D.T1.2.1 Common guidance on stakeholder involvement

Stakeholder Identification Analysis and Recommendations

Provided by

Karin Drda-Kühn, Kultur und Arbeit e. V. (main editor)

with contributions from the ARCHEODANUBE project partners:

Michael Anranter, Szilvia Bíró, Andrea Csapláros, Jasmina Davidović, Nejc Dolinar, Dumitrita Efremov, Julia Gamper, Lenka Křížková, Andrea Manzin, Nikolay Nenov, Rok Ratej, Gabriel Rustoiu, Azra Sarić, Maria-Elena Seemann, Zsolt Simon, Thomas Stollenwerk, Simeon Stoyanov, Radek Široký, Iskren Velikov, Katharina Zanier

December 2020

Content

1.0 Executive Summary

The following **stakeholder analysis** describes the process and outcome of identifying stakeholders for the (further) development of archeo parks and the establishment of the ARCHEODANUBE stakeholder groups in ten European cities. Stakeholders were grouped and assessed according to their focus of work, their interest in participating in ARCHEODANUBE and their influence on the success of the project. Consideration was given to how each of these stakeholder groups could best engage with the project. In addition, it was recorded which possible conflicts are already foreseeable and whether these can be dealt with in advance.

The data was collected by a survey October - December 2020 and included all ten city partners of the ARCHEODANUBE project. The analysis showed that **representatives of public authorities** could clearly be identified and their willingness to participate in stakeholder groups was given. The **fields of culture, heritage and tourism** need a much broader approach in terms of identifying relevant stakeholders. Even if important stakeholders from cultural heritage management could be reliably identified, other actors that also play an important role were missing almost everywhere, e.g. self-employed persons offering various cultural and tourism services, companies or institutions that provide tourism-relevant infrastructure (gastronomy, hotel industry, mobility). **Civil society representatives** have mostly been identified in sufficient quantity and more are likely to be added in the course of the project. The **media** need further identification, especially social media were underrepresented in the outcome of the survey.

Specifically, it is seen as beneficial for the next steps that **some conflicts that may arise** due to diverging interests or particular interests of stakeholders have been identified. This will play an important role in the preparations of the stakeholder groups.

The analysis resulted in general recommendations for all city partners to start establishing stakeholder groups. In addition, all city partners received individual recommendations based on the data provided.

All in all, the data provided sufficient indications on the design of the stakeholder groups to start establishing them on city level for the (further) development of the archeo parks.

2.0 Stakeholder involvement: getting further together

In the frame of the ARCHEODANUBE project all ten city partners agreed to establish **local stakeholder groups** according to the targets identified in the application. Potential stakeholders will be invited to local/regional workshops where the project activities and procedures are presented and discussed, and cooperation is requested.

City partners' task is to **ensure active participation of city representatives in the stakeholder groups** throughout the project. This includes input to and feedback on activities and outputs. It also includes regular meetings at local level. The most obvious group members were identified in the stakeholders' identification which is presented methodologically and from the outcome below. Additional recommendations were provided by the ARCHEODANUBE knowledge providers.

A stakeholder, by definition, is **anyone who has an interest in, or is affected by the outcomes of an archeo park.** That could encompass many persons and institutions, so analysis to determine significance is critical being aware that some stakeholders might reveal themselves at a later stage of implementation. Involvement of stakeholders is a **proactive endeavour**, creating an environment where varied perspectives and voices are valued, heard and taken into account. Stakeholder involvement is an approach to stakeholder liaison that goes far beyond mapping and communicating of activities for a park to **include co-design, benefits and value creation for the whole city.**

Actually, stakeholder engagement requires a **paradigm shift in setting up a cultural heritage site like an archeo park**. It is a different mind-set, which will alter the nature and construction of a vision, shifting the focus to **holistic sustainability as a key outcome** and criterion for success. Sustainable approaches go beyond the mere creation of a park: they include the social and economic sustainability of the wider city community.

Stakeholder involvement may not make the delivery of objectives easier, faster and less complicated. However, it is a way to secure sustainability and acceptance in the city community and make people proud of their local heritage. A successful strategy will bring long-term effect because **people who identify with their heritage will stand up if it is in danger**. Co-design by beneficiaries and visitors of heritage sites and local communities is already standard in many European countries supported by respective laws and accompanied by trained urban planners.

