

Co.Co.War - Community Toolkit. Understanding the (Dis)Value

Original

Co.Co.War - Community Toolkit. Understanding the (Dis)Value / Morezzi, E., Vagnarelli, T., Araque, S.. -
ELETTRONICO. - (2026), pp. 1-246. [10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8911]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/3011314 since: 2026-06-15T11:54:46Z

Publisher:

AMSA Acta

Published

DOI:10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8911

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)



Dissonant Heritage and War
Conservation and Communication
of a Difficult Legacy

Co.Co.War Community Toolkit

Understanding the (Dis)Value



Finanziato
dall'Unione europea
NextGenerationEU



Ministero
dell'Università
e della Ricerca



Italiadomani
PIANO NAZIONALE
DI RIPRESA E RESILIENZA



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ
DI BOLOGNA



UNIVERSITÀ
POLITECNICA
DELLE MARCHE



Politecnico
di Torino

Dipartimento
di Architettura e Design





Dissonant Heritage and War
Conservation and Communication
of a Difficult Legacy

Co.Co.War - Community Toolkit

Understanding the (Dis)Value

Authoring research unit:

Politecnico di Torino

Dipartimento di Architettura e Design - DAD

Emanuele Morezzi

Tommaso Vagnarelli

Santiago Araque Collazos

First Edition: February 2026

DOI <https://doi.org/10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8911>

Project website: <https://cocowar.com>

This open-access volume is an outcome of the PRIN project “Co.Co.War - Dissonant Heritage and War. Conservation and Communication of a Difficult Legacy” (MUR 2022YHNX9M_001 - CUP J53D23013690006), funded by the Italian Ministry of University and Research and coordinated by Prof. Leila Signorelli. Other project outcomes include: “Co.Co.War - Atlas. Mapping Dissonant Heritage”; “Co.Co.War - Glossary. Dissonant Heritage concepts and terms”; “Co.Co.War - Handbook. Managing Dissonant Heritage”.



This volume is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0

International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

“Co.Co.War — Dissonant Heritage and War. Conservation and Communication of a Difficult Legacy” is a National Research Program (Progetto di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale — PRIN) funded by the Italian Ministry of University and Research. The project is carried out by an interdisciplinary network involving three Italian universities: Alma Mater Studiorum — Università di Bologna, Università Politecnica delle Marche, and Politecnico di Torino. The project investigates the phenomenon of dissonant heritage in contexts shaped by war, conflict, and contested pasts, focusing on architectural and cultural assets whose meanings are unstable, conflictual, or socially disputed, and whose interpretation, conservation, and communication are often exposed to ethical, political, and social tensions. Co.Co.War aims to develop innovative, value-based, and critically grounded approaches to the study and management of this complex heritage by integrating conservation practices with interpretative and communicative strategies. Rather than seeking to resolve dissonance or to stabilize heritage meanings, the project acknowledges conflict, ambiguity, and plurality as structural conditions of these sites. Through comparative analysis, methodological experimentation, and interdisciplinary collaboration, Co.Co.War explores how dissonant heritage can be responsibly investigated, preserved, and communicated, while addressing emerging risks such as interpretative conflicts, polarized narratives, and the instrumentalization of memory.

This publication forms part of an interconnected set of research outputs produced within the Co.Co.War project. It is intended to be considered together with: “Co.Co.War - Atlas. Mapping Dissonant Heritage” (<https://doi.org/10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8909>); “Co.Co.War - Glossary. Dissonant Heritage Concepts and Terms” (<https://doi.org/10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8910>) and “Co.Co.War - Handbook. Managing Dissonant Heritage” (<https://doi.org/10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8912>).

Co.Co.War - Community Toolkit

Preface

The Co.Co. War Community Toolkit is conceived as a methodological and operational infrastructure designed to support engagement with communities in contexts of dissonant, contested, or traumatic heritage. It is intended for researchers, professionals, and practitioners working at the intersection of architectural heritage, memory, and conflict, and does not propose prescriptive solutions, best practices, or normative participatory models. Instead, it offers a critically framed repertoire of tools intended to support dialogue, observation, mapping, and interaction with communities, while explicitly addressing the epistemological, ethical, and relational challenges inherent in working with difficult heritage. The Toolkit is grounded in the assumption that dissonance is not only embedded in material heritage, but is produced and sustained through perceptions, memories, silences, power relations, and forms of mediation that shape how heritage is accepted, rejected, negotiated, or avoided. It is deliberately conceived as a flexible and modular system: tools are not meant to be applied exhaustively or indiscriminately, but selected, combined, adapted, or excluded in response to specific research objectives, contextual conditions, and identified sensitivities. Each tool embodies particular assumptions about agency, exposure, and interpretation, and actively shapes both the forms of knowledge produced and the relationships established with communities. The Toolkit is organized into six categories—Interviews, Observation, Mapping, Group Activities, Community-Led tools, and Creative tools—each corresponding to a distinct mode of interaction and analytical intent. These tools are not neutral instruments for data extraction, but relational devices that require critical awareness and methodological control. For this reason, the Community Toolkit operates in direct interdependence with the Community Process Diagram, which governs when and how tools are activated within a sequenced, reflexive, and ethically calibrated engagement process.

