



Working Document 51936-2022

Incorporating sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes – Interviews

Iratxe Landa-Mata, Christin Krohn

5057 - RUVIVAL (5057), WP4 – task 4.1 (Interviews)

22.05.2024

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Summary..... | 2 |
| 1.1 | Background..... | 3 |
| 1.2 | Aim of the interviews | 4 |
| 2 | Method | 5 |
| 2.1 | Recruitment process and interview participants | 5 |
| 2.2 | Interview guide..... | 5 |
| 3 | Main results | 7 |
| 3.1 | Experiences with cultural heritage management and reuse processes | 7 |
| 3.2 | Sustainability and cultural heritage reuse..... | 12 |
| 3.3 | Operationalization of sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes..... | 14 |
| 3.4 | Identification of needs | 16 |
| 3.5 | Institutional anchoring of RUVIVAL’s sustainability framework | 19 |
| 4 | Conclusion | 20 |
| | References..... | 24 |
| | Annex A: interview guide | 26 |
| | Annex B: Information letter with consent form | 30 |

1 Summary

This working document is part of work package 4 of the project RUVIVAL – *Rural Vitalization through Various Adaptations of cultural heritage and Landscape*. It summarizes main insights gained from interviews with individuals working with cultural heritage management in Norway. Analysis of interview data enhances knowledge gained from a previous literature review to inform the design of a framework/tool to facilitate consideration of sustainability principles and elements in the design, implementation and evaluation of cultural heritage reuse projects.

Interview data suggests that cultural heritage reuse processes are site- and context-dependent, little systemized and at times coincidental. According to participants' experiences, no particular methods, tools and guidelines are deployed in these processes. Nevertheless, analysis of interview data reveals factors that contribute to successful cultural heritage reuse processes, in which municipalities emerge as key facilitators and coordinators. These factors include but are not limited to collaboration, networking and broad public participation, the integration of knowledge, competence and skills, commitment and political prioritization, access to financial resources and communication on cultural heritage's values.

Based on interview participants' experiences, using cultural heritage can contribute to multiple social, economic and environmental aspects relevant for sustainable development, and this should also be pursued, as they considered that cultural heritage management cannot only be about preservation. Yet, interviews also suggest that operationalizing sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes in practice is challenging. Conflicts emerge, and lack of knowledge and commitment are related to a recurrent challenge: the prioritization of economic aspects. Moreover, although there is an increased interest in bringing sustainability considerations into reuse processes, the use of methods, guidelines or tools to operationalize sustainability in these processes is also lacking. Crucially, this lack of formalization not necessarily being perceived as negative.

Interview participants perceive a need for creating wider engagement and raising awareness about the cultural heritage's values and the implications of using cultural heritage. They called for pedagogic tools that allow for the integration of a broader range of sustainability aspects, help to concretize sustainable development goals and assist decision-making by making trade-offs visible and helping to deal with conflicts. Participants also expressed the need for guidelines to initiate and implement heritage reuse process and assist choices, as well as an overview of existing relevant regulations and schemes.

Participants found it difficult to pinpoint which institutions RUVIVAL's framework/tool should be addressed to. Municipalities emerged as clear candidates, but it was also suggested that the framework/tool could be addressed at multiple stakeholders.

Last, findings suggest that in designing RUVIVAL's framework/tool, it seems crucial to take into account different practices and engage potential users. Moreover, RUVIVAL's framework/tool should be pedagogical and easy to use and not create an additional burden to users.

1.1 Background

This working document summarizes part of the work conducted within the project *RUVIVAL - RUral Vitalization through Various Adaptations of cultural heritage and Landscapes*, whose main aim is to produce tools and knowledge that support cultural heritage adaptive reuse processes in ways that preserve cultural heritage values while attending to societal challenges and satisfying local needs. RUVIVAL is focused on rural environments in Norway and is grounded on a dynamic understanding of these processes, according to which new reuse alternatives will emerge, as heritage values, challenges and ways to satisfy needs evolve¹.

More specifically, this working document is embedded in Work Package 4 of the RUVIVAL project, whose main objective is to design, test and develop a tool/framework to guide design and implementation of cultural heritage reuse processes in ways that contribute to sustainable development and facilitate their assessment. The tool/framework will be designed by combining top-down and bottom-up approaches and shall incorporate quantitative and qualitative indicators as well as attempt to balance contextual relevance and applicability across cases. WP4 comprises three main tasks: (4.1) design of initial framework; (4.2) implementation/testing of the framework; (4.3) development of final framework.

As part of task 4.1, a literature review was conducted, whose main results are documented elsewhere,² but we briefly summarize here because they provided an important background for the interviews. The literature review suggests that there is an increasing number of empiric studies documenting the relationship between cultural heritage reuse and various sustainability aspects, including immaterial, social and environmental aspects that were previously dedicated less attention. Nevertheless, knowledge is still insufficient, particularly in the Nordic region. Moreover, little attention is given to negative implications of reusing cultural heritage.

The literature review retrieved various operational frameworks to inform selection of heritage reuse alternatives at early stages of decision-making processes and to post-evaluate their contribution to selected criteria. Recurrent elements in these frameworks are multicriteria decision analysis methods and indicators. Most frameworks are developed based on existing literature and expert consultations to e.g. select criteria, methods and/or alternatives, although several of the studies recur to engagement of a wider range of stakeholder under application of the frameworks (e.g. to weight criteria and/or evaluate alternatives on selected criteria). That being said, there is seemingly a lack of frameworks to guide implementation of heritage reuse processes, and existing guidance material to e.g. map heritage values or identify/engage stakeholders is disperse.

Moreover, the literature review cast limited insight onto cultural heritage reuse practices in Norway and whether they attempt to incorporate sustainability principles. Yet, experiences made while attempting to implement sustainable development goals into municipal and regional planning and/or create value on the grounds of cultural heritage, illustrate that doing so can be challenging and require substantial resources. Operationalizing sustainability in manageable and locally relevant ways, creating engagement and facilitating decision-making

¹ A more thorough description of the project, overall approach, methods and work package structure is provided in TØI's working document 51935.

² Results from the literature review are reported in TØI working document 51935.

processes attending to various interests can be demanding, particularly when resources are limited.

Building on these experiences, we anticipate that there is, thus, a demand for easy and accessible guidance material and tools adapted to various needs. While we envision the opportunities of building on existing tools, criteria and indicators and compiling existing guidance material retrieved through the literature review, we also see the need for consulting stakeholders working with cultural heritage management in Norway to gain more information on current practices and needs when working with cultural heritage reuse, which could not be found through the literature review, on current practices. This working document summarizes, thus, the process of conducting the interviews to fulfill this objective.

1.2 Aim of the interviews

The overall purpose of the interviews is to collect information relevant for the 1st draft of RUVIVAL's sustainability framework/tool. The interview guide (annex A) was drafted based on preliminary results from the literature review with the aim to gather information on the following items:

- experiences with cultural heritage management and reuse processes;
- the contribution of cultural heritage reuse to sustainable development;
- attempts to operationalize sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes;
- tentative elements to be included in RUVIVAL's sustainability framework, based on stakeholders' needs; and
- the potential institutional anchoring of RUVIVAL's sustainability framework

The aim of the project RUVIVAL and the interviews was described in the information letter (annex B) which was used to collect informed consent from interview participants.

2 Method

2.1 Recruitment process and interview participants

Recruitment of participants was discussed with project members, and collaborating partners were consulted in the recruitment process. We contacted

- a) individuals who are acquainted with RUVIVAL's cases³
- b) experts in reuse and/or management of cultural heritage, and
- c) experts in the field of sustainability

We believed it was important to interview individuals who had worked with RUVIVAL's cases to get deeper insights into cases' reuse processes as well as with individuals that had no relation to the selected cases but may, nevertheless, have relevant insights for the integration of sustainability elements and principles in cultural heritage reuse projects.

Nineteen individuals were invited to participate in the interviews in autumn 2021, and 9 agreed to do so. One of them had had no direct connection to RUVIVAL's cases, and eight did, albeit to different levels. Two of them were related to Abborhøgda, although they had not been directly engaged in the case; two knew well the process around Laphella in Hemnesberget; two knew well reuse processes ongoing at the historic lighthouses; and one had worked in Obrestad. Unfortunately, we could not interview anyone deeply engaged with Tungenes lighthouse.

Table 1 provides an overview of interview participants. As illustrated in the table, interview participants comprise representatives from both the public administration and the voluntary sector. We have concealed the cases participants are related to in order to ensure anonymity.

Interviews were conducted in November and December in 2021 in Zoom.

Table 1: Overview of interview participants

| ID | Area of expertise | Sectorial affiliation | Relation to case |
|----|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| A | Cultural heritage | Public administration | yes |
| B | Sustainability | Public administration | - |
| C | Cultural heritage | Public administration | (yes) |
| D | Nature-based tourism | Voluntary sector | (yes) |
| E | Cultural heritage | Voluntary sector | yes |
| F | Tourism | Public administration | yes |
| G | Cultural heritage | Voluntary sector | (yes) |
| H | Cultural heritage | Public administration | (yes) |
| I | Cultural heritage | Public administration | yes |

2.2 Interview guide

We opted for a structured (Dunn, 2016) or standardized open-ended interview (Patton, 2002) and for using an interview schedule. The interview guide was discussed with project members

³ Caes – Abborhøgda (Kongsvinger), Laphella (Hemnes), Obrestad lighthouse (Hå) and Tungenes lighthouse (Randaberg) – are presented in TØI's working document 51935.

and colleagues, and this process led to revisions of the interview guide structure and the wording of questions.