Stakeholder involvement also means a shift for the tasks of archeo park managers from management to facilitation. Social value and sustainable benefits for the whole community gain relevance and are expected to be part of running a site. It is more and more about tapping the opportunities available through a strategic vision and different processes. Inclusively engaging a wider definition of stakeholders, and redefining who should be positively affected by our project, generates a wider buy-in, sense of inclusion and energy, driving project success – and ultimately delivering more sustainable benefits.

3.0 Methodological approach for a decision-making process for stakeholders' involvement

The following methodology was suggested to the **ARCHEODANUBE** city partners as an outline for the process of stakeholders' involvement in the **ARCHEODANUBE** project. This methodology was first discussed and agreed upon with knowledge partners WPRED, STC and task leader ZVKDS. It was then communicated to the city partners in order to start with the process. Part of this methodology was an Excel file »Preparation stakeholders' engagement_data acquisition« which can still be accessed on Google Drive:
https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1Y2cu1y2LjSAd5wZcCZnGjt795r7DZQFC
The city partners were asked to start the stakeholder involvement process by 3 steps:

- **Step 1: Identification - Identify all potential stakeholders and groups**
- **Step 2: Involvement - Get in touch with the identified stakeholders**
- **Step 3: Assessment - Assess and prioritise the stakeholders**

Step 1: Identify all potential stakeholders and stakeholder groups

The identification of relevant stakeholders had first priority for the engagement process. City partners were asked to check core groups of stakeholders in **ARCHEODANUBE**. They were asked to note down which representative they already know and whom they would like to have included as stakeholders. These were the groups to be checked:

Authorities

- local authorities of the following sectors: culture, heritage, tourism, city development, economic development (including spatial planning and relevant networks)
- regional authorities of the following sectors: culture, heritage, tourism, regional development, economic development (including spatial planning, relevant networks)
- national authorities of the following sectors: culture, heritage, tourism, economic development (including spatial planning, national monument/conservation authorities and relevant networks)
- other decision makers (e.g. politicians)

Culture & heritage sector

- archeo park managers or park operators including their own staff (administrative office, ticket office, facility managers etc)
- experts like conservators and researchers (academic staff)
- respective professional associations
- free-lance guides
- cultural event organisers
- companies working continuously at the archeo park (gardeners, construction companies, craftspeople, climate control and lighting specialists)
- local museums
- libraries

Tourism
- local / regional DMO (Destination Management Organisation) responsible for tourism activities
- local / regional accommodation providers or their association

- local / regional restaurants, caterers or their association
- small businesses directly linked to the archeo park (e.g. shop operators, souvenir manufacturers)
- mobility providers (public and private local buses and trains, car rentals, bike rentals, river shipping companies, parking area operators, public roads administration)
- public utilities providers (post offices, waste managers, toilet operators)
- cultural-touristic networks

Civil society

- Interested citizens e.g. local inhabitants close to the archeo park
- Representatives of citizens' initiatives and civil society organisations
- Organized »Friends of the Archeopark« (e.g. associations)
- environmental groups, representatives of protected areas nearby
- educational institutions (e.g. schools, education providers, operators of youth groups)
- major companies (especially those which are known to be active for culture and heritage)
- social institutions (like youth centers, rehabilitation centers, social welfare institutions)

Media
- relevant media on local/regional level (print, broadcast, TV)
- relevant media on supra-regional / national level (print, broadcast, TV)
- Specialist publications (culture, heritage, regional development, conservation)
- social media bloggers
- journalists (free lancers)

These are the five most important groups for stakeholders' involvement, therefore city partners were asked to find representatives of all of these groups. ARCHEODANUBE will need a mix of representatives, in order to ensure that no group is unintentionally

excluded. This does not mean that all persons will be represented in the end, but it is essential to legitimate the whole process and add credibility to all future activities. For each of the five groups city partners were asked to identify at least 2 stakeholders using the following questions for identification:

- Who might be positively affected by **ARCHEODANUBE**?
- Who might be negatively affected by **ARCHEODANUBE**?
- Who needs to be influenced in the project?
- Who can influence results targeted by **ARCHEODANUBE** project?
- Who can be actually influenced to promote the broad adaptation of the project results?
- Who will influence the establishment/development of the archaeological park (in case the park is not yet established as with some **ARCHEODANUBE** partners)?

