Creative Europe programme to raise the action’s relevance.

In all focus group discussions, the participants that are involved in the action also expressed the relevance of the EHL for their sites. Nonetheless, in some focus group discussions, the participants mentioned that current societal developments have to be better addressed by the
EHL. They believed that the idea behind the EHL is relevant for these challenges and it should be further pursued.

The OPC respondents shared similar views as all respondents agreed with the statement that it is important for the EU to take action in order to encourage the sharing and appreciation of cultural heritage (100% strongly agreed or agreed). Other statements, which were mostly agreed with, were to strengthen intercultural dialogue (98%) and to raise awareness of common European history and values (94%). Regarding the involved and non-involved respondents, both of the groups expressed similar agreement with these statements.

Some aspects of the relevance of the EHL were covered by respondents in the comments section, given to respondents at the end of the questionnaire. One respondent noted that the attribution of the Label is perceived positively by younger participants of the guided tours at one of the EHL sites. The respondent claimed that the European project and its values deserve to be understood and experienced by all EU citizens. A few other respondents expressed that the EHL plays an important role in promoting cultural heritage, highlighting its European dimension and strengthening a sense of belonging to Europe.

3.2. Coherence

Interview evidence show that high-level interviewees perceived potential synergies and complementarities to exist between the EHL and other EU-level actions. Interviews with Commission officials showed that more synergies are planned to develop in 2018 and onwards with the New Agenda for Culture and the 2019 Annual Work Programme for Creative Europe.

A few national coordinators and site managers perceived synergies or complementarities to exist with other EU actions like the European Heritages Days or Europe for Citizens programmes. A few site managers reported taking part in the European Heritage Days events. However, most of other interviewees did not provide a clear opinion regarding synergies or complementarities in respect to the EHL and other EU actions.

Meanwhile, the focus group participants did not cover the topics of synergies, complementarities and overlaps between EHL and other EU actions in-depth. However, some of the stakeholders underlined that more synergies could be created between EHL and other EU actions in the areas of financial support to and capacity building of the labelled sites.

Interviewees widely referred to UNESCO programmes when asked about the extent to which EHL’s objectives, instruments, and target groups are similar to other national, EU and international initiatives. For some of the interviewees EHL seemed clearly distinct from UNESCO programmes, while for others similarities between them were evident. The same difference of views regarding EHL’s coherence with UNESCO programmes was identified among the focus group participants.

Meanwhile, the OPC respondents stated that the EHL has most overlaps with the UNESCO World Heritage List (69% strongly agreed or agreed), the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe (64%), the UNESCO Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (54%) and the European Union Prize for Cultural Heritage/Europa Nostra Award (54%). Least overlaps were seen between the EHL and other initiatives targeted at intercultural dialogue or any other national and local initiatives.

The analysis of responses by involvement in the action revealed a more nuanced picture. Those respondents who are involved in the action reported most overlaps between the EHL and some European programmes, namely the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe (75% strongly agreed or agreed), the European Union Prize for Cultural Heritage/Europa Nostra Award (71%) and projects under the Creative Europe programme (58%). Meanwhile, those respondents who are non-involved in the action saw most similarities between the EHL and the UNESCO World Heritage List (72%), the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe (60%) and the UNESCO Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (58%). The share of “Do not know” responses was significantly higher among the non-involved respondents compared to those who are involved in the EHL.
All OPC respondents were given an option to specify with what other initiatives the EHL is similar. Respondents indicated the following initiatives: the European Year of Cultural Heritage (N=2), the Europe for Citizens programme (N=1), the intergovernmental EHL initiative (N=1), the Carpathian Convention Working Group on Cultural Heritage and Traditional Knowledge (N=1), the V4 Cultural Heritage Working Group (N=1), the Strategy 21 (N=1), the Faro Convention (N=1), the Hungarikum National Register (N=1) and the European Heritage Days (N=1).

3.3. Efficiency

Stakeholders consulted during the interview programme covered the aspects of efficiency in-depth. The different-level interviewees mainly discussed the selection and monitoring processes, as well as stressed the need for enhancing communication of the EHL action, establishing the EHL network etc.

Meanwhile, participants to the focus group programme mostly stressed the low visibility of the label; lack of a clear identity and vision of the label; unclear definition of the European significance criterion; as well as a need for financial and other type of support to the labelled sites. The focus group discussions had little coverage on the pre-selection, selection and monitoring processes, as these topics were outside of the remit of some local stakeholders participating.

Regarding pre-selection and selection, interview evidence show that there are two type of pre-selections organised in Member States. 53% of national coordinators reported organising bottom-up pre-selections, while 47% of them stated implementing top-down method for pre-selection.

Overall, the panel members interviewed evaluated the EU-level selection process to be working well, including the communication between the panel and the Commission. However, some non-selected sites and national coordinators interviewed indicated that explanations provided in the Panel Reports regarding the selection decisions are sometimes insufficient. Article 11-2 was also discussed by some interviewees who generally viewed it in a more negative than positive light.