The interviews started with a brief introduction on the aim of the project and the interview. Following the introduction, participants were given the opportunity to ask questions. Questions were structured along the following topics: a) interviewees' experiences with cultural heritage reuse processes; b) attempts to operationalize sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes; c) identification of needs to integrate sustainability aspects in cultural heritage reuse processes, and d) potential institutional anchoring of RUVIVAL's sustainability framework. Thus, the interview scheduled followed a pyramid structure (Dunn, 2016, p. 156). It started with what we believed were easier to answer questions about participants' experiences with cultural heritage management and moved towards the more challenging topic of sustainability. Part A comprised questions on interviewees' work with cultural heritage management and, if relevant, descriptions of reuse processes they had engaged with, e.g., stakeholder involvement, utilization of tools, methods and guidelines. In part B, interviewees were asked about their understanding of sustainability, their opinions about the contribution of heritage reuse projects to sustainable development and their experiences and knowledge on incorporation of sustainability in such projects. Questions in part C were formulated to identify participants' intention to integrate sustainability in future reuse projects and, eventually, which types of information, guidance material, tools, etc. they need to do so, in order to identify tentative elements to be contained in RUVIVAL's sustainability framework. Part D comprise questions to query the potential institutional anchoring of RUVIVAL's sustainability framework. At the end of the interview, participants were given the opportunity to add any thoughts and comments which they considered relevant for the aim of the project and/or the interview, following suggestions made by Patton (2002, p. 379).

The final interview guide can be found in Annex A.

3 Main results

We present main insights gained through the interviews by interview topic. At times, we refrain from referring to participants to ensure anonymity.

3.1 Experiences with cultural heritage management and reuse processes

As table 1 indicates, while some participants were engaged with cultural heritage management quite directly, others worked with cultural heritage from tourism or sustainability perspectives. Consequently, experiences were quite diverse, and some participants had experiences with specific cultural heritage reuse processes, while others were acquainted with cultural heritage management in more general terms.

In summarizing participants' experiences, we start with describing those pertaining RUVIVAL's cases, followed by a description of experiences with other cultural heritage reuse processes. This section ends with further experiences that we consider also relevant for RUVIVAL's and interviews' scope.

3.1.1 Experiences with RUVIVAL's cases

Abbørhøgda, Kongsvinger

Unfortunately, none of the participants interviewed had been very much engaged in this case, although institutional affiliation indicated otherwise. Nevertheless, interviews revealed that there is comprehension for the negative reactions against current plans to develop accommodation at the barn at Abborhøgda, and we gain some perspective in how Kongsvinger municipality's work with cultural heritage (which is linked to place development) has evolved over time to be more interdisciplinary and to engage residents more actively. The former is illustrated with the recent development of a cultural heritage plan and collaboration with neighboring municipalities to develop a regional cultural heritage plan. Moreover, a shift from involving residents because 'they had to' towards a true will of involving residents because they see the value in this engagement has been perceived.

Laphella, Hemnesberget, Hemnes

Hemnes municipality has increasingly understood the importance of tourism over time, and cultural heritage plays a central role in this shift, as reflected in development projects around war monuments, Nordland's newspaper and Hemnesberget's waterfront, including Laphella's development. Responsibility for cultural heritage management is distributed in the municipal administration, but this is not regarded as a disadvantage. One of the participants considers the municipality is actually "lucky" to count with individuals that carry complementary knowledge. The municipality does not count with a lot of resources (and is dependent of external funding), but has many creative people and has managed to create arenas in which various stakeholders and enthusiastic individuals can engage in dialogue. Moreover, the municipality has also initiated promotional work (e.g., book, CD-cover with the picture of a comb cake – the traditional local pastry) to raise awareness of the site's values among visitors' and locals. Hemnes is also currently working on a 'cultural heritage trail' and certification programmes.

Various stakeholders have played important roles in the development of RUVIVAL's case – Laphella, which today is Hemnes municipality's main presentation card and is filled with cultural activities (concerts, art exhibitions and school tours). Among them, 'Laphellas Venner' association has been key, first (40 years ago), in saving Laphella from becoming a redevelopment project and then, in using it. Since recently, Laphella counts with a cultural arena consisting of various modern stages with good acoustics, showrooms and toilet facilities. Its development, which was initiated 3 years ago has been implemented with funds from 3 financial institutions (kr. 800000); Hemnes municipality (kr. 600000) and Nordland County (kr. 600000) as well as with significant voluntary work accounting for approx. kr. 500000. 'Laphellas Venner' were also involved in developing the concept for the cultural arena, which was designed by a local architectural firm (Tanken).

Laphella has also been a central part in the development of the waterfront, which has also engaged many local and regional stakeholders. The development of the pier to protect the cultural environment has led to the development of a marina by the Boat and Sport Fishing Association, an outdoor area with a harbor garden, and the establishment of a boat building museum. There are also plans to adapt fishing spots on the pier for individuals with reduced mobility. The success of this development process seems to be possible due to a union of forces: the commitment of volunteers and local architects, whose work made it easier to raise interest among financial institutions; political prioritization; local competences; municipality's capacity to involve many stakeholders and interests and incorporate different perspectives; an interest in taking care of rather than tearing down; cooperation with private actors and volunteers; support from the local community (from both voluntary associations and the municipality) and from the county; and integration of local knowledge. The latter has taken place both informally and through more formal channels (e.g., association's regular meetings), and having a municipal rural developer has also made it easier for volunteers and local actors to contact the municipality. The developer and agricultural municipal managers have also been key supporting players during the process, particularly in applying for funding / financing opportunities. For instance, the agricultural municipal manager has been crucial in facilitating collaboration with the Cultural Heritage Fund.

The reuse process initiated at Laphella and continued along the waterfront followed the guidelines on technical / construction work developed in the 80's by the municipality in collaboration with 'Laphellas Venner'. This document along with the association's work were considered relevant for a seafront development in line with sustainable development. Moreover, a key requisite of the cultural arena development was to fit it into the cultural environment. Else, participants were not aware of any further formal guidance or tools used in the reuse process other than the mentioned guidelines. This was also regarded as a conscious choice made by the association to remain a creator and keep the grassroots initiative instead of becoming a servant drowned into bureaucracy. For instance, choosing use functions for the Laphella's houses owned by the association did not follow any formal or systematic process. Using one of the houses as museum was motivated by local engagement, when people started showing up with craft tools used in boat building, as it became known that the association has started work to protect Laphella. The other two houses are used to show the way people used to live because they are too vulnerable to be used for anything else and because there are very few buildings that survived the fire. For the owners, it was never relevant to use them to house accommodation, to rent them and/or make a business out of them – 'this would mean destroying the environment'. Nevertheless, one of the participants believes that nothing is

worse than a museum without open doors and houses were, thus, developed for cultural-historical dissemination and cultural-related recreation.

Tungenes and Obrestad lighthouses

One of the participants attributed the success of Tungenes and Obrestad to various international projects, the nomination of Stavanger as a cultural capital, strong will and collaboration between various stakeholders. This participant believes that the INTERREG project (2000) was crucial in starting the reuse process. The project started with Nordtrail, a collaboration project between several counties, in which a significant aim was to facilitate tourism. The nomination of Stavanger as cultural city also played a role, particularly because the city involved much of the county under this nomination. According to this participant, there was a strong will to get something started at Obrestad and Tungenes lighthouses, being key stakeholders the municipal public administrations, who succeeded in establishing a dialogue with the local population, a committed owner (the Norwegian Coastal Administration) and the Directorate for Cultural Heritage.

Another participant reports how one of these international projects consisted in an EU-collaboration between a vocational school in Estonia, the Archaeological Museum in Stavanger and the Directorate for Cultural Heritage initiated in 2014, during which knowledge was exchanged. Partners in Estonia contributed with professional expertise in stone building and the Obrestad contributed with knowledge relevant for the establishment of an art centre in Estonia. The fairly extensive restoration process lasted for about 18 months and allowed tackling challenges previously met (lack of expertise, limited resources). At times the site had to be closed for the public, but good communication work facilitated public understanding. Recently, knowledge on liming has also been retrieved from Scotland, digitally due to the pandemic. According to this participant, these restoration projects have created great enthusiasm around the lighthouse. Although the lighthouse has long been used, there was a time where it was in a very bad condition from a building protection perspective, e.g., mould, algae, etc.. People are now prouder of communicating their history because the site looks better aesthetically. Restoration has also had positive ripple effects for users of the lighthouse, who have also refurbished rooms and used the space more intensively for workshops and exhibiting lighthouse equipment, which again leads to the dissemination of cultural values. For this participant, elements that have contributed to this success story are project orientation, knowledge and dissemination. Municipal ownership of both Obrestad lighthouse and the cultural environment in which it is embedded also facilitates administration, and Hå municipality has over time recognized the importance of cultural heritage and dedicated resources to heritage protection. Today, the lighthouse is well visited; it creates employment opportunities (6-7 distributed among many part-time employees and a permanent caretaker central for maintenance work); and renting of Obrestad's buildings (five in total) generates income and work. According to this participant, love for cultural heritage is not enough. It is very important to map restoration needs and signal why these are important. Getting politicians into buildings is also key so that they feel ownership and get involved.