At the end of Step 1 a list of potential stakeholders was generated from different groups that our **ARCHEODANUBE** city partner organizations might never have capacity to engage fully with. That's why in Step 3 they were suggested to assess, analyze and prioritise relevant stakeholders.

Step 2: Involvement - Getting in touch with the identified stakeholders

City partners were then asked to get in touch with their stakeholders in order to find out:

- How are they involved in the archeopark (or the future archeopark as not all city partners have established archeo parks yet),
- How are they involved in tourism,
- If they are willing to join a stakeholder group.

This was the first opportunity in **ARCHEODANUBE** project to get in touch with possible stakeholders. City partners chose the best way and used these instruments of doing that:

- **Instrument 1 – the phone interview**: Due to time constraints, the phone interview was a good option.

- **Instrument 2 – the focus group**: City partners were asked to consider creating a so-called »focus group« of the persons identified above to present the

ARCHEODANUBE project and ask them to answer some questions. It was strongly recommended to invite a good mix of all identified groups as they might already be the »core groups« of the later stakeholder meetings. A good size for a focus group would be 10 – 15 persons (not more in order to give every person space for contributions). However, the COVID-10 pandemic did not allow to use this good instrument.

For Instruments 1 and 2 the institutions, companies, organisations, individuals were contacted with our ARCHEODANUBE flyer or other information sheets describing the project (e.g. with the first ARCHEODANUBE newsletter).

- **Instrument 3 – the online survey:** This is a good instrument when people know the persons they want to get in touch with. Then the questions could be transferred into an online survey tool (like survey monkey https://www.surveymonkey.com/ - available in many languages) which have to be translated and communicated to the stakeholders. The outcome would be generated and translated into English.

For Instrument 3 institutions, companies, organisations, individuals could be contacted - preferably with the ARCHEODANUBE flyer. Information on ARCHEODANUBE could be included in the introduction of the survey tool.

City partners were asked to use the communication opportunity of all three instruments:

- to present the ARCHEODANUBE project
- to inform about the background and ambition of the project and
- to announce the set-up of a stakeholder group on city level.

City partners were asked to fill in the respective answers in the Excel spreadsheet on Google Drive.

Step 3: Assess and prioritise the stakeholders

This step was to analyse the answers given by possible stakeholders and to classify stakeholders based on their relevance and significance to the ARCHEODANUBE project. For that, city partners were asked to fill in additional columns in the spreadsheet.

Relationship to the goals of ARCHEODANUBE should be identified:

- **Primary stakeholders - people/groups that are directly affected**, either positively or negatively, by **ARCHEODANUBE**. In some cases, there are primary stakeholders on both sides as an activity might benefit one group and have a negative effect on another. E.g. improved mobility opportunities might benefit visitors to the site and will affect the living quality of persons living close by.

- **Secondary stakeholders - people/groups that are indirectly affected**, also either positively or negatively, but are not regularly engaged in activities of the **ARCHEODANUBE** project and respective results and may not be essential for **ARCHEODANUBE**'s success. E.g. some media might be important for communication but they will not be directly involved in activities.

- **Key stakeholders - might belong to either or none of the first two groups**, are those **who can have a positive or negative effect or who are important within or to an actor** within **ARCHEODANUBE** project.

City partners were asked to keep in mind that **each stakeholder has its own set of goals and objectives** and is often driven by a different set of needs. Failing to recognise this nuance can result in negative influences on the outcome of the engagement. Therefore, in the spreadsheet they were asked to **identify conflicts and critical issues** which will most probably already pop up during your interviews.

Challenges to cope with

The biggest challenge of these process steps was to get in touch with possible stakeholders at all. Due to the circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic, neither focus groups nor face-to-face meetings could be organised. Telephone interviews also proved difficult for many city partners, as the people contacted could not be reached at their places of work, but worked in their home offices with different working hours, as family obligations (e.g. home schooling) and professional obligations had to be reconciled. Considering these challenges, it is all the more astonishing that a wealth of data was collected that allowed a first analysis of the initial situation in all ten cities.