Interview evidence also show that the selection criteria were clear to almost half of the site managers from the labelled sites interviewed (47%) and unclear to only a minor share of them (10%). Other site representatives did not express their opinion regarding the clarity of the selection criteria. Some of the different-level interviewees deemed the European significance criterion to be ambiguous. The focus group participants generally shared the same view regarding the European significance criterion and stressed the need to clarify it to reduce its ambiguity.

Some of the focus group participants linked the European significance criterion to the identity of the label and developing a common brand. They were concerned that the diversity of the labelled sites may make it difficult to create a common brand and market it. For stakeholders who took part in focus group discussions, the vision of the label, its future goals and objectives (i.e. its main message and what the label represents, as well as the number of sites the Commission envisions to label) were unclear. Focus group participants generally stressed the need to clarify and disseminate the EHL vision.

With regard to 2016 monitoring procedures, 14 out of 20 senior staff members interviewed from the monitored sites perceived it to be useful and reported that it was an opportunity to take stock of their achievements, as well as allowed them to discuss challenges and future plans with the panel. Three national coordinators stated that they conduct a national-level monitoring, yet it is more informal.

Other topics that were highly discussed during the stakeholder consultation were the visibility and communication of the label. Focus group participants generally emphasised that the label is not widely known neither among the general public nor among the cultural heritage professionals. Some participants reported that they were only aware of the label because of their affiliation with the labelled site.
Meanwhile, communication was extensively discussed by participants to interview programme. The EHL action was perceived as sufficient only by around half of the interviewees. For example, 50% of the labelled sites and 57% of the national coordinators deemed communication with the European Commission to be sufficient. While high-level interviewees anticipated more initiative from the labelled sites in terms of communicating the label and their European significance, site managers of the labelled sites expected the Commission to play a greater role in communication instead.

Focus group participants also had diverging views on communication roles within the action and promotion of the label to wider audiences. Likewise interviewees, some focus group participants repeatedly stressed that a greater role of the Commission in promoting the label is necessary. Meanwhile, a few others highlighted that some sites do not actively communicate the label and should demonstrate more initiative themselves.

In respect to communication on a national level, only 37% of the site representatives interviewed perceived communication with national coordinators to be sufficient. However, around half (48%) of the national coordinators reported an active communication with the sites. The interviewees highlighted the usefulness of EHL annual meetings. The meetings were praised for giving an opportunity to meet with other sites, share knowledge, establish new connections and plan potential joint projects. Yet, a few interviewees also highlighted some points for improvement regarding the organisation of the 2018 EHL meeting in Plovdiv, Bulgaria. Also, half of the sites reported communicating with other sites beyond the annual EHL meetings.

Some site managers interviewed reported that several forms used in the action are complicated and could be further simplified. More than half of the site managers interviewed who filled-in the application form (8 out of 12) reported that the application form was long, repetitive and time consuming. Similarly, a few site managers who participated in monitoring reported difficulties with uploading the information on the monitoring sheet.

Overall, stakeholder consultation evidence highlight scope for improvements. Both interviewees and focus group participants expressed a strong need to improve the communication of the action, including adopting more diverse communication measures for communicating to the public and within the action (e.g. social media, shared online platforms, competitions, TV shows etc.). Some focus group participants also mentioned that the current promotional tools (e.g. postcards) are not efficient or wide reaching. Different-level interviewees and focus group participants called for establishing a network; providing financial support to the labelled sites to implement their activities; and also highlighted the importance of capacity building of the labelled sites. Yet, a few focus group participants also claimed that the sites themselves need to be more active and collaborate with other sites.

A few focus group participants and interviewees underlined that the EHL is a recent initiative. They highlighted that the EHL needs time to evolve further and some of the issues EHL currently faces will resolve with time. Also, high-level interviewees stated that future support is going to be established in due course.

In respect to OPC results, respondents involved in the action quite favourably evaluated the efficiency of measures and tools used in the action in reaching the target audiences and communicating European narrative of the sites. The measures, which respondents perceived to be most efficient, were: live exhibitions and guided tours (N=19, strongly agreed); the website of the site (N=17); live seminars, workshops and lectures (N=14); and celebration events (N=14).

Regarding the governance of the programme, respondents mostly agreed that the following aspects are present: results of the action correspond to the resources used (N=18, strongly agreed or agreed), the selection criteria are clear (N=18) and that the EU selection procedures are transparent (N=17). The weakest areas were perceived to be the usefulness of the EU monitoring in improving the performance of the sites (N=7, disagreed), taking the needs of end-users into consideration (N=7) and having realistic desired outcomes of the action (N=5).
3.4. Effectiveness

The interviewees had difficulties to judge the achievements of the EHL in terms of the general objectives of “Strengthening the European citizens’ sense of belonging to the Union” and “Strengthening intercultural dialogue”. The majority of interviewees expressed doubts that an impact was made in regard to these objectives. The interviewees generally assumed that the EHL is still a young action which needs more time to achieve greater effects.