For the project RUVIVAL it is important to consider the environment in which heritage cases are embedded. This notion is taken even further in the case of lighthouses, where one of the participants expressed that a lighthouse cannot be understood without taking into account the entire chain of lighthouses along the Norwegian coast. According to this participant, it was this understanding (of lighthouses as a network) that formed the basis for protecting a selection of

lighthouses. Linked to this notion, another participant identified two levels in lighthouses' reuse processes: one in which the lighthouses have work in collaboration with each other and one in which they have worked individually.

3.1.2 Experiences with other heritage reuse cases

In general, interviews gave the impression that working with cultural heritage processes is quite multifaceted and demands a great deal of collaboration with several public bodies, private individuals and heritage managers at municipal, county and national levels.

One of the participants talked about several cultural heritage reuse processes where they had managed to satisfy municipal and regional needs by finding new functions to unutilized heritage buildings (with the success of some of these projects having been recognized by prizes). At first, this participant found it difficult to identify the ingredients that had contributed to the success of these projects, as each project is different and characterized by a series of coincidences. Later in the interview it became clear that the involvement of the local population and the presence of enthusiast and conscious individuals among private and public actors had been crucial. Nevertheless, beyond these success stories, confronted positions among the local population regarding potential uses of particular heritage cases had also been experienced. Lessons learned from these projects have fed into the current cultural heritage plan, in which social sustainability is a main pillar, as well as contributed to better quality standards and better knowledge on how to set up project plans, how to involve civil society, and how to disseminate information. Yet, it can be challenging to convey cultural heritage values against builders' and developer' projects and their cost-based calculations, and decision-makers do not have sufficient knowledge about the breadth of values that lie in cultural heritage (making necessary contracting external expertise).

Two of the participants brought in a tourism perspective in cultural heritage reuse projects. One of them considered important collaboration and dialogue with various stakeholders, engagement of enthusiastic individuals, external funding, prioritization of those markets interested in the 'unique' and the use of promotional material to raise awareness about heritage's values, when working with cultural heritage reuse projects. This participant regarded also important the collaboration between owners and municipalities for the provision of necessary infrastructure (e.g, toilet), and to motivate private owners to invest in cultural heritage reuse projects. To illustrate this, she referred to a case which had probably been demolished, if the owner had not participated in a course organized by the county municipality that made him aware of the opportunities of using it. Back then, the owner had talked about burning everything down because he was not interested in living there. Today, the place houses accommodation, cafe, farm shop and rooms can be rented and has won an award for the work done. The other participant (and the organization the participant works for) placed the emphasis on taking care for facilitating use functions that do not compromise preservation. Financial aspects are not prioritized; otherwise, sites would have been teared down and rebuilt. This participant regarded estimations of the number of expected visitors also influential for considering potential uses and was acquainted with previous attempts to set up cultural heritage-based products (a car-based wilderness car route) who had not succeed, possibly because volumes were never large enough and visitors' expenditure was low. According to this participant product development is key ('marketing is not enough'). Else, implementation of heritage reuse processes was regarded to depend on the site-specific context.

Two of the participants were well acquainted with the process of initiating and implementing reuse processes at historic lighthouses. Their accounts may be relevant for RUVIVAL's cases, even though they did not always explicitly refer to any of the particular lighthouse cases in RUVIVAL.

According to one of them, there is no systematic way to carry out reuse processes at historic lighthouses, and the result is often random. This lack of systemization is attributed to the lack of relevant skills in the Norwegian Coastal Administration (main owner of historic lighthouses), on fields such as cultural heritage management beyond maintenance work, e.g. tourism. These reuse processes use protection and management plans and tools for mapping the technical conditions of the sites, but there is, for instance no systematic way to choose the function that the lighthouse will host. The only requirement is that the lighthouse is accessible to the public. This and reducing maintenance costs are Norwegian Coastal Administration's main motivations for renting out these lighthouses. The processes of using lighthouses and their outcomes vary a lot, but according to this participant lighthouses privately owned are usually best taken care of. For this participant, the probabilities to succeed with reuse process are influenced by ownership (which influences the type of funding available), the constellation of users and tenants, context and accessibility, municipality's commitment and voluntary work (and the interplay between the latter two). The latter was illustrated by examples where voluntary work had rolled back due to lack of municipal effort (in such cases, volunteers are often charged with a double burden: volunteer work to get funding and volunteer work to work with the funds they have themselves raised). The importance of context was illustrated by examples of lighthouses where the building mass had been adapted to be used, but where deficiencies in quay facilities have made this use impossible. This participant was aware of conflicts that had arisen between owners and tenants, generally due to insufficient compliance from owner's side. The latter was attributed to the low budgets dedicated to maintenance work and could hinder development projects (e.g., accessibility improvements) for which municipalities may have set funding aside. In participant's experience, tenants often deliver more than what they have committed to, and if they do not, it is easy for the owner to end their contracts. This participant also believed that short-termed contracts between owners and tenants can hinder private investments on the site.

The other participant considered that the reuse processes that had taken place at lighthouses can encourage heritage owners – who are often afraid of the protection status – to initiate reuse processes. This participant recalls how lighthouses' protection status posed some challenges in relation with universal design in the beginning, but how challenges have been overcome. In this regard, parallels were drawn between the use of historic lighthouses and an ongoing project aiming at facilitating use of technical industrial cultural heritage (energy plants). According to this participant, factors making this process more challenging were ownership (power companies do not have the same interests in taking care of cultural heritage and their own history and are more profit-oriented); differences in how marketable sites are (lighthouses are established as central tourism destinations and can be linked to much more fun experiences); size (power plants are larger and are, thus, more difficult to maintain) and accessibility (power plants are less accessible). To counteract the latter, the project is trying to connect these industrial heritage sites to the 'National Tourist Roads'. According to this participant, connecting tourism to reuse projects can be fruitful because tourism stakeholders bring in a different perspective and are good at tying together different places and attracting people. This participant was neither aware of any tools, methods and guidelines used in

heritage reuse projects but emphasized the importance of creating local engagement, sharing knowledge and networking interested parties. For instance, the county administration can assist, among other things, with grant applications, assessment of heritage values and networking.

3.1.3 Other relevant experiences

Although not all interview participants have had experiences with specific cultural heritage reuse processes, they all could provide insights that we consider relevant for RUVIVAL.

One of the participants had deep knowledge in how municipalities have worked with cultural heritage plans to prioritize and take care of cultural heritage and environments. Developing such plans is not always easy, and according to him, some municipalities struggled because they have limited capacity and resources. Small municipalities usually lack a dedicated position to cultural heritage and/or experience and order plans from costly external consultants and experts. However, this participant believes that this lack of competence is not necessarily real, but rather perceived and grounded on a lack of self-confidence and a belief that has traditionally placed the responsibility for cultural heritage management at the county and national level, even though municipalities have always had a responsibility grounded on the Plan and Building Act. In his opinion, working with cultural heritage plans has generally contributed to change this perception and increase awareness about local self-determination. Nevertheless, municipalities' work on cultural heritage plans has been diverse. Some municipalities have used guidelines (e.g., for assessing values) and DIVE analyses, while others have not used any tools. According to him, broad cooperation and input from professional associations have been central for them.

A further participant had no experience with cultural heritage management and reuse processes but has been involved in several projects which have looked into how using natural and cultural heritage resources can create multidimensional values and sustainable development in small municipalities. According to this participant, much of the knowledge and examples on how to work with sustainability are focused on large municipalities. Yet, planning can be a challenge for small municipalities who often have limited resources, and some choose to apply to the regional planning office.

3.2 Sustainability and cultural heritage reuse

Before presenting participants' perspectives on the contribution of cultural heritage to sustainable development (table 2), we consider it relevant to present how they understood sustainable development. Although understandings were somehow different, interview participants associated sustainable development to inter-generational justice, environmental, social and economic dimensions, not surpassing carrying capacities and/or UN's sustainable development goals.

Participant A linked sustainable development to the notion ensuring that the activities we do today do not ruin for future generations. For him, sustainable development is about long-term thinking. This temporal inter-generational understanding was shared by participants D, E and F. For participant E sustainable development is to ensure that what we do today does not ruin development in the future, both locally and globally. And for participant F sustainable development means taking care of what you have for the next generation, not using it up. For

her, this implies using heritage buildings rather than demolishing them, even though the latter may be cheaper. For participant D sustainable development implies managing resources in ways that the local environment, climate and culture are respected so that the next generations can also have the opportunity to enjoy and experience nature and culture. He, thus, believes it is important to preserve cultural-historical values for future generations to enjoy, without this necessarily meaning that everything should be the same. He sees no point in preserving, but he thinks it is important not to use up places and take care of them.