What next?

In the next step ACW provided an analysis of the outcome and gave every city partner a clear recommendation for the organisation of the stakeholder groups based on the collected data.

With the collected information it is possible to organise the future stakeholder groups (= Deliverable D.T1.2.2 Establishing local stakeholder learning & action teams). Although it is important to try to include all relevant stakeholders, it is not necessary to include them to the same extent. Not all stakeholders are equally interested in and affected by ARCHEODANUBE project. Different people can be involved only in those parts of the process that are most relevant to them. The reason for defining the scope of stakeholder involvement is to clarify exactly what the boundaries are, i.e. what can really be achieved in practice.

4.0 Overall outcome

Involvement of authorities and public institutions:

As expected, almost all city partners were able to name authorities and public institutions at the local level (municipalities) that could be involved. Regional institutions (regional government level) were also represented at most partners, whereas national institutions (e.g. federal ministries) were named as stakeholders by only a few partners. This is due to the different levels of technical and financial responsibility. In principle, it is to be welcomed that here the identification mostly took place with several persons and work areas, i.e. the responsible authorities for culture, urban development and tourism were identified.

The actual **involvement of authorities** in the archeo parks or their development was also mostly clearly identified. Their involvement in tourism activities was limited to the fact that they themselves are operators of tourism agencies.

Regarding the **involvement of authorities in a stakeholder group**, no consistent picture emerged. However, most of the stakeholders identified are assumed to be willing to be involved in a local stakeholder group. The further away the institutions are from the local level, the more uncertain the assessment of possible participation. This is

understandable from a pragmatic point of view, but if these institutions were obviously essential for local decisions, it would be important to ensure their involvement.

Most city partners have clear ideas on **how the representatives of public institutions can contribute to the success of ARCHEODANUBE**. However, the majority of them are rather cautious in their assessment of whether the relevant representatives are actually interested in being involved in a stakeholder group, and they are more sceptical than optimistic about the influence of these people on the success of the project.

It gets interesting when assessing **possible conflicts or critical points** that might emerge: Only four out of ten city partners identified conflicts or problematic issues at all, and to varying degrees. The conflicts identified are very valid and will definitely need further consideration when establishing the stakeholder groups.

Involvement of other decision-makers:

Only one city partner identified another possible stakeholder in connection with the public sector. Politicians were suggested as an example in the spreadsheet, assuming that they would support archeo parks in local and regional decision-making. Obviously, **the city partners did not see it this way**, although it can be assumed that without political support and backing, projects like archeo parks are hardly feasible.

Involvement of stakeholders in culture and heritage:

As expected, almost all city partners identified **a wealth of stakeholders in archeo park managers, their staff, restorers, and scientific staff**. Numerous representatives were also found for the group of local museums. These groups will therefore be sufficiently represented.

It is obvious, however, that not all cities are aware of the fact that there are **many more actors contributing to the cultural heritage sector** who should be included in the stakeholder groups: Only a few freelancers, cultural event organisers, companies linked

to archeo parks and libraries were identified. In most cases, the interest of these representatives to be involved was indicated as high.

Involvement of tourism:

Of particular project interest was, of course, the involvement of representatives of tourism. Here the picture was not uniform, but nevertheless revealing. While the local and regional tourism agencies, which are responsible for tourism "by virtue of their office", were well represented, the **many people and institutions that can contribute to successful cultural tourism were hardly taken into account.** This suggests that there is hardly any cooperation with the accommodation providers, gastronomy, small companies from the creative industries, mobility providers, infrastructural providers and tourist networks, or that these are not yet perceived as attractive partners. However, it is possible that this deficit was also due to the fact that during the survey period (October - December 2020, partly in the Corona Lockdown with mostly closed facilities) it was difficult to make contact with such persons and facilities. It will therefore be a task in the coming months to first identify and then involve these institutions in the organisation of the stakeholder groups.

