



Ancona, 07/06/2019

**Subject: Minutes of the First Working Groups' Meeting and Core Group Meeting of COST Action CA18110: "Underground Built Heritage as catalyser for Community Valorisation"**  
**Ancona, 06-07/06/2019**

## **A. Working Groups' Meeting**

### **1. Welcome to participants**

The participants were welcomed by Eva Savina Malinverni, Professor at the Engineering Faculty, UNIVPM, and local organizer of the Ancona Meetings, and by Maria Serena Chiucchi, Deputy Dean and Professor at the Economics Faculty, which hosts this meeting.

### **2. Introduction to the WGs activities and tasks for the first meeting**

The AC, Giuseppe Pace, did a brief presentation of CA 18110 by introducing the challenges and giving a view of problems and constraints related to the UBH conservation. In particular, UBH conservation is seen as a cost and a barrier to regional and urban development. Then, he illustrated research and capacity building objectives, keywords, and areas of expertise relevant for the Action, activities planned, an overview of the activities' flow for the year-one, the current network extension (24 MSs) and the Action management organization.

He provided, in addition, a first definition of Living Lab (Protected spaces for developing and experimenting new practices, and promotes external landscapes, such as local communities independent from vested interests and the lock-ins created by lobbying and regulatory capture).

Finally, the AC introduced the tasks to be discussed in the next WG meetings, that is:

- Surveying participants' experiences
- Knowledge-base for case-studies", with investigation methodology, history background, bibliography, main stakeholders, problems, perspectives
- Organising STSMs in the 4 selected UBH sites, supported by local proposers
- Communication and dissemination
- Living Labs preparation
- Training School

### **3. First Communication Plan and activities**

The Science Communication Manager, Dov Winer, introduced the first draft of the Action CDP. He described the Communication activities, defined the Targeted Audiences, the strategy for a Visual Identity. Then, the SCM pointed out the three levels of communication: internal, external EU Wide and national, the reporting. For the first communication, a decision must be taken as back office facilities for the internal management of the WGs, projects and teams. For EU wide, the SCM introduced the idea of developing CA 18110 Wikipedia country pages and described wiki projects that may serve as templates. Social Media, such as Facebook and Twitter, have been already designed and activated. Flyer and Poster will be prepared once finalized the logo. A newsletter will be published every four months.

### **4. Tour de table/ Questions: First round**

The Action participants expressed their views in the debate coordinated by Susana Martinez-Rodriguez.

### **5. Working groups Parallel sessions**

Each working group started, in separate rooms, the specific planned activities.

**WG1 meeting** was leaded in the morning by Roberta Varriale, and in the afternoon by Sorin Hermon. They





discussed about how to prepare a survey on U4V participant experience (on SurveyMonkey), to develop “Underground Heritage Site” cards, and to prepare a glossary for Underground Built Heritage. In particular, the leaders’ presentation pointed out on the UBH classifications (functional). Finally, the WG discussed about UBH projects and case studies, and in particular how to provide support to the four selected case studies. Results are shown in the WG1 presentation

**WG2 meeting**, led by Alfonso Bahillo, produced the following meeting results:

Members discussed about the specific (ICT) tools that every member could provide to any of the case studies and/or living labs. These are the (ICT) tools that can be probed in any case study:

- Thermal imaging cameras for vision in darkness and dampness detection
- Geo-radar and geophysical surveys for locate underground structures
- Collection and digitalization of old UBH data
- Stress and deformation monitoring
- Dynamic load monitoring for vibrations
- Remote (wirelessly) sensing (cracks, water, inclination, settlement...)
- SLAM for 3D modelling
- Computational Modelling of UBH

Then, a list of questions helped the members to better understand each case study and living lab context, and to focus efforts in such a context. These were the specific questions to be (mainly) answered by the case study stakeholders:

- Who are the stakeholders?
- What are their expectations?
- What specific tools and resources do the stakeholders use for UBH conservation and monitoring (if any)?
- Pros and Cons of those specific tools?
- Legal requirements when installing new equipment and collecting, processing, publishing and providing UBH data?
- Strategic approach to integrate in surroundings?

Two members of the WG2 give two technical talks: Thermal imaging by Robert Olbrych (Lodz University of Technology, Poland); Remote Sensing by Zili Li (University College Cork, Ireland).

**WG3 meeting**, led by Shirley Cefai and Ernesto Marcheggiani, discussed about the action goals, and in particular the issue of the survey and how the Action should progress with filling in the survey. Discussions went in the direction of how the case studies should be selected and what information should be given. Aim of meeting was meant to be directed towards what the theoretical framework of WG3 should be. The WG3 will continue communication via skype so as to formulate the theoretical framework. In particular, the main problems are:

- Clarify the role and work of WG3
- Problems of communication – work on glossary so as to have clear communication and understanding between individuals
- WG3 – Reuse and valorization – How will values be attributed?
- Discussing sites of Outstanding Universal Value, then authenticity is crucial
- Queries re whether case studies will include sites from Asia and other continents – this will be influenced by the different cultures and hence how values like authenticity will be influenced.