Participant G highlighted more the three dimensions of sustainable development. For her, sustainable development involves an environmental and economic side as well as taking care of both cultural-historical values while at the same time being able to create benefits for what society needs today. According to her, using cultural heritage is necessary to preserve cultural-historic values because use prevents it from decaying. At the same time, she considers important to be aware of heritage buildings' limitations. They do not withstand anything and in some cases, it may be necessary to build adjacent larger buildings and/or restrict traffic to/from sites either in space (narrow access) or time (closed during certain periods). But she believes that it is possible to find good solutions.

For participant B, sustainable development encompasses both – the social, economic, environmental and cultural dimension and Brundtland's notion of taking care of future generations. She also talked more thoroughly about the concept and described two ways in which one can talk about and work with sustainable development. One as broad (economic, cultural and environmental) value creation in which social capital ensures that one dimension does not grow at the expense of another. And another perspective built around the notion of delivering something in a better condition than the one you received it.

Participant H links sustainable development with not moving beyond the carrying capacity and with managing development.

One participant (I) did not clarify his understanding of sustainable development, and a further participant (C) found it also challenging to communicate what he understood by sustainable development. However, he referred to UN's sustainable development goals during the interview.

All participants believed that it is important to strive for sustainability in the management of cultural heritage. Cultural heritage management should not only be about preserving but could also be used in a broader perspective (participant A). Nevertheless, two of the participants did not sympathize with how the concept is used. Participant B said that it can be very frustrating to see how sustainability is operationalized and can be used for almost anything, and participant C viewed sustainability as a politically charged word used for almost anything, and compared it to how 'innovation' is used.

Moreover, despite these difficulties, both participants communicated which sustainability aspects cultural heritage reuse can contribute to. This is illustrated in table 2, which provides an overview of the contribution of cultural heritage to sustainable development according to interview participants own experiences.

Table 2. Contribution of cultural heritage to sustainable development by interview participant

| ID | Contribution of cultural heritage to sustainable development |
|----|---|
| A | Climate change mitigation and environmental protection; strengthen identity and belonging. |
| B | The preservation of knowledge about nature management and food production, landscapes, traditions and cultural history, the creation of meeting places and local arenas for integration, the experimentation with and dissemination of traditional craft techniques, the enhancement of local identity and pride; job creation and economic and local community development |
| C | Dissemination of the place's history, creation of meeting places and identity, climate change mitigation and adaptation |
| D | Development of a culture-based tourism experiences offers the opportunity to create local employment (in tourism and related industries such as food production or product design) and contribute to retaining a critical mass of people to sustain basic services and facilities (e.g. schools). Using cultural heritage can also contribute to climate mitigation and nature preservation |
| E | well-being, sense of belonging, protection of cultural-historical values, improved accessibility to individuals with reduced mobility, climate change adaptation |
| F | Increases place's attractiveness towards both visitors and residents, create pride and strengthen local identity, provide a sense of place, brings history into the future, provides a sense of belonging, creates a team spirit, well-being |
| G | Economic and business development, creating social and recreation spaces, supporting social network, local identity |
| H | Heritage preservation, climate change mitigation, convey country's and place's history, site development; attracting visitors and residents, local identity and pride, creation of social arenas. |
| I | local identity and pride, dissemination of cultural values, employment, use values |

3.3 Operationalization of sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes

As participant B described, there are several ways to use cultural heritage to facilitate sustainable development: one is using historical lines as a point of entrance; a second one is creating values on the basis of cultural heritage resources; a third one is through landscape analysis. Yet, as she and further participants (D, G) indicated, in practice, operationalization of sustainability is often characterized by conflicts. To illustrate this, she referred to some of the conflicts she had experienced between sustainability dimensions such as job creation to counteract rural abandonment, on one hand, and pressures on nature, on the other, and between ways of using landscapes from the standpoint of different cultural traditions (e.g. Norwegian and Sami). For participant D striving towards sustainable development in the management of cultural monuments and environments is always open to discussion, and discussions are unavoidable. He often witnesses conflicts between use and preservation interests – “*should the windows provide light or be authentic?*”. Also filling in heritage sites with alternative functions can be a topic of discussion, particularly when it is perceived that the new function is too distant from the original one. However, he believes that some functions (such as simple accommodation) are less problematic (compared to e.g., modern conference facilities) and can be used in quite a few contexts without leading to major changes. He believes it is important to find a balance between preserving the most important things (based on experts' considerations) and creating value to avoid outmigration. Otherwise, cultural heritage and monuments are returned to nature. Also, participant G was aware of conflicts that emerge between preservation and use, and of the need for measures to consider heritage buildings' capacity to withstand stress. But she believes that it is possible to find good solutions.

Against these balance-seeking perspectives, for participant A, operationalization of sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes needs prioritization (as well as be clear about

what this implies for other dimensions). He regards all UN's SDGs important, but, at the same time, he believes that it is important to prioritize climate and environment, because he believes that it is utopian to balance all goals, particularly if we insist in the need of economic growth. However, he further believes that, if we manage to ignore this need and acknowledge that production does not always have to imply a consumption of material resources, but can also be services, experiences, culture, conditions are favorable for being able to find synergies between the environment, climate and social dimensions in cultural heritage reuse processes because in most cases the environment, climate, the social and culture do not come into conflict. Using building stock, saving resources and avoiding more climate emissions does not necessarily weaken identity and belonging, in his opinion. That being said, he recognizes the challenges posed by densification and the importance to find a balance between density and living conditions and environmental quality, which he understands as variation, experience values and green areas. He also believes that it is important to implement measures that translate into immediate climate gains, because we need the effects now (in the next 20 years) and not in the next 50-60 year, as life cycle analysis emphasize. In fact, although he recognizes the long-term dimension in the concept of sustainable development, believes that investing too much in the long run is dangerous. For him, it is absolutely crucial to make use of existing building stock with as few upgrading measures as possible. And if this is not possible one must then look for transformation. Regardless of the approach, one should be aware of resource use and emissions of upgrading measures. These should not be higher than the effect measures will have on resource savings.

In addition to conflicts and prioritization of economic dimensions, lack of sufficient knowledge, fragmentation of sustainability goals across sectors and lack of commitment can also challenge operationalization of sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes. Participant C had experiences how operationalizing sustainability can be challenged by lack of knowledge and competences to set up heritage values against builders' and developer' projects. He also considered the prioritization of different sustainability dimensions by different municipal sectors and services to be the wrong approach. For participant F lack of commitment among private owners can also be a hindrance. However, in its core, this seems also to be related to economic prioritization, as she argued that the main reason for this lack of commitment was the belief that tearing down heritage and selling is more profitable than taken care of the site by reusing it.

In general, the use of methods, guidelines or tools to operationalize sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes was not widespread. This does not mean that participants did not consider sustainability perspectives. For instance, according to participant E, they have sustainable perspectives in mind when they work with heritage protection and use, but these are not formalized. In fact, he showed little to no interest in a tool to be used on them from the outside or by them from within putting it this way – *“we are better with a hammer than with a PC”*. He finds it useful to build on experiences where one has succeeded, he finds it difficult to transfer experiences from case to case because each cultural environment is different from the others. Despite this, he considers the new cultural heritage plan has collected many experiences others can benefit from. Similarly, participant I was skeptical about the notion of a 'sustainability framework or toolbox'. He thinks it can quickly become very clichéd, superficial and useless, and that it can give a misleading picture. In his opinion every cultural monument is different, and it is not possible to use a toolbox on all possible heritage buildings and by all

possible people (even if it was to be limited to a specific type of building). Moreover, he believes that it is important not to talk too in too abstract terms

In addition to participant E, participants B, F and H suggested that formalization of ongoing work with sustainable development has not taken place. For instance, participant B has observed that many municipalities are already working with sustainability, but she is less certain to what extent this work is formalized. Similarly, participant F reported that there is a lot of sustainability thinking in the work they do, but that they have been bad at putting it into words. Both participants F and H reported that they have not been so good at working with sustainable development and cultural heritage so far. However, both have started projects to, respectively, link regional cultural heritage plans and municipal work to UNs SDGs. Participant F has witnessed a positive shift: from a time where sustainability was a very vague word to how now UN's sustainability goals are increasingly being used. At the same time, participant H expresses uncertainty on the success of such a project, as they often struggle to attract large business players.

Also, participant D was unaware of specific analysis made in the reuse cases he is acquainted with. He believes it is first and foremost about learning from others in networks of teams and about using existing available competences and knowledge. His organization has issued a sustainability roadmap accompanied by a number of indicators, and teams have been asked to concretize this sustainability commitment at organizational level in relation to their local context to implement it into local action plans. However, discussions have been so far primarily focused on the environment and transportation and less on cultural heritage. Nevertheless, they are committed to take care of cultural heritage and environments and they map assets, which are worthy of protection.

Despite this lack of formalization, participant A thinks that traditional cultural heritage value criteria will be increasingly linked to and harmonized with broader sustainability criteria.