There were also only vague answers regarding the involvement of these groups in the activities of the archeo park and their ambitions to make the park a success story. **Possible conflicts were not identified** with any of the partners. The interest in involvement was assessed very differently by the partners - from medium to very high. This is surprising because one would expect that tourism professionals would see an archeo park as a particularly attractive asset to their tourism portfolio. It suggests that the **awareness for the touristic dimension of an archeo park is not yet present on the tourist side.**

Involvement of civil society:

A **very pleasant surprise emerged from the mapping of civil society institutions that could participate in stakeholder groups**. All but one of the city partners identified committed individuals as well as interesting and well-established institutions such as

associations, youth groups, environmental groups, educational institutions, committed companies and social institutions. The interest of these groups in getting involved was consistently identified as medium to high; however, opportunities to influence were rated as rather reserved. Possible conflicts were not identified.

Involvement of the media:

All but one of the city partners identified relevant media that could be involved in the stakeholder groups. Traditional media such as newspapers, radio and TV were most represented, and some specialised publications were also mentioned.

Surprisingly, social media were hardly mentioned by any of the partners. This seems unrealistic because by now there should hardly be a European city that is not represented with groups on social media such as Facebook and Instagram or has its own channels on YouTube. This is a point that needs to be discussed with the city partners to find out why these media, which (due to the language) are especially interesting for national tourists, were not identified as communication tools.

The role of the media was assessed differently: Even if there was agreement that they can **contribute to awareness raising**, their interest in involvement (e.g. reporting) was rated from low to very high. Possibilities of positive influence were also rated from low to very high. This is probably related to the journalistic self-image as well as different journalistic conditions and working methods.

5.0 General recommendations

Despite all the differences that became apparent among the city partners, some general recommendations for the establishment of stakeholder groups can be made that are likely to be relevant for all partners:

- The establishment and operation of an archeo park is a complex task and requires the inclusion of many different actors, disciplines and expertise.

Therefore, managers and operators have to **accept that they do not have all the knowledge that would be necessary to solve such a complex task**.

- Make it clear from the outset that it **is not (only) about archaeological heritage or tourism**, but about social values, identity building of the whole city, economic benefits and employment opportunities for all citizens.
- Implementation steps may have an impact on persons and groups that is not immediately obvious. The **early establishments of stakeholder groups** can help to bring different interests together, help to identify possible contributions and prevent and mitigate conflicts.
- The involvement of stakeholders is a **long-term strategy, not a temporary task.** Additional stakeholders should always be welcome as a stakeholder group is never a closed shop.
- Involve everyone who wants to, **regardless of function or status.**
- Make it clear at the beginning of a stakeholder initiative **what is non-negotiable.** These can be, for example, legal or monument preservation requirements.
- **Listen to your stakeholders** and draw conclusions! This will help to identify conflicts at a stage when they still can be solved or negotiated.
- Insist on an **appreciative, respectful basic attitude towards all participants**, in internal and external communication.
- **Create an "alliance of the willing"**, i.e. of people interested in getting involved in the development of archeo parks. Others will follow!
- **Transparency is key!** Communicate your concern and the opportunity of involvement openly and transparently by finding strong media partners and using tools such as newsletters and social media.
- **Keep rethinking who can contribute to the success of the archeo park.** Many facilities and people are not immediately recognisable as important stakeholders, but nevertheless can make important contributions.
- Establish a good cooperation with tourism professionals of all kinds trying to **find "a common language".** This may include regular meetings beyond the stakeholder group meetings.
- Be aware that all **stakeholders bring their own interests or have particular interests** that are not necessarily congruent with those of the archeo park. The ability to compromise and continuously balance interests is part of working with stakeholder groups.

- Archeo parks need supporters on local and regional level. **External experts with professional reputation and unquestionable expertise might help** to solve conflicts and come to solutions.
- It will prove helpful to **prepare for "troublemakers"** in the participation process, e.g. people for whom their particular interests are more important than the objectives of the archeo park project.
- There are some **personal qualities that are helpful**: listening, communicating, engaging, staying objective, acting without airs and graces.