Some proposed sentences to develop into themes uptaken by WG3:

- WG3 governs ACTION's work on valorisation of UBH to foster community's benefit on regeneration, creativity, social innovation through tourism (Klodiana)
- WG3 governs action's work on regeneration of UBH significations to foster forward-looking strategies to re-orient cultural visions of reuse/relaunch/regeneration (Rita)
- WG3 governs action's work on interpretation of UBH to foster conservation, reuse and creative solutions to benefit communities by soliciting tourism and economic improvement (Laura).
- WG3 governs Action's work on regeneration of UBH to foster community's benefit through tourism, creativity and social innovation (Sanjin)



**WG4 meeting**, led by Carlos Smaniotto Costa and Nataša Pichler-Milanovic, gave life a very interactive teamwork, whose outcome is synthetized as follow:

The WG4 collected experiences on planning approaches (in general and with regard to undergrounds), on methodologies and tools used, and how Underground4value can benefit from such experiences (lessons learned).

**Experiences** are summarized in the following four points:

- Raise awareness on the values/benefits of UBH
- Empower communities\* (first decide “who” belongs to the community - and what interests are being forwarded)
- Multi-character of UBH scales (spatial - legal - cultural - historical) -Spatial contexts and scales (Regional, Rural / Urban, City, Neighbourhood, Site) - UBH have no fix boundaries and can be found in and throughout all scales)
  - Administrative & institutional context
  - Exploitation level
    - Those that are already known and are being “explored” - partially also over-explored, i.e. for tourism purposes;
    - Those that are already known and not explored yet, or are under-explored,
    - Those that are unknown and therefore not explored.
  - Public Spaces & Community Value > create meaningful POS that empower societal, communal and civic interactions.
    - **Agents of Change** / drivers of decisions/ Framework & context based

The WG addressed the following points to WG1 for a reflection:

- To provide a definition of “COMMUNITY” in the sense of U4V > a group of people already interested in the development of UBH, or a group that could be interested. Please take into consideration case studies and try to define communities in relation to the selected case studies.
- To provide a definition of **different stages of UBH**:
  - Those that are already known and are being “explored” - partially also over-explored, i.e. for tourism purposes;
  - Those that are already known and not explored yet, or are under-explored,
  - Those that are unknown and therefore not explored

WG4 also individuated the following issues as obstacles to the community empowerment and UBH valorization:

- “Weak” legal/institutional frame (partly too strict or partly too flexible)
- Balance between bottom up and top down approaches (reflecting public policies and regulations)
- Negative image of UBH - low value
- Conflicts between
  - Conservation and use
  - Winners and losers
  - Public and community interest(s), and private interests
  - Compensation rights - betw. required and provided compensations (winners and losers) > Losses in terms of monetary, space, environment, property, community, etc.
- Lack of “Governance”

Finally, the lessons learned are as follow:

1. Creating an added value > create a meaning, provide a use or a function to a UBH - create a “symbolic meaning” a commodity for it (tools: Data base, Networking, Storytelling, Promotional campaign)
2. Creating new local-based knowledge and interact with the community (Digital platforms)
3. Monitoring the process - base it on the 17 UN sustainability goals
4. Collective Will > find a balance between the institutional work and voluntary work (community) (Workshops)
5. Demonstration of values > construction of meaning (see topic 1 above) (Storytelling)



6. Implement and force interactivity between community and stakeholders, policy makers
7. Honesty in communication messages (fairness processes)
8. Accessibility to UGB (ensuring safety and security of users)
9. Providing channels for collective learning

WG4 also investigated the context of case studies, by producing a graph.

**WG5 meeting**, led by Florin Nemtanu, provided relevant tools for the Action communication. Results are summarised as follow:

The discussion was on how to find the ways for a better dissemination and exploitation activity and to increase the visibility on social media channels. All members are encouraged to be part of the **Facebook group**. Another way is to be focused on professional social media (at least 2):

- The LinkedIn group is also available – the same kind remark to all members to join it and be active.
- A Researchgate project is online and we have the opportunity to add valuable things there.

An **account on Instagram** will be opened soon. The members are encouraged to send pictures related to the underground places and to create a depository of pictures with all meta data of these pictures.

Another proposal is to establish a **YouTube channel** and after every meeting, the Action Chair and the communication team will provide to the team movies and pictures to update the content of the channel.

Olga Lo Presti, who is the responsible to maintain the website updated, presented the **state of the website**. The website of the action is online and the link between the webpage and the LinkedIn and Facebook groups are ready done.