3.4 Identification of needs

Participants raised various and diverse needs to integrate sustainability in cultural heritage management. They range from the adoption of legislative and regulatory measures to the dissemination of best practices and knowledge. While not all of the topics raised by participants can be addressed within the scope of RUVIVAL, several of them are quite relevant for the design of RUVIVAL's sustainability framework. Admittedly, some of them were described in rather general terms, but they also help us to identify functionalities and attributes that seem relevant for RUVIVAL's sustainability tool. In summary we can say that participants called for pedagogic tools adapted to various users' needs and skills that allow for integration of various sustainability aspects and guide them when initiating and implementing heritage reuse processes.

Several participants called for consideration of various aspects in cultural heritage reuse processes (A, B, C, D, G, H). Participant A, for instance, called for greater integration of climate and environmental considerations in decision-making processes to support more re-use and less resource consumption. Participant C considered important to help decision-makers to work with the concretization of sustainability goals (participant C). In this sense, it was suggested that the RUVIVAL's tool could include a description of aspects that one should be aware of to ensure that the use of cultural heritage contributes to sustainable development (participant D).

During the interviews, several participants highlighted the need for tools to deal with conflicts and balance perspectives, although one participant (A) considered this to be quite utopian. Participant B considered important to have good processes and guidelines developed with this aim, as well as tools that allowed for dealing with these dilemmas and paradoxes and for identifying key thresholds such as maximum or optimal numbers of visitors or cabins. Also, participant G considered important to have well and long-term thought processes that integrate different perspectives (conservators, environmental managers, etc.) as well as increase awareness about dimensions and trade-offs one should take into account, particularly in the beginning of a reuse project. For her, a key question to answer is *'how can I facilitate / develop this without it being at the expense of this other?'*. For participant H, it is important to facilitate assessment of different aspects against each other in relation to UN's sustainability goals. For participant D, it is important to attend to professional expertise to be aware of redlines.

Participants expressed the need for guidelines to initiate and implement heritage reuse process. For instance, participant F called for guidelines addressed to owners to increase awareness of cultural heritage as a resource, answering questions such as *'what do I need to think about? What do I need to be aware of? Who can I contact to find out more?'*, as well as for guidelines to assist choices in ways that comply with aesthetic values. Participant D suggested that the tool could also comprise an overview of existing and relevant regulations and schemes. According to participant G, existing guidelines and tools are often addressed to heritage owners, and she calls for material guiding for tenants of cultural heritage buildings on possible paths to follow after entering into an agreement. Such guidelines could contain information on who they can contact, who they can collaborate with and what type of funding opportunities exist depending on the use function.

Participants also considered important to produce tools that are understandable and easy to use. A suggestion made by participant F to facilitate this was to include both written and visual (e.g. videos) material. For participant C it is very important to disseminate knowledge in ways that are easy to understand and work pedagogically towards key stakeholders such as policymakers and the construction industry. Also, participant D believes that it is important that tools are simple and able to communicate the essence. He believes that one must be aware that not everyone will use them if too detailed, and he illustrated this point with the topic of indicators. He believed that indicators can be too academic, top-down and challenging for some stakeholders. He said that people working in the voluntary sector prefer doing physical work than paperwork, as they already have too much pressure and that filling out a form can be too much for them.

Based on the above and participants' comments, it is, thus, also important that tools attend to users' differentiated needs and competences. For instance, participant B called for more examples applied to small municipalities, while attending to their differentiated needs, while participant D consider important to attend to owners' differentiated starting points and competences, considering that they can be quite diverse (e.g., volunteers, museums). In this regard, he also mentioned that it could be appropriate to have tools at two different levels: one for those who work with cultural heritage (e.g., professionals, planners); and one who translates the first level into one appropriate for cultural heritage owners with different types of knowledge (e.g., private owners, public sector, volunteers).

Some participants also raised the importance of creating wide local engagement in cultural heritage reuse projects (participants G and H), preferably at earlier stages of the process (participant C). Participants also regarded important to create political awareness about the implications of using cultural heritage in terms of jobs, industry, etc. in a long-term perspective (participant H), as well as create awareness about cultural heritage values among e.g. developers, visitors, local population (participant C). He also regarded necessary to improve cooperation towards selected sustainability goals across municipal sectors.

As described in previous section (5.2.3) one of the participants (participant I) was particularly skeptical about the notion of developing a ‘framework’ or ‘tool’. He believed it is important to talk about specific buildings and cases (rather than in general terms), and he called for concretization. For him, the combination of different competences and skills into work teams and local anchoring were key to succeed in cultural heritage reuse processes. For him, an alternative would be to understand such a toolbox in terms of personal abilities and competencies, so that it facilitates the creation of teams of people with different skills, regardless of whether this is anchored in the public, private or voluntary sectors. He regards also important to capture people with a burning commitment among the local population and that these are led by a kind of mentor / coach who can distinguish between good and useless ideas.

Ideally, RUVIVAL’s sustainability framework should attempt to address all these needs, although its capacity to do so will also depend on its design. As participant D put it, it is important that tools are designed by users. However, this is still an open question in RUVIVAL.

On the other hand, RUVIVAL will not be in the position to address all the identified needs. One participant called, for instance, for legislation to prevent prioritization of the economic dimension in decision-making processes and regulation that protects both cultivated and uncultivated land, such as tax fees that can be used as an incentive (participant A). He was critical of the construction/ developer sector and expressed little understanding for building so many cabins when so many homes are empty and blamed this on *“inherited modernism traditions where natural areas were considered almost like a tabula rasa”*. In this connection, he refers to a paradox: 30-50% of residential houses in rural Norway are empty (40-60% in northern Norway and 25-35% in southern Norway), while lots of cabins are being built, leading to loss of land, biotopes, nature, etc.

Other participants expressed the need for measures to raise competences among practitioners such as training courses on tools relevant for working with cultural monuments (participant C), networks (participant F) or seminars to facilitate knowledge exchange between professionals (participant I).

Some participants also highlighted the need for instruments to raise interests among cultural heritage owners and motivate them to use existing cultural heritage (participants F and H). While RUVIVAL’s sustainability framework may comprise some guidelines (participant F) (as described above) or possibly best-practices to show that it is possible to use protected cultural monuments (participant H), other measures such as the organization of study trips to show successful reuse projects (participant F) fall outside the project’s scope.

Participants also called for strengthened craftsmanship competence in the restoration of buildings through e.g., the establishment of good competence centres and prioritization of specific subjects in educational institutions to increase vocational interest among the youth, as

well as increased awareness of what these skills represent for sustainability (participant C). Further demands expressed by participants comprised the need for external funding, especially to implement large projects (participant E), and for quality assurance of existing databases to prevent and avoid damage to cultural heritage (participant C). RUVIVAL's contribution to most of these needs is largely limited to their identification and will need to be addressed elsewhere.

3.5 Institutional anchoring of RUVIVAL's sustainability framework

The question of institutional anchoring was not easy to answer for some respondents. Else, opinions were varied. RUVIVAL's sustainability framework is not defined yet and this may have diffculted to have clear ideas about potential users of the tool.

Difficult to say. Two participants (B, D) considered it was difficult to say who were most relevant users, although one of them suggested that cultural heritage managers seemed better suited to use it. A further respondent (E) was not asked about it, as it was clear that he was not interested in the adoption of formal instruments. The voluntariness of the framework was highlighted by further participants.

Municipalities. Two participants mentioned that the tool could be used at the municipal level (A, C). For participant C, the work of integrating sustainability into cultural heritage reuse projects is a public interest. He believed that this responsibility should be shared between the administration, the elected representatives and the population and that citizens engagement is, thus, very important.

Multiple users. Three participants (A, F, G) could envision that RUVIVAL's sustainability framework could have multiple users. Participant G believed that several types of users could benefit from RUVIVAL's tool. One type of users could be cultural heritage tenants, regardless of whether these are public, private or civil associations. Another type of users could be stakeholders who have good overview of different tourism services and providers (such as county administrations and regional business councils) who could, then, link heritage reuse processes into existing service networks.

Participant A believed that RUVIVAL's tools should first and foremost be anchored at the municipal level, but he also believed it would be important to consider the construction sector as a target group, particularly large companies which, in his opinion, should be more focused on rehabilitation rather than new construction. He further added that the tool could be directed to both the construction industry and the municipality in ways that it facilitated cooperation. Moreover, he mentioned the importance of facilitating sustainable choices and bringing the concept of sustainability beyond researcher and academic circles, where it is already well established. He illustrated this with an example from the housing market. In his opinion, people looking for housing should not first think of new built houses.

4 Conclusion

This working document summarizes results from interviews conducting within the project *RUVIVAL - Rural Vitalization through Various Adaptations of cultural heritage and Landscape*, which seeks to produce tools and knowledge that supports cultural heritage adaptive reuse processes in ways that preserve cultural heritage values while contributing to sustainable development of rural environments. Interviews are embedded in work package 4, where RUVIVAL partners aim to develop and test a framework/tool to facilitate consideration of sustainability principles and elements in the design, implementation and evaluation of cultural heritage reuse projects to both guide decision-making processes and demonstrate projects' contribution to sustainable development.