6.0 Recommendations for single cities

For the following cities, special recommendations are provided in order to assist them in the composition and establishment of stakeholder groups:

6.1 City of Ptuj – Slovenia – data provided by MOP

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions
Authorities	. recorded in great detail . nearly all willing to join a stakeholder group . very supportive . good level of interest . possible conflicts already identified	. Are you sure that there is no political support for the park?	. check how to cope with the already identified possible conflicts, how they can be mitigated . probably this is a point to be very straight at the beginning of the stakeholder group meetings to clearly express the non-negotiable issues
Culture & heritage	. very strong inclusion of park managers and conservators . very high interest from the cultural and heritage sector in the city	. Are you sure that there are no businesses from the creative industries linked to the park?	. Most probably there are (small) businesses linked to the park which should be invited to the stakeholder group, e.g. guides, event organisers, souvenir creators?
Tourism	. The main actors in tourism are involved	. Why is it unclear how tourism can make **ARCHEODANUBE** a success?	. The first stakeholder group sessions should communicate the

	. They are willing to join a stakeholder group	. The main actors for (cultural) tourism beyond the city tourism agency are not yet included.	benefits which tourism at the archeo park can bring. . Include those businesses in tourism which will definitely benefit from tourism: accommodation providers, gastronomy, shop operators,
Civil society	One civil society representative is identified with an already established cooperation	. Civil society is not yet sufficiently included in the stakeholder group . There are surely more institutions which could be invited	. Please focus on civil society representatives a little bit more; make sure that after the first meeting there is public communication about the opportunity to join the group
Media	. Radio and TV identified . the identification of a marketing person from the radio is good, could be approached for a media partnership	. Are there no newspapers in Ptuj? . Are there no social media groups linked to Ptuj?	. Please check which newspapers are available in Ptuj and include them . Please identify social media that are focused on Ptuj – there surely are!

6.2 City of Vodnjan – Croatia – data provided by partner GVD

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions

Authorities	. sufficient local authorities included . support function well identified . level of interest good	. Are you sure that there is no inclusion necessary from regional or national level? . Are you sure that there is no political support for the park? . Are you sure that there are no possible conflicts?	. check again possible conflicts which might arise between (e.g.) conservation & tourism, citizens & tourism
Culture & heritage	. strong inclusion of park managers and conservators . high interest from the cultural and heritage sector in the city	. Are you sure that there are no businesses from the creative industries linked to the park?	. Most probably there are (small) businesses linked to the park which should be invited to the stakeholder group, e.g. guides, event organisers, souvenir creators?
Tourism	. the local tourism agency is identified and interested . an economic developer is identified	. Unclear what the economic developer might contribute . The main actors for (cultural) tourism beyond the city tourism agency are not yet included.	. The first stakeholder group sessions should communicate the benefits which tourism at the archeo park can bring. . Include those businesses in tourism which will definitely benefit from tourism: accommodation providers, gastronomy, shop operators, private tourism agencies
Civil society	. a youth organisation is included	. Civil society is not yet sufficiently included in the stakeholder group . There are surely more institutions which could be invited	. Please focus on civil society representatives a little bit more; make sure that after the first meeting there is public

			communication about the opportunity to join the group
Media	. different media well included	. unclear what kind of media could be included . Are there no social media groups linked to Vodnjan?	. Please check if print-broadcast-TV are available in Vodnjan and include them . Please identify social media that are focused on Vodnjan – there surely are!

6.3   City of Starý Plzenec – Czech Republic – data provided by partner RDAPR

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions
Authorities	. recorded in great detail . nearly all willing to join a stakeholder group . very supportive . good level of interest . possible conflicts already very clearly identified	. Are you sure that there is no political support for the park?	. check how to cope with the already identified possible conflicts, how they can be mitigated
Culture & heritage	. enough stakeholders of the sector identified		
Tourism	. The main actor in tourism is involved	. Why is it unclear if they would join a stakeholder group?	. The first stakeholder group sessions should communicate the

		. Why is their interest "medium"? Are they not responsible for tourism on local level? . The main actors for (cultural) tourism beyond the city tourism agency are not yet included.	benefits which tourism at the archeo park can bring. . Include those businesses in tourism which will definitely benefit from tourism: accommodation providers, gastronomy, shop operators,
Civil society	One relevant civil society representative is identified with an already established cooperation	. Civil society is not yet sufficiently included in the stakeholder group . There are surely more institutions which could be invited	. Please focus on civil society representatives a little bit more; make sure that after the first meeting there is public communication about the opportunity to join the group
Media		. unclear what kind of media could be included . Are there no social media groups linked to Pilsen?	. Please check if print-broadcast-TV are available in Pilsen and include them . Please identify social media that are focused on Pilsen – there surely are!