In this framework, the data and responses generated through the Toolkit's tools do not stand as isolated outputs, but function as foundational inputs that interface directly with the Community Process Diagram and other project phases—such as archival analysis, spatial assessment, and policy review—to inform heritage conservation or transformation strategies that are not only technically sound but also culturally coherent and scientifically accountable, as they are grounded in the lived experiences, value systems, and relational dynamics of the communities involved.

INDEX

/01

INTRODUCTION

1.1- Introduction	10-11
1.2- Community and Dissonant Heritage	12-13
1.3- Why Dis-Values?	14-15
1.4- Why a Community Toolkit?	16-19
1.5- How do I use the Community Toolkit?	20

/02

THE TOOLKIT

2.1- The Toolkit	21
2.2- The tools	22-25
2.3- Outcomes	26-31
INTRO	32- 35
IN- (Interviews)	36-43
OB- (Observation)	44- 51
MA- (Mapping)	52- 59
GR- (Group Activity)	60- 67
CL- (Community-Led)	68- 73
CR- (Creative)	74-79

/03

GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION & SUMMARY OF THE TOOLKIT

3.1- Graphical Representation and Summary of the Toolkit	80-83
---	-------

/04

COMMUNITY PROCESS DIAGRAM (CPD)

4.1- Community Process Diagram CPD	84-86
4.2- Structure of the Phases and Sections	87-89
4.3- Graphical Analysis and Section Structure	89-96
4.4- Actors	97- 99
4.5- Outcomes	100- 105
4.6- COMMUNITY PROCESS DIAGRAM (CPD)	
Phase 01	106- 115
Phase 02	116-139
Phase 03	140-157
Phase 04	158-185
Phase 05	186-209
Phase 06	210- 233

/05

APPENDIX

234-239

/06

REFERENCES

240-243

/1.1

INTRODUCTION

Dissonance, as a phenomenon related to heritage, represents a complex condition that challenges conventional approaches to conservation and interpretation. Dissonant heritage is characterized by the coexistence of recognized cultural, historical, and architectural values and a set of conflicting perceptions rooted in traumatic, difficult or contested pasts. These perceptions, shaped by memories, emotions, and lived experiences, deeply influence the ways in which heritage is understood, experienced, and negotiated by local communities. For experts, stakeholders, professionals, university professors, and researchers engaging with dissonant heritage, the main challenge lies not only in addressing the physical and material dimensions of heritage objects, but also—and above all—in understanding how these objects are perceived by the communities that surround them. Dissonant heritage (*see definitions in the Co.Co.War Glossary*) exists through a fundamental duality: a physical dimension that embodies values worthy of conservation and transmission to future generations, and a perceptual dimension that may attribute negative or conflicting meanings to the same heritage due to past traumatic or oppressive events. These two dimensions coexist and hold equal relevance. In many cases, it is precisely the perceptual dimension that conditions, limits, or prevents appropriate processes of conservation and communication. For this reason, the study, observation, and conservation of dissonant architectural heritage require, as a necessary condition, the establishment of a structured process of dialogue, sharing, understanding, and communication with local communities. Such a process must be guided by experts, but it cannot rely exclusively on technical tools; it must also account for people, relationships, and the time needed to build trust and mutual understanding.

Within this framework, the CPD Community Process Diagram has been developed as part of the research project Co.Co.War — Dissonant Heritage and War. Conservation and Communication of a Difficult Legacy. The Toolkit aims to provide professionals and researchers with a set of tools and strategies to support interaction with communities,

Introduction

to investigate and clarify perceptions related to dissonant heritage, and to synthesize these perceptions in a structured and communicable form. This step is considered essential for the development of responsible and context-sensitive approaches to dissonant heritage. The present document does not claim to be exhaustive or universally applicable. It is conceived as a project-oriented tool, developed within a specific research framework, yet potentially transferable to other contexts. Its application and adaptation are left to the professional judgment of the experts who choose to use it. The Toolkit builds upon existing methodologies and guidelines developed by established institutions working on community participation and engagement in heritage processes.