Interviews followed a previous literature review with the purpose to cast light on issues insufficiently documented in the documents reviewed. Interview participants included individuals acquainted with RUVIVAL's cases, experts in reuse and/or management of cultural heritage, and experts in the field of sustainability. Among interview participants, we find representatives from the public administration and from the voluntary sector. In total, nine individuals were interviewed in Zoom in autumn 2021. Interviews were semi-structured along themes to gain insight into participants' experiences with cultural heritage management and reuse processes, the relationship between cultural heritage reuse and sustainable development, attempts to operationalize sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes, tentative elements to be included in RUVIVAL's sustainability framework, and the potential institutional anchoring of RUVIVAL's sustainability framework.

The first aim was, thus, to learn from interview participants' **experiences with cultural heritage management and reuse processes**. In general, interviews give the impression that working with cultural heritage processes are multifaceted, site- specific and context-dependent, little systemized and rather organic (at times random and coincidental). Participants were not particularly aware of the utilization of methods, tools and guidelines to guide these processes. And some expressed even unwillingness to use them, as they could lead to too much bureaucratization.

That being said, based on participants' experiences, we have identified some factors that seem to be central in the success of cultural heritage reuse processes:

- Collaboration between various stakeholders (including public bodies at various levels, private actors and civil society)
- Networking and knowledge exchange
- Public and broad participation through the creation of dialogue areas
- Having the right constellation of actors in the process, e.g., owners-tenants
- Integration of complementary knowledge, competence and skills
- Commitment of individuals across public, private, and civil bodies
- Political prioritization
- Funding, including motivating private investment
- Dissemination to increase awareness about heritage's values
- Contextual characteristics such as accessibility to the site

These factors are also interrelated to each other. For instance, collaboration, networking and public participation are regarded key to facilitate integration and exchange of knowledge. Moreover, municipalities emerge as key actors in facilitating many of these factors such as in ensuring municipal collaboration with the voluntary sector and private actors, bringing together multiple forces and knowledge, and securing access to funding and key infrastructure and services. Related to this point, interviews also suggest that municipal approaches to cultural heritage have evolved over time, with cultural heritage becoming much more integrated with tourism and place development, and with municipalities becoming more aware of cultural heritage's importance.

Interviews also illustrate that heritage reuse processes can be triggered by international projects and events, on which cultural heritage cases manage to capitalize. Moreover, reusing cultural heritage sites can also have positive ripple effects, as it was the case with Laphella and the further development of the Hemnesberget waterfront and the effects that Obrestad lighthouse's municipal restoration had on tenants' own initiatives and on raising the sense of pride among locals.

On the other hand, interviews suggest that lack of commitment (e.g., lack of municipal support to improve accessibility or owners insufficient disposal of resources for maintenance) can compromise cultural heritage reuse processes. Also, real or perceived lack of competence among municipalities can act as a bottleneck, considering their key role. Moreover, it can be challenging to balance economic interests with other values, and the later risk often going unnoticed due to a lack of knowledge among decision-makers.

The second aim of the interviews was to gather information on the **contribution of cultural heritage reuse to sustainable development** from participants' perspectives. Interview participants considered that cultural heritage's use should and can contribute to sustainable development in various ways. In fact, various participants believed that cultural heritage management cannot only be about preservation, but about how cultural heritage can be used in ways that satisfy needs and contribute to sustainable development. Participants considered that use of cultural heritage can contribute to enhancing identity, creating a sense of place and a sense of belonging; social inclusion; job creation; business development; recreation; economic and local community development; dissemination of historic and cultural values and knowledge; climate change mitigation and environmental protection; networking; and well-being. Use was also regarded key to prevent decay and, thus, to preserve cultural heritage. Most participants associated sustainable development to notions of inter-generational justice, and/or environmental, social and economic dimensions. Some participants expressed some discomfort about how the concept is used but still believed – like the others – that it is important to strive for it.

The third aim was to gain insight into **attempts to operationalize sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes**. Based on interviews, this operationalization is not straightforward and is characterized by various challenges. Conflicts emerge between use and preservation (e.g. appropriateness of changes or use functions), sustainability dimensions (e.g. job creation and environmental pressures) and perspectives on ways of using landscapes (e.g. between Norwegian and Sami). Some participants believe in the possibility of finding solutions or uses that facilitate accommodation of interests. For other participants, however, this balance is utopian (in particular between the economic and other dimensions), and what is needed is clear prioritization and being clear about what we are willing to sacrifice in doing so.

Insufficient knowledge, fragmentation of sustainability goals across sectors and lack of commitment can also challenge operationalization of sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes. And both insufficient knowledge and lack of commitment seem to be related to one recurrent challenge compromising sustainable development: the prioritization of economic aspects in heritage reuse processes.

Despite these challenges, participants signaled that they do consider sustainability perspectives, when working with cultural heritage preservation and use. However, these ‘thinkings’ are not formalized, and the use of methods, guidelines or tools to operationalize sustainability in cultural heritage reuse processes does not seem to be widespread. This was not necessarily perceived as negative. Two participants were actually quite skeptical to the notion of the tool targeted by the project based on the difficulty of transferring experiences between unique cultural heritage sites. Other participants expressed that there are ongoing efforts to formalize sustainability commitments and expect positive developments in this respect.

The fourth aim with the interviews was to query **tentative elements to be included in RUVIVAL's sustainability framework**, primarily based on the identification of needs and challenges. Participants called for pedagogic tools that allow for integration of various sustainability aspects which usually receive insufficient attention (e.g. climate, environment); offer assistance in the concretization of sustainable development goals and the identification of redlines; help to deal with conflicts, dilemmas and paradoxes; and increase awareness about trade-offs. Moreover, participants expressed the need for guidelines addressed at both owners and tenants to initiate and implement heritage reuse process and assist choices. Interview participants also sense a need for creating wide local engagement as well as raising awareness about cultural heritage's values among a wide range of actors and creating political awareness about the implications of using cultural heritage in a long-term perspective.

The fifth and last aim was to investigate the **potential institutional anchoring of RUVIVAL's sustainability framework**. This was not easy to answer. RUVIVAL's sustainability framework is not defined yet and this may have difficulted to have clear ideas about potential users of the tool. For some participants cultural heritage managers and municipalities are clear candidates; but participants could also envision multiple users including county administrations, private and civil associations and even the construction sector. Considering the existence of differentiated needs and competences, it was suggested to create tools addressed at two different levels: one for those who work with cultural heritage (e.g., professionals, planners); and one towards cultural heritage stakeholders with different types of knowledge (e.g., private owners, public sector, volunteers). The voluntariness of the framework was highlighted by some participants, with some insinuating resistance to the notion of a ‘sustainability tool’.

Overall, we can conclude that interviews were useful to gain insight into aspects insufficiently documented in the literature and document review. That being said, participants also mentioned needs that RUVIVAL's sustainability tool will not be in the position to address. To them belong calls for legislative changes to prevent prioritization of the economic dimension in decision-making processes and protect land, improving competences in the restoration of buildings, increasing vocational interest among the youth, and securing funding and quality assurance of existing databases. RUVIVAL is also unlikely to be in the position to tackle all aspects challenging operationalization of sustainability principles in cultural heritage reuse process. RUVIVAL's sustainability framework/tool is, for instance, insufficient to change the

fragmentation of sustainability goals across sectors or the lack of commitment. Yet, by demonstrating how cultural heritage reuse can contribute to various sustainability aspects and how these relate to each other, RUVIVAL may spur motivation and contribute to sectorial integration. Also, by facilitating access to guidance material, methods and knowledge, RUVIVAL's sustainability framework/tool can facilitate initiation of cultural heritage reuse projects. Moreover, RUVIVAL's sustainability framework/tool can contribute to change perspectives prioritizing economic interests, by increasing awareness about non-economic aspects.

Based on findings, in designing RUVIVAL's framework/tool, it seems crucial to take into account different realities and practices (e. g. different municipalities work differently with planning). Moreover, RUVIVAL's framework/tool should not pose an additional burden for users. While it is considered important that tools are designed by users, this is still an open question in RUVIVAL. Take-aways for designing RUVIVAL's framework/tool are that the tool should be pedagogical, understandable and easy to use; comprise visual and textual components to capture the attention of various types of users; integrate various sustainability dimensions and contribute to operationalization of sustainability goals; allow for working with trade-offs, conflicts and dilemmas; contain guidelines to initiate and implement heritage reuse process; and contribute to create wide local engagement, as well as increase awareness about cultural heritage values and the long-term implications of reusing cultural heritage.

Insights gained through the interviews will be further discussed in an online workshop to inform the design of RUVIVAL's framework/tool, whose ultimate objectives are to guide decision-making processes when opting for reusing obsolete cultural heritage, implement projects and demonstrate their contribution to sustainable development.

