

PILOT ACTION B

TYOPOLOGY

D.T3.3.2

02/08/2021





1) BACKGROUND

The present document is to be read in conjunction with the SACHE-Navigator. The navigator, as spelled out in the methodology, is a “tool that allows its user (economic development agents, cultural operators and others both within SACHE and beyond) to clarify his/her position along the process of establishing cross-sectoral partnerships at the junction of cultural heritage, the creative industries and other sectors (e. g. new technologies) and direct a suitable course of action to the end of stimulating entrepreneurial activity.”

The SACHE Project Typology, subject of this paper, is designed to help the user of the navigator to characterise and classify his/her project along a spectrum of preeminent project types that have emerged from SACHE (thus far) and which will allow for a more case-specific deployment of the navigator.

Drawing on information gathered throughout the project thus far (training courses, coaching actions, transnational workshop, informal conversations, ...), a project typology has been drafted with the potential to support the transitioning from Pilot Action A to Pilot Action B. Those pilot actions are interconnected with PA_B, referring to and building upon PA_A. The typology allows for the various projects following from the partners’ local activities to be characterised, handled and portrayed in a more systematic fashion. More specifically, the classification scheme aims at the following:

- a) Guiding the partners (as well as users beyond SACHE) as to how to “read” their projects within the context of the SACHE-Navigator.
- b) Forming a conceptual basis for PA_B in as far as those project types/clusters proposed are to serve as a point of departure for discussions around their general suitability as a structuring device. That is, those project types may be viewed as working hypothesis.

2) PROJECT TYPES (CLUSTERS)

The different project types are explained below. For greater clarity, each project type description is followed by one or two examples.

Four different project types appear to emerge from the anecdotal evidence gathered thus far. It is important to emphasise that those project types should not be considered mutually exclusive, but they describe tendencies in the general orientation of the projects embarked on.

Type I: Mediation of cultural heritage

Projects that centre around the (new technology enabled) development of forms and practices of displaying, mediating, engaging with cultural (heritage) artefacts in various contexts ranging from museums to libraries to other settings. Innovations in this field may include solutions developed by CCI’S and digital startups such as archaeogaming, digital twins or virtual experiences (AR, VR, virtual museums over web applications ...) to mention but a few. Other institutional aspects such as audience development through new technologies (such as e-ticketing) would also fall into this bracket.



Relevant best practices:

- i. ***Augmented Reality tours by ARTGLass at Brescia's Museums, Italy.***

https://youtu.be/URjyDdQq_Ws

- ii. ***Circo Maximo, VR Experience, Rome, Italy***

<https://youtu.be/zyEl4ZL2qz4>

Type II: Cultural heritage institutions as innovation hubs

Projects that engage CCI'S and innovative startups in cooperation with cultural (heritage) institutions as inspirational spaces, prompting creative processes and collaborative dynamics on the grounds of specific atmospheric constellations that are tapped into by those very institutions involved. Brought to bear are their specific scenographic as well as curatorial competences. Cultural heritage institutions here are no longer viewed exclusively as repositories of historic knowledge (as the product of past searches for clarity to cope with specific (problematic) situations) but as centres of activity forming around the continuing process of inquiry into our current and future relationships with the world. Projects of this type may include, for instance, museums evolving into something of a future lab.

Relevant best practice:

- i. ***Acmi X co-working, Melbourne, Australia***

<https://www.acmi.net.au/acmi-x/>

Type III: Cultural heritage institutions as transmitters

Projects that envisage cultural (heritage) institutions, as engines for local economic development, as discursive and interactional spaces around the display of new trends, products, technologies etc. There is indeed some overlap with Type 2 projects, with a subtle yet important difference being its focus on public engagement rather than incentivisation and structural support of innovation. Projects of this type (III) require to be carefully framed and may include research institutes presenting their work in museums; museums exhibiting new and/or evolving technologies in collaboration with industry; industry engaging with cultural and creative sectors etc.

Relevant best practice:

- i. ***New Inc, New York Museum Incubator***

<https://www.newmuseum.org/pages/view/new-inc-1>



Type IV: Cultural heritage as a creative resource

Projects that are focused on the immediate engagement with the assets of cultural heritage and, more specifically, the resources stored within, i. e. specific funds of knowledge and competencies grown over time. These may include local crafts traditions that are being referenced, reinterpreted and/or rearranged in the process of finding new solutions (products, services, processes etc.) to contemporary issues.

Relevant best practice:

i. The Creative Museum EU project

<http://creative-museum.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/analysis-of-best-practices.pdf>

Type X: Un-defined

Projects that for some reason sit squarely with all of the above categories and require their own appraisal.