In all focus groups, the participants mentioned the lack of visibility of the EHL, especially among citizens and other local and regional sites. Therefore, no major effects were perceived in terms of the action’s overall objectives of “Strengthening European citizens’ sense of belonging to the Union” and “Strengthening intercultural dialogue”. Also, most participants could not prove a connection between the EHL award and a risen popularity of a site. Only more rural sites tended to acknowledge an increased visibility.

The site representatives interviewed could give a large insight into their activities that are both implemented and planned until 2020. This thus gave an insight into their contribution to the action’s site-specific objectives, which were perceived as partly or mainly achieved. According to them, only a few sites could not make greater progress in implementing their projects. The interviews with site representatives allowed to collect data on a great number of motives, benefits and challenges of being an EHL site. National coordinators also perceived more effects to be visible on a site level compared to the national level.

The site-level focus groups put more focus on the activities of the site. Here, the participants mainly discussed educational, touristic and communication activities to highlight the European significance of the site and to raise citizen awareness of a common European history. Although progress was perceived in all these fields, participants indicated that further progress can still be made. When it comes to questions of European tourists and European collaborations, the sites reported a stronger exchange with sites and institutions in neighbouring countries than in others. Still, the exchange with other sites, especially during the EHL Days, was perceived as an important benefit for EHL sites.

Participants of national-level focus groups, which are not representing a site or a national coordinator’s office, often did not know the EHL well before the evaluation. For them, it was difficult to link the effects to the action. They gave ideas and suggestions how to raise the effects of the EHL in terms of marketing and cooperation with schools.

Regarding sustainability of the action, high-level interviewees were asked for their perspectives on the sustainability of the effects. According to them, the necessary pre-conditions for the sustainability are still to improve. In general, there were nearly no unintended consequences reported by the interviewees.

In respect to OPC results, respondents that reported involvement within the action had diverse opinions regarding the effectiveness of the EHL. These respondents stated that most progress in reaching the overall goals and objectives of the EHL, since its launch in 2011, was made in stressing the symbolic value and raising the profile of sites significant for common history (N=16, significant or some progress). Meanwhile, least progress was perceived to be made in strengthening European citizens’ sense of belonging to the Union (N=12, minimum or no progress).

Regarding the attainment of site specific objectives, respondents involved in the action perceived most progress to be made by the sites in highlighting their European significance (N=18, significant or some progress) and increasing access to the sites through digital tools, especially for young people (N=15). The sites were perceived to be making least progress in the areas of fostering synergies between cultural heritage and contemporary creation and creativity (N=10, minimum or no progress), and contributing to the attractiveness and the economic and sustainable development of regions (N=9).

Meanwhile, most of the total number of respondents (both involved and non-involved) stated that a visit to an EHL site (either directly or online) has increased their appreciation of cultural
heritage (97% strongly agreed or agreed) and encouraged them to learn more about European history and culture (91%). Most of respondents expressed willingness to know more about the EHL, with 65% reporting that they would be definitely interested in gaining more information about the scheme. The majority of respondents stated that knowing that a specific site bears the EHL would encourage them to find out more about the site (93% strongly agreed or agreed), visit the site online (87%), find out more about the EHL (87%) and other labelled sites (91%).

3.5. EU added value

The interview evidence show that panel members, national coordinators and Commission officials perceived the main EU added value of the action in the sites’ focus on the European dimension. They noted that sites may need support in strengthening this aspect and increasing the understanding of what European identities and values can mean (e.g. through having a European-wide exchange platform). However, slightly less than half of site representatives interviewed perceived a change in their site’s narrative towards a stronger European dimension. Some interviewees also highlighted the action’s importance for the increased value of culture on the EU-level, as well as for the European unification process.

In the focus groups, the European narrative was also discussed as a current difficulty and challenge for the sites and the overall action. External stakeholders that participated in national focus groups especially, but also other participants, had difficulties to identify the European values and/or narratives represented at the sites, as the sites are very diverse in their approaches and in the topics covered. This diversity was perceived to be both a positive and challenging aspect. Focus group participants stressed that it would be valuable for the action to define a certain commonness between the sites to strengthen the EHL brand.

Regarding a hypothetical termination of the action, most interviewees would not expect major consequences if the action is discontinued. However, site representatives expressed fears that if the action was discontinued, a disruption of their achievements and efforts could occur. The interviewees generally agreed that the EHL is a young action and needs more time to generate and increase its effects and added values. Focus group participants stated that EU role in shaping the EHL should be greater at this early stage of the action, especially as there is no other linking organisation, platform or official network which could fulfil this task.

Similarly to interview and focus group results, the OPC data show that respondents involved in the action quite favourably evaluated the added value brought by the transformation of the initiative to an EU-level action, specifically in the areas of functioning and visibility of the Label (N=15, strongly agreed or agreed) and cooperation between Member States (N=14). Regarding a hypothetical termination of the EHL action, the respondents perceived that it could bring negative impact in the areas of European citizens’ appreciation of European values (N=17) and understanding of European history (N=16), fostering intercultural dialogue (N=15) and strengthening citizens’ sense of belonging to the Union (N=13). Only 3 respondents stated that the termination of the action would bring no change.
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