The **dissemination** through conferences and scientific and academic events – there is a list with these conferences and the members of the action are invited to contribute with more conferences and events. Information and scientific articles are well accepted as dissemination vehicles for our action. For scientific articles, Open Access publications will be targeted.

**Newsletter** – 1 newsletter every semester, simple structure and the logo and identity signs – a draft was already proposed. The newsletter content is: the topics, the message of the chair, the message of the editor (Renata Salvarani), announcements, short articles, calendar of the action.

**Webinar** – films from training schools – and from early carrier researchers – Tony Cassar will provide technical assistance.

## 6. First Core Group meeting

The AC remembered that the priority is to finalise the SURVEY already prepared in MONKEY SURVEY. A draft version will be available on DROPBOX and the WP Leader will comment and give feedback. Then, the survey will be launched. Another issue is how to put later the survey information in a database on the website. The first database will have information about the members of the COST, a second about SITES, and eventually a third database about TOOLS. Carlos Smaniotto and Alfonso Bahillo made suggestions their previous experiences organising databases. Alfonso suggests as the easiest way: Google Forms & manage the information in an Excel file. Sorin Hermon rises a question about European Union and the allocation of those databases: he suggested looking at ARIADNE website, which sounds like collective repositories. He emphasized that this is more challenging (planning, authorizations, and of course Budget). Regarding publications, he also mention SOTERO. Finally, he emphasized how important is to plan and make strategies. The AC remembered how important it is to find economic and practical solutions.

Next point: the boards.

- Committee for the training school
- Editorial board
- ITC conference grants
- WIKI Project

However, these points have not been discussed only saying that the Leaders will select one member for each committee. The AC introduced the LOGO COMPETITION (a result is required) and the WIKI Project. Then, the AC asked for Muge Akkar about the call for the STSM, which will be send as soon as possible. There will be 1 STSM for each case study.



Muge Akkar will be on charge of collecting the candidates and send the call. The suggestion is to have final selected candidate from other community/country. The candidate will have 3 weeks focuses on the case study, the UBH and the community, and will participate to a living lab initiative (decided by the host organization).

Carlos Smaniotto suggested to have shorted missions, but AC does not see it convenient, although interesting. Ernesto Marcheggiani asked for the eligibility criteria for the STSM. Ernesto thought it will be some new rules, recently. AC answered that it will consider COST regulation, even the recent changes. Zili Li, the responsible for ITC conference grant, promised to launch the call for the 2020 conference as soon as possible. Carlos has previous experience and the conversation is about funding the conference. The focus will be on early career researchers. Then, debate passed on the Scientific committee for the next Training School in Naples. The participants will be maximum 40 people. Brainstorm for the key points:

- Tutors of papers for the students.
- Technicians
- ICT
- Decide what is relevant for the school
- Schedule and number of lectures, and other workshops.

The following point was the communication, introduced by Dov Winer. We already have a guideline for the Newsletter. Dov insisted on the WIKI Project and to decide the outline which will be organised on categories.

The WGs have to care of INDICATORS and results infographs (gender balance, participants for each plenary, WP...) and the AC will share that info in the website. Florin Nemtanu, then, made a brief about the Newsletter. The Editor is Renata Salvarani and the Board is composed by Dov, Florin and Susana. Last remark from the AC: this is not a traditional COST Action, because of the living lab approach. For better clarifying the concept, he promised to prepare a little paper on the topic "living Labs" and to share it: he asks also for on-field experiences. There will be also a bibliography on the living labs in order to prepare the CA18110 LIVING LABS. The AC emphasizes this point, because this is the most conflicting point, and no doubt the most difficult to success. It will also find to invite some external experts (by free, for now).

The chair closes the meeting at 18.38.

## 7. First Underground4value Stakeholders Workshop

The public open stakeholder workshop was chaired by Ernesto Marcheggiani. Sauro Longhi, Rector of Università Politecnica delle Marche, Paolo Marasca, Representative Ancona Municipality, and Eva S. Malinverni, professor of Università Politecnica delle Marche and local organiser, welcomed the participants.

Giuseppe Pace introduced to the local stakeholders the COST ACTION CA18110 Underground4value, clarifying the opportunities for local communities that the Underground Built Heritage could provide

Then, a presentation from Marco D'Orazio, Paolo Clini and Enrico Quagliarini, gave a summary of the Palazzo Campana hypogeum study, by describing its environmental characterisation and providing a proposal for an alternative fruition.

Then, Annalisa del Bello, responsible for the culture of the Camerano Municipality made a presentation of the local tunnels and their proposal for valorisation, proposing a candidature for becoming a future Underground4value case-study. Finally, a round table, chaired by Ernesto Marcheggiani, saw the interaction between the U4V experts and local stakeholders.

The workshop ended at 13.30.