References

- Aigwi, I. E., Ingham, J., Phipps, R. and Filippova, O. (2020). Identifying parameters for a performance-based framework: Towards prioritising underutilised historical buildings for adaptive reuse in New Zealand, *Cities* 102 (2020) 102756
- Bullen, P. A. & Love, P. E. D. (2010). The rhetoric of adaptive reuse or reality of demolition: Views from the field. *Cities* 27 (2010) 215–224, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2009.12.005
- Bullen, P. A. & Love, P. E. D. (2011). Adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. *Structural Survey*, Vol. 29 No. 5, 2011, pp. 411-421
- Calder, A. (2015). What Conservation Can Do For Community: Maximizing the Contributions of Adaptive Reuse Interventions to Community Development. A thesis presented to the University of Waterloo in fulfillment of the thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Arts in Planning Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2015
- Dane, G., Houpert, C. and Derakhshan, S. (2019). D2.3 Guidelines for sustainable adaptive reuse for CH. ROCK Regeneration and Optimization of Cultural heritage in creative and Knowledge cities, H2020-SC5-2016-2017 GA 730280
- De Medici, S., De Toro, P and Nocca, F. (2020). Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development: Impact Assessment of Two Adaptive Reuse Projects in Siracusa, Sicily, *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 311
- Dunn, K. (2016). Interviewing. Chapter 8 in Hay, I. (2016). *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. Fourth edition. Oxford University Press, Canada
- Europa Nostra (2015). Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe. Published on behalf of the CHCfE Consortium by the International Cultural Centre, Krakow June 2015. ISBN 978-83-63463-27-4
- Guzmán, P. C., Pereira Roders, A. R. and Colenbrander, B. J. F. (2016) Measuring links between cultural heritage management and sustainable urban development: An overview of global monitoring tools. *Cities*, Volume 60, Part A, February 2017, Pages 192-201
- KMD. (2021). Strategi for småbyer og større tettsteder som regionale kraftsentre. Sterke småbyer og tettsteder gjør det attraktivt å bo, leve og jobbe i hele landet. Kommunal- og moderniseringsdepartementet
- KMD. (2019). National expectations regarding regional and municipal planning 2019–2023
- Loli, A. & Bertolin, C. (2018). Towards Zero-Emission Refurbishment of Historic Buildings: A Literature Review. *Buildings* 2018, 8, 22
- MD. (2005). St. Meld. St. 16 (2004-2005). Leve med Kulturminner. Det kongelige miljødepartement.
- MD. (2013). Meld. St. 35 (2012-2013). Framtid med fotfeste. Kulturminnepolitikken. Det kongelige miljødepartement.
- Nocca, F. (2017). The Role of Cultural Heritage in Sustainable Development: Multidimensional Indicators as Decision-Making Tool. *Sustainability* 2017, 9, 1882; doi:10.3390/su9101882
- Oslo Economics. (2017). Vern gjennom bruk – Hva hindrer næringsvirksomhet med utgangspunkt i kulturminner? Utarbeidet på oppdrag for Norsk Kulturarv
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). “Qualitative interviewing”. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Sage, Newbury Park.
- Plevoets, B. & Van Cleempoel, K. (2019). Adaptive Reuse of the Built Heritage. Concepts and cases of an emerging discipline. Routledge.

- Potts, A (Lead Author). 2021. European Cultural Heritage Green Paper. Europa Nostra, The Hague & Brussels
- RA. (undated). Riksantikvarens innspill til handlingsplan for arbeidet med bærekraftsmålene
- UN. (2015). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015. A_RES_70_1_EN
- UNESCO. (2019). THEMATIC INDICATORS FOR CULTURE IN THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. Culture 2030 Indicators
- Yung, E. H. K. & Chan, E. H. W. (2012). Implementation challenges to the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings: Towards the goals of sustainable, low carbon cities. Habitat International 36 (2012) 352-361, doi:10.1016/j.habitatint.2011.11.001

Annex A: interview guide

Del 1: Introduksjon

Om prosjektet og intervjuet: prosjekt finansiert av NFR, samarbeidspartnere (Norske Parker; Riksantikvaren; Norges Kulturvernforbund; DNT; Innlandet FK); forskningsinstitutter (TØI; NIKU; NMBU).

Formål med prosjektet er produsere kunnskap som kan bidra til at gjenbruksprosesser av kulturminner bidrar til bærekraftig utvikling. I intervjuet ønsker vi å snakke om dine erfaringer i arbeid med det å gjenbruke og bevare kulturminner, eventuelle forsøk til å iverksette bærekrafts prinsipper og aspekter i gjenbruksprosesser av kulturminner og type kunnskap og/eller verktøy som du mener kan tilrettelegge for å utforme og gjennomføre gjenbruksprosesser på måter som bidrar til bærekraft utvikling samt for å evaluere og synliggjøre dette bidraget.

Vi er interessert i dine egne opplevelser, erfaringer, og meninger – uansett hva disse er. Tar deg gjerne tid du trenger for å besvare på spørsmål, og spør gjerne om noe er uklart. Om det er noe spørsmål du ikke ønsker å besvare er det bare å si.

Del 1: Erfaringer med gjenbruksprosesser

Kan du fortelle oss litt om ditt arbeid med kulturminner og kulturmiljøer? F. eks. hvilken type oppgaver jobber du med, ditt ansvarsområde, hvem jobber du med?

Kan du beskrive for meg/oss prosessen av å ta i bruk **kulturminner (bruk gjerne et eller flere konkrete eksempler) / XX eventuell navn av kulturminne XX?**

Hvem har vært / er involvert i prosessen/disse prosesser?

Er det noen spesiell grunn for å involvere disse? (*pga. kunnskap, erfaring, stilling, interesse, representativitet i samfunnet, mm.*).

Hvem har ledet / leder prosessen / disse prosesser?

Hvor god synes du prosessen / prosesser er/har vært med tanke på å inkludere lokal kunnskap om miljøet og tradisjoner?

Hvordan ville du si at denne prosessen er vanlig eller skiller seg fra andre gjenbruksprosesser du har eventuell jobbet med? (eventuell: Hvordan ville du si at gjenbruksprosesser ligner / skiller seg fra hver andre?)

Brukte dere noen konkrete metoder, verktøy, veileder **i disse gjenbruksprosesser / prosessen av å ta i bruk XXnavn navn av kulturminneXX?**

(*hvis metoder, verktøy, veileder m. fl. brukt*)

Hvilke metoder, verktøy, veileder brukte dere / pleier dere å bruke?

Hvordan synes du disse metoder fungerer med tanke på at prosessen og beslutninger som resulterte av denne kan bidra til bærekraftig utvikling?

Hvordan synes du disse metoder fungerer med tanke på å inkludere lokal kunnskap?

Er det andre metoder/verktøy som du synes egner seg til å bistå gjenbruksprosesser på måter som tilrettelegger for at disse prosesser bidrar til bærekraftig utvikling?

Kan du si litt mer om dette?

I hvilken grad ville du si er disse metoder brukt?

Er det andre metoder/verktøy som du synes egner seg til å inkludere lokal kunnskap?

Kan du si litt mer om dette?

I hvilken grad ville du si er disse metoder brukt?

(hvis metoder ikke brukt)

Har du kjennskap til metoder, verktøy, veileder som er relevant å bruke i gjenbruksprosesser?

(hvis kjennskap, men ikke brukt)

Hvorfor valgte dere å ikke bruke disse likevel?

Hvordan synes du disse metoder egner seg til å bistå gjenbruksprosesser på måter som tilrettelegger for at disse prosesser bidrar til bærekraftig utvikling?

Hvordan synes du disse metoder egner seg til å inkludere lokal kunnskap?

Del 2: Erfaringer med å operasjonalisere bærekraft i gjenbruksprosesser

Hva forbinder du med bærekraftig utvikling?

Synes du at man bør etterstreber etter bærekraftig utvikling i forvaltning av kulturminner?

Hvorfor (ikke)?

Ville du si at det å gjenbruke kulturminner bidrar til bærekraftig utvikling på en eller annen måte?

Hvordan da?

Tenker du på noen konkrete eksempler, når du sier dette?

Om relevant: Kjenner du til **XX navn av gjenbruksprosjekt (RUVIVAL case)? XX**

Ville du si at det å gjenbruke **XX navn av gjenbruksprosjekt (RUVIVAL case) XX** bidrar til bærekraftig utvikling på en eller annen måte?

Hvordan da?

Har dere forsøkt å innlemme bærekraft prinsipper og dimensjoner **i gjenbruksprosesser av kulturminner / arbeid med å gjenbruke XX navn av gjenbruksprosjekt⁴ XX?** (eventuell nevne noen av aspekter som intervjuede har nevnt ovenfor eller andre, f.eks.: sosial, miljø, økonomisk bærekraft eller enda konkrete, f. eks. styrke identitet, formidle kulturarv, redusere utslipp, utnytte ressurser, tilpasning klima)

(hvis ja): Kan du fortelle litt mer om dette?

(hvis ikke): Har dere vurdert dette? Er det noen grunn for å ikke gjøre det?

Finnes det eller planlegges f. eks. en egen bærekraftstrategi for å jobbe med gjenbruk av **kulturminner / XX navn av gjenbruksprosjekt XX?**

I så fall, hvem har vært med i å utforme og lede den?

Vet du om det er f. eks. foretatt analyser av hvordan **gjenbruk av kulturminner / gjenbruk av XX navn av gjenbruksprosjekt XX** kan bidra til bærekraftig utvikling?

Hvilke?

Hvem has bestilt disse?

Hvem har gjennomført dem?