6.4   City of Sarajewo – Bosnia and Herzegovina – data provided by partner OC

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions

Authorities	. recorded in detail . nearly all willing to join a stakeholder group . very supportive . good level of interest . possible conflicts already very clearly identified	. Are you sure that there is no political support for the park?	. check how to cope with the already identified possible conflicts, how they can be mitigated . The conflict on inconsistent legislation at the level of Bosnia and Herzegovina from cultural heritage might really be a problem to be tackled as early as possible
Culture & heritage	. sufficiently identified	. there might be some more (small) businesses to be considered	. Most probably there are (small) businesses linked to the park which should be invited to the stakeholder group, e.g. guides, event organisers, souvenir creators?
Tourism		Stakeholders still to be identified	
Civil society		Stakeholders still to be identified	
Media		Stakeholders still to be identified	

6.5.   City of Alba Iulia – Romania – data provided by partner MNUAI

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions
Authorities	. recorded in detail . nearly all willing to join a stakeholder group	. Are you sure that there are no possible conflicts?	. check again possible conflicts which might arise between (e.g.)

	. very supportive . good level of interest		conservation & tourism, citizens & tourism
Culture & heritage		Stakeholders still to be identified	
Tourism		Stakeholders still to be identified	
Social society	. There is one representative from education identified	. It is unclear what kind of role the educational provider could play for the archeo park . Civil society is not yet sufficiently included in the stakeholder group . There are surely more institutions which could be invited	. Please focus on civil society representatives a little bit more; make sure that after the first meeting there is public communication about the opportunity to join the group
Media	. one newspaper is identified	. unclear why the newspaper might have no interest in the archeo park	. Please check if more print-broadcast-TV are available and include them . Please identify social media that are focused on Alba Iulia – there surely are!

6.6. City of Sremska Mitrovica – Serbia – data provided by partner MS

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions
Authorities	. recorded in detail . all willing to join a stakeholder group	. Are you sure that there are no possible conflicts?	. check again possible conflicts which might arise between (e.g.)

	. supportive . medium level of interest	. Are you sure that there is no political support for the park?	conservation & tourism, citizens & tourism
Culture & heritage	. very strong inclusion of culture and heritage institutions . mostly high interest from the cultural and heritage sector	. Are you sure that there are no businesses from the creative industries linked to the park?	. Most probably there are (small) businesses linked to the park which should be invited to the stakeholder group, e.g. guides, event organisers, souvenir creators?
Tourism	. one expert in tourism identified, obviously with good expertise specifically in archeotourism	. there are surely more public or private tourism agencies	. some more data should be collected on tourism facilitators
Civil society	. one person identified, obviously representing volunteers . high interest	. Civil society is not yet sufficiently included in the stakeholder group . There are surely more institutions which could be invited	. Please focus on civil society representatives a little bit more; make sure that after the first meeting there is public communication about the opportunity to join the group
Media	. very well identified . social media considered . Interest in cooperation identified		

6.7   City of Chisinau – Moldova – data provided by partner UL

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions

Authorities	. recorded in detail . all willing to join a stakeholder group . very supportive . good level of interest . possible conflicts already very clearly identified		. check how to cope with the already identified possible conflicts, how they can be mitigated
Culture & heritage	. recorded in detail . nearly all willing to join a stakeholder group . very supportive . sufficient level of interest		
Tourism	. A main actor in tourism on national level is involved which seems to be a strong stakeholder	. Why is the interest of this stakeholder only "medium"? . Other actors for (cultural) tourism beyond the one agency are not yet included.	. The first stakeholder group sessions should communicate the benefits which tourism at the archeo park can bring. . Include those businesses in tourism which will definitely benefit from tourism: accommodation providers, gastronomy, shop operators,
Civil society	. many and interesting possible stakeholders with partly very high interest identified		

Media	. one media representative identified	. unclear what other kind of media could be included . Are there no social media groups linked to Chisinau?	. Please check if print-broadcast-TV are available in Chisinau and include them . Please identify social media that are focused on Chisinau – there surely are!