[1] Tandon, A.; Harrowell, E.; Selter, E. (2021). Toolkit on Heritage for Peace and Resilience. Design, monitor and evaluate heritage projects in conflict settings. PATH Peacebuilding Assessment Tool for Heritage Recovery and Rehabilitation. International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), Rome, Italy.

[2] IDEO.org. (2015). The Field Guide to Human-Centered Design. IDEO, Canada.

[3] Robson, R.; Jones, S.; Matthews, P.; Robertson, K. (2021). Social Value Toolkit. PhD project, Wrestling with Social Value: An Examination of Methods and Approaches for Assessing Social Value in Heritage Management and Conservation (2018-2021). University of Stirling, Historic Environment Scotland (HES), UK.

It is hoped that this document may support ongoing processes of understanding disvalue and contribute to the set of tools currently in use, offering a new and specifically tailored interpretative perspective for those working with architectural heritage. The distinctive feature of this Toolkit lies not only in its focus on disvalue and community interaction, but above all in its effort to articulate forms of dialogue—already widely discussed in existing field of research—in relation to projects dealing with architectural heritage, and in particular with processes of conservation, transformation, restoration and communication carried out by experts in historic heritage and architectural conservation.

/1.2

COMMUNITY & DISSONANT HERITAGE

Community engagement represents a key dimension when addressing dissonant heritage. Dissonance arises from the coexistence of divergent perceptions and interpretations of the values that contribute to the cultural significance of a place or building. In this context, opinions, memories, and lived experiences held by individuals and communities are not ancillary elements, but constitute an essential component for understanding how dissonance is produced, maintained, and negotiated over time.

This approach reflects the increasing recognition, over recent decades, of the central role played by communities in relation to cultural heritage. In particular, the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention, 2005) defines cultural heritage not merely as a set of inherited resources, but as a dynamic process shaped by people and their evolving values. According to the Convention, “cultural heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions,” and “a heritage community consists of people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage which they wish, within the framework of public action, to sustain and transmit to future generations”.

1- ICOMOS, & ICCROM. (2023). ICOMOS-ICCROM Guidance on Post-Disaster and Post-Conflict Recovery and Reconstruction for Heritage Places of Cultural Significance and World Heritage Cultural Properties (1st ed.). ICCROM, ICOMOS International Secretariat.

MANCANO I DOCUMENTI DI BETUL

Within this framework, the relationship between communities and dissonant heritage is not secondary, but constitutive of dissonance itself. Dissonant heritage exists precisely because of the ways in which heritage

Introduction

is perceived, interpreted, contested, or rejected by communities in relation to traumatic, sensitive, or conflictual pasts. For this reason, the tools presented in this Toolkit are intended to explore the extent, depth, historical layering, and fragmentation of dissonance as a perceptual phenomenon, dissonance, in fact, resides primarily in the perceptions held by communities; therefore, any intervention on architectural heritage requires a thorough analysis of what constitutes this dissonant perception and the associated disvalue (see *definitions in the Co.Co.War Glossary*).

Moreover, dissonant heritage is often linked to painful or highly sensitive issues—such as religious conflicts, ethnic divisions, political disputes, or deeply rooted social tensions—that can evoke strong emotions and expose practitioners and communities to potential risks. In this context, maintaining an informed, conscious, and careful relationship with communities is crucial. Without such an approach, conservation, restoration, or transformation projects may inadvertently exacerbate conflict or undermine both the heritage itself and the viability of the intervention. Clear and structured engagement strategies create the conditions for dialogue, trust, and responsible action, enabling professionals to address architectural heritage while acknowledging and engaging with the complex perceptual dimensions that define its dissonance.

/1.3

WHY DIS-VALUES?

Within the field of dissonant heritage, it is necessary to reconsider—and in some respects reverse—traditional approaches to investigation, conservation, and restoration. Conventional heritage methodologies are generally driven by the identification and enhancement of positive cultural, historical, and memorial values, which function as the primary drivers for conservation and communication strategies. In the case of dissonant heritage, however, this value-centered logic proves insufficient. The question posed by the title *Understanding the (dis)value?* reflects the need to shift the analytical focus from the affirmation of established values to the critical examination of disvalue.

Introduction

This approach does not deny the existence of cultural, historical, or architectural value within dissonant heritage. On the contrary, it assumes that such heritage necessarily embodies a form of value that motivates its study and potential conservation. However, this value manifests itself through dissonance and is often perceived primarily as negative, problematic, or uncomfortable. Rather than being associated with shared pride or positive collective memory, dissonant heritage is frequently linked to rejection, hostility, repulsion, or unresolved trauma. It is precisely this condition of (dis)value that constitutes the central object of inquiry.