⁴ Kan være RUVIVALs case eller en annen eksempel deltakere bringer fram

I hvilken grad har man tatt hensyn til disse analysene i gjenbruksprosesser?

Braker dere f. eks. noen analyser, veileder, etc. i arbeid med det å gjenbruke kulturminner / XX navn av gjenbruksprosjekt XX?

I så fall hvilke har vært dine erfaringer derved/så langt? (fordeler, ulemper og utfordringer) (eventuell, f. eks. C. hvis deltaker jobber med mer overordnet planer): Hvilken rolle spiller kulturminner og kulturmiljøer i bærekraft strategier du har jobbet med?

Braker dere noen konkrete verktøy (f.eks. indikatorer) for å følge opp bidrag av kulturminner og miljøer til bærekraft utvikling? I så fall, hvilke?

Del 3: Behov identifisering

Ønsker dere å jobbe med integrering av bærekraft prinsipper og dimensjoner i videre arbeid med å gjenbruke kulturminner / XXnavn av kulturminneXX?

(eventuelle oppfølgingsspørsmål, hvis ja):

Er det noe som kunne gjøre dette arbeid lettere?

Hvilke aspekter mener du har spesiell betydning (negativ eller positiv) for stedets eller regionens bærekraftige utvikling?

Er det noen kunnskap, verktøy og/eller ressurser som dere trenger for å jobbe med gjenbruk av kulturminner / XXnavn av kulturminneXX på måter som bidrar til bærekraft utvikling?

(eventuelle oppfølgingsspørsmål, hvis ikke):

Hvorfor ikke?

(eventuell) Gjelder det kun dette XXnavn av kulturminneXX,?

(eventuell) Vurderer dere å gjenbruke noen (andre) kulturminner?

(hvis ja):

Ønsker dere å jobbe med integrering av bærekraft prinsipper og dimensjoner i arbeid med å gjenbruke disse kulturminner?

Er det noe som kunne gjøre dette lettere? *(bruk lignende batteri spørsmål som ovenfor)*

Del 4: Forankring

Hvor mener du arbeidet med å integrere bærekraft prinsipper og dimensjoner i gjenbruksprosesser kan best forankres?

Hvorfor?

Er det eventuell andre steder/institusjoner du mener kunne dra nytte av et verktøy som tilrettelegge for at bærekraft prinsipper og dimensjoner kan integreres i gjenbruksprosesser av kulturminner?

Del 6: Takk for deltakelse & Oppfølging

Takk for at du tok deg tid!

Er det noe annet som du ønsker å legge til som du synes er relevant ifm intervjuets formål?

Har du ellers noen kommentarer og/eller spørsmål om prosjektet?

Vi vil holde deg gjerne oppdatert om prosjektets framgang. I denne forbindelsen vil jeg nevne at vi i prosjektet ønsker å belyse mange andre spørsmål enn de vi har snakket om i dette intervjuet. Bl. a. ønsker vi også å finne måter til å engasjere sivilsamfunnet og forbedre samarbeid mellom aktører i bevaring og bruk av kulturminner samt å synliggjøre den mangfoldig verdi av kulturminner.

Kan vi ta kontakt med deg igjen i tilfelle det er noe som vi ønsker å følge opp ifm intervjuets eller prosjektets øvrige formål?

Er det noen annen person som du mener vi burde ta kontakt med for å belyse noen av spørsmålene som er sentralt i dette prosjektet?

Annex B: Information letter with consent form

Formål. Dette er en forespørsel til deg om å delta i forskningsprosjekt *RUVIVAL - Adaptiv gjenbruk av kulturminner som verktøy for å vitalisere norske bygdesamfunn*. Hovedformålet i prosjektet er å undersøke hvordan gjenbruk av kulturminner og -miljøer kan organiseres slik at kulturmiljøverdiene i bygdesamfunn i Norge ivaretas og samtidig tilpasses nye behov og samfunnsutfordringer.

RUVIVAL er finansiert av Norges forskningsråd og ledet av Transportøkonomisk institutt (TØI). Mer informasjon om prosjektet finner du her: <https://www.toi.no/ruvival/>

Et av delmålene i prosjektet er å utvikle, teste og evaluere verktøy som er egnet til å utforme og gjennomføre gjenbruksprosesser av kulturminner og -miljøer på måter som bidrar til bærekraftig utvikling. Vi er også interessert i hvilken type kunnskap og/eller verktøy som trengs for å tilrettelegge for dette. TØI vil med dette invitere deg til å delta i et intervju for å belyse noen spørsmål i sammenheng med dette.

I intervjuet ønsker vi å snakke om dine erfaringer i arbeidet med gjenbruk og bevaring av kulturminner og -miljøer, eventuelle gjenbruksprosjekter du er kjent med der man har prøvd å iverksette bærekraftsprinsipper. Vi er interessert i få innblikk i typer av kunnskap og/eller verktøy som du mener at man med fordel kan gjøre bruk av i denne sammenheng.

Avidentifiserte (anonymiserte) opplysninger og analyser av intervjudataene vil kun brukes i dette forskningsprosjektet og i eventuelle andre relaterte forskningsprosjekter ved Transportøkonomisk institutt, og av samarbeidspartnere i *RUVIVAL*. Du kan se hvem disse er her: <https://www.toi.no/ruvival/>

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet? Transportøkonomisk institutt.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta? Denne invitasjonen mottar du fordi du har signalisert interesse til å delta i et intervju. Vi håper at du vil fortsatt delta.

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta? Hvis du velger å delta i prosjektet, setter vi pris på at du deltar i ett intervju i løpet av høsten 2021. Du vil kunne velge om intervjuet skal skje online eller på telefon, samt hvilke tidspunkt som passer best for deg. Vi anslår at hvert intervju vil vare ca. en time.

Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Hvis du velger å delta, kan du når som helst trekke samtykket tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle dine personopplysninger vil da bli slettet. Det vil ikke ha noen negative konsekvenser for deg hvis du ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke deg.

Ditt personvern – hvordan vi oppbevarer og bruker dine opplysninger. Vi vil bare bruke opplysningene om deg til de formålene vi har beskrevet i dette skrevet. Vi behandler opplysningene konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Video/lydopptak av intervjuet vil lagres i et lukket system ved Transportøkonomisk institutt. Kun forskere som jobber i dette prosjektet, vil ha tilgang til disse. Andre vil ha kun tilgang til transkriberte intervjudata der dine personlige opplysninger (f.eks. ditt navn) er avidentifisert ved bruk av koder. Du, som deltaker, vil ikke kunne gjenkjennes i noe publikasjonsmateriale.

Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet? Opplysningene anonymiseres når forskningsprosjektet avsluttes, noe som etter planen skjer i 2025. Dette skal gjøres ved å slette lyd-/videoopptak og nøkkelen som kobler ditt navn og personopplysninger til kodene brukt i materialet som publiseres.

Dine rettigheter. Så lenge du kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, har du rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke personopplysninger som er registrert om deg, og å få utlevert en kopi av opplysningene,
- å få rettet personopplysninger om deg,

- å få slettet personopplysninger om deg, og
- å sende klage til Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

Hva gir oss rett til å behandle personopplysninger om deg? Vi behandler opplysninger om deg basert på ditt samtykke (se eget formular helt nederst). På oppdrag fra Transportøkonomisk institutt har NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket. Hvis du har spørsmål knyttet til NSD sin vurdering av prosjektet, kan du ta kontakt med:

- NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS på epost (personverntjenester@nsd.no) eller på telefon: 55 58 21 17.

Hvor kan jeg finne ut mer? Hvis du har spørsmål til prosjektet, eller ønsker å benytte deg av dine rettigheter, ta kontakt med oss:

- Iratxe Landa Mata, Transportøkonomisk institutt, ilm@toi.no, +47 44 77 92 04
- Jan Vidar Haukeland, Transportøkonomisk institutt, jvh@toi.no, +47 92 63 01 90
- Vårt personvernombud: Silvia Olsen, Transportøkonomisk institutt (TØI), epost: sjo@toi.no, mobil 40 88 23 59 eller Gro Østlie, Transportøkonomisk institutt (TØI), epost: gro@toi.no, mobil 91 61 93 47

Samtykkeerklæring

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet RUVIVAL - Adaptiv gjenbruk av kulturminner som verktøy for å vitalisere norske bygdesamfunn og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål.

Jeg er blitt informert om at jeg når som helst kan trekke samtykket tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn; at alle mine personopplysninger da vil bli slettet; og at det ikke vil ha noen negative konsekvenser for meg hvis jeg ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke meg.

Jeg er også blitt informert om mine rettigheter, hvordan data skal behandles og oppbevares, hva det innebærer for meg å delta i prosjektet, og hvem jeg skal henvende meg til i tilfelle jeg har ytterligere spørsmål eller ønsker å klage. Jeg samtykker til:

- ☐ å delta i ett intervju høsten 2021
- ☐ at opplysninger jeg gir, publiseres slik at jeg ikke kan gjenkjennes (f.eks. ved bruk av sitater koblet til kode som erstatter mitt navn).

Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet.

(Dato og signatur av prosjektdeltaker. Vennligst skriv i tillegg ditt navn i blokkbokstaver)