6.8 City of Szombathely – Hungary – data provided by partner WPRED

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions
Authorities	. recorded in detail . maybe willing to join a stakeholder group . supportive approach . good level of interest . no conflicts identified and justified		
Culture & heritage	. recorded for experts like conservators and a local museum . inclusion of Catholic Church which is also operating the visitor center . opportunities for success clearly identified	. Unfortunately, it is unclear yet if the experts / owner of the site will be interested to join a stakeholder group which seems to be in contradiction to their declared level of interest.	. the participation of the Catholic Church as owner of the park site could be an opportunity for touristic cooperation . Involving the site owner in the stakeholder group could help to resolve foreseeable conflicts.

		. Possible benefits for the Iseum Savariense from the new archeo park need to be communicated.
. possible conflicts clearly presented . very high level of interest		
Tourism	. inclusion of an interest of local tourism agency is clearly presented . the identification of the mobility provider and (kind of) private tourism agency is regarded as an advantage	. Other actors for (cultural) tourism beyond the two agencies are not yet included.	. The first stakeholder group sessions should communicate the benefits which tourism at the archeo park can bring. . Include those businesses in tourism which will definitely benefit from tourism: accommodation providers, gastronomy, shop operators,
Civil society	. very clearly and convincingly identified		
Media	. a local TV station is identified	. unclear what other kind of media could be included . Are there no social media groups linked to Szombathely	. Please check if print-broadcast are available in Szombathely and include them . Please identify social media that are focused on Szombathely – there surely are!

6.9   City of Varna – Bulgaria – data provided by partner BATTI

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions

Authorities	. recorded in sufficient detail concerning basic data on local level	. no other data provided beyond the identified names and contact details . no analysis possible	. please complement the data on stakeholders
Culture & heritage	. three stakeholders of the sector identified	. some more possible stakeholders from other cultural or heritage organisations as well as creative businesses needed	. please complement the data on stakeholders
Tourism		Stakeholders still to be identified	
Social society	Two relevant civil society representative are identified, one with high interest in the project	. Civil society is not yet sufficiently included in the stakeholder group . There are surely more institutions which could be invited	. Please focus on civil society representatives a little bit more; make sure that after the first meeting there is public communication about the opportunity to join the group
Media	. One medium is identified	. The relevance of the one identified medium is unclear . Are there no social media groups linked to Varna?	. Please check if print-broadcast-TV are available in Varna and include them . Please identify social media that are focused on Varna – there surely are!

6.10 City of Rousse – Bulgaria – data provided by partner RRMH

Inclusion of:	Strengths	Room for improvements	Suggestions
Authorities	. recorded in sufficient detail concerning basic data on local level . one stakeholder is identified with very high interest for the project	. no other data provided beyond the identified names and contact details . no analysis possible	. please complement the data on stakeholders
Culture & heritage	. recorded in sufficient detail concerning basic data on local level	. no other data provided beyond the identified names and contact details . no analysis possible	. please complement the data on stakeholders
Tourism	. two tourism agencies are identified	. no other data provided beyond the identified names and contact details . no analysis possible	. please complement the data on stakeholders
Civil society	. two actors are identified	. no other data provided beyond the identified names and contact details . no analysis possible	. please complement the data on stakeholders
Media	. three media identified	. no other data provided beyond the identified names and contact details . no analysis possible	. please complement the data on stakeholders

7. 0 Glossary of abbreviations

For a better understanding of abbreviations used, a glossary is provided below.

Abbreviation	City Partner
BATTI	Bulgarian Association for Transfer of Technology and Innovation
GDV	City of Vodnan - Dignano
MNUAI	National Museum of Unification Alba Iulia
MOP	Municipality of Ptuj
MS	Museum of Srem
OC	Municipality of Centar Sarajewo
RRMH	Rousse Regional Museum of History
RDAPR	Regional development Agency of Pilsen Region
UL	Urban Lab Chisinau Association
WPRED	West Pannon Regional and Economic Development Public Nonprofit LtD
	Knowledge Providers
ZVKDS	Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia
STC	Sustainication