From this perspective, the Toolkit does not aim to investigate the intrinsic architectural, material, volumetric, or morphological qualities of dissonant heritage, which are implicitly acknowledged but are not the focus of this theoretical framework. Instead, it seeks to understand why these sites generate conflict, resistance, or emotional distance, and how such reactions are constructed and sustained over time. The emphasis is therefore placed not on the celebratory narratives traditionally associated with heritage, but on the tensions, contradictions, and negative meanings that often obstruct processes of conservation and communication.

This shift in focus entails both a methodological and an ethical challenge. Investigating (dis)value requires not only the involvement of communities,

but also their emotional engagement in articulating perceptions that are frequently painful, contested, or deliberately avoided. Dissonant heritage often relates to memories and experiences that communities may prefer to silence, remove, or erase. Asking communities to engage with these dimensions demands careful mediation and a conscious acknowledgment of the emotional implications involved. It is within this context that Toolkit CoCoWork — Community Toolkit. Understanding the (dis)value positions itself as a support instrument for professionals and researchers. The Toolkit is conceived to assist in identifying, articulating, and interpreting negative or conflicting values that are complex, layered, and deeply embedded in collective memory. Although often linked to traumatic or difficult pasts, these (dis)values are central to understanding the contemporary significance of dissonant heritage and represent a crucial field of investigation for any responsible intervention. By addressing (dis)value as an analytical starting point rather than as a secondary obstacle, the Toolkit proposes a necessary shift in perspective for projects dealing with the conservation, transformation, restoration, and communication of architectural heritage in dissonant contexts.

/1.4

WHY A COMMUNITY TOOLKIT?

The Community Toolkit was developed as an integral part of the project's work package (WP3) Understanding the (Dis)Value, which aims to create a precise methodology that enables, on one hand, the identification of different types of stakeholders directly related to the heritage in question, and on the other, the production of concrete results that contribute to a comprehensive, real, and in-depth understanding of dissonant heritage and the conflicts associated with it.

For this reason, during the research process, it was considered necessary to compile a list of recommended, innovative, and applicable tools suited to cases of dissonant heritage, always in relation, to the local community that lives in direct connection with that heritage. Thus, the Toolkit provides the opportunity to propose, gather, and design a variety of tools capable of adapting to and addressing, the social, methodological and procedural challenges that may arise when dealing with dissonant heritage. The development of the Co.Co.War Community Toolkit is grounded in a set of methodological references that informed both its structure and its overall approach. Among the different sources consulted during the research process, three Toolkits played a particularly significant role in shaping the framework of the document and in guiding the selection, adaptation, and refinement of the tools presented. These references contributed in complementary ways to the definition of the Toolkit, especially with regard to community engagement, the articulation of values, and the management of complex and sensitive heritage contexts.

Introduction

A first and central reference is the Social Value Toolkit developed by the University of Stirling. This Toolkit provides a clear and methodologically structured approach to identifying, documenting and interpreting social values related to heritage. Its main contribution lies in the organization of tools into coherent categories and in the attention devoted to defining objectives, expected outcomes, and target groups. This approach proved particularly relevant for the development of the Co.Co.War Community Toolkit, especially in relation to the decision to group tools according to different forms of interaction and to present each one through a concise and standardized tool sheet. The emphasis on clarity, comparability, and readability influenced the overall structure of the Toolkit and reinforced the importance of making tools accessible and usable for practitioners working in diverse contexts. More broadly, the Social Value Toolkit supported the idea that community values can be systematically explored and interpreted through appropriate methodological choices.

[1] Robson, R.; Jones, S.; Matthews, P.; Robertson, K. (2021). Social Value Toolkit. PhD project, Wrestling with Social Value: An Examination of Methods and Approaches for Assessing Social Value in Heritage Management and Conservation (2018-2021). University of Stirling, Historic Environment Scotland (HES), UK.

A second key reference is the PATH (Peacebuilding Assessment Tool for Heritage Recovery and Rehabilitation) developed by ICCROM. PATH was particularly important in framing heritage practice as a process embedded in broader social and political dynamics, especially in contexts affected by conflict or deep social tensions. Its contribution lies in the explicit attention to conflict sensitivity and in the recognition that heritage-related decisions may have unintended consequences if dissonance, contested meanings, and power relations are not adequately considered. Rather than offering prescriptive solutions, PATH promotes a reflective approach based on guiding questions and contextual assessment. This perspective informed the Co.Co.

War Community Toolkit in its attention to risk, ethical awareness, and the need to situate community engagement within a wider understanding of social dynamics. Although PATH operates primarily at a strategic level, its emphasis on reflection and awareness strongly resonates with the objectives of the Co.Co.War project.

[\[2 \] Tandon, A.; Harrowell, E.; Selter, E. \(2021\). Toolkit on Heritage for Peace and Resilience. Design, monitor and evaluate heritage projects in conflict settings. PATH Peacebuilding Assessment Tool for Heritage Recovery and Rehabilitation. International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property \(ICCROM\), Rome, Italy.](#)

Introduction

A third relevant reference is IDEO's Human-Centered Design Toolkit, which originates from the field of design thinking and social innovation. While not specifically focused on heritage, this Toolkit contributed to the development of tools aimed at engaging with perceptions, experiences, and narratives at a more experiential level. Its emphasis on empathy, observation, and iterative exploration informed the design of tools that rely on dialogue, creative practices, and direct interaction with communities. The IDEO approach encourages flexibility and adaptation, acknowledging that complex realities cannot be fully addressed through rigid or linear methodologies. Within the Co.Co.War Community Toolkit, this influence is particularly visible in tools that seek to explore emotional, symbolic, and experiential dimensions of dissonant heritage.

[\[3 \] IDEO.org. \(2015\). The Field Guide to Human-Centered Design. IDEO, Canada.](#)

Building on these references, the Co.Co.War Community Toolkit develops a specific methodological position based on a clear definition of dissonant heritage and, more specifically, of dissonant architectural heritage. The Toolkit was developed within a research project whose expertise and disciplinary background are closely connected to architectural conservation, restoration, and transformation. For this reason, the selection and adaptation of tools were guided by the intention to explore how dissonance affects architectural heritage and how community perceptions influence processes of conservation, transformation, and communication.

In this context, community engagement is not conceived as an end in itself, but as a necessary step to orient architectural heritage practices in contexts characterized by dissonance. The collection of qualitative and quantitative data, the dialogue with communities, and the interaction with different social groups are aimed at understanding how architectural heritage is perceived, contested, or rejected, and how these perceptions are linked to memories, conflicts, and disvalues.

/1.5

HOW DO I USE THE COMMUNITY Toolkit?

The Community Toolkit is divided into six general categories, based on the different activities carried out by the tools contained in each category, each identified by a distinctive color (**Interviews, Observation, Mapping, Group Activity, Community-Led, Online, Creative**). In addition, the Community Toolkit is integrated into the methodological framework Community Process Diagram (CPD). Within this framework, different tools are recommended directly during the various phases through the use of the nominative code that identifies each tool, consisting of the initials of the category to which it belongs and the number assigned to that specific tool.

Introduction

Tool Categories



/2.1

THE TOOLKIT

The Community Toolkit is structured around six general categories, each corresponding to a specific type of activity and form of interaction with communities (Interviews, Observation, Mapping, Group Activity, Community-Led, Creative). Together, these categories are intended to provide the broadest possible spectrum of approaches to community engagement, reflecting the diversity of contexts, actors, and objectives that characterize work on dissonant heritage. Within each category, individual actions are presented through concise and clearly structured tool sheets. These are designed to allow users to immediately understand the purpose of each tool, the type of interaction it enables, and the expected outcomes associated with its application. This structure is intended to facilitate practical use, supporting professionals in navigating the Toolkit efficiently and in making informed choices.

The Toolkit is conceived as a flexible and adaptable instrument. Users are not expected to apply all the tools indiscriminately; rather, they are encouraged to select only those tools that are most appropriate and relevant to the specific needs, constraints, and objectives of their project. In this sense, the Toolkit supports a modular approach to community engagement, allowing different combinations of tools to be assembled in response to different contexts. In addition, the Community Toolkit is integrated into the broader methodological framework of the project. Within this framework, specific tools are recommended at different stages of the process through a nominative code system. Each code is composed of the initials of the category to which the tool belongs and a numerical identifier, enabling clear reference and consistent use across the various phases of analysis, dialogue, and interpretation.

/2.2

THE TOOLS

The tools presented in this Toolkit are organized into six distinct categories, corresponding to the different objectives pursued and to the variety of strategies through which interaction with communities can be structured. These categories reflect the need to address dissonant heritage through multiple forms of engagement, acknowledging that no single approach can adequately capture the complexity of perceptions, memories, and disvalues associated with contested heritage contexts. Each category has been defined on the basis of the type of interaction it enables and the goals it is intended to achieve. The Toolkit structure allows users to understand the underlying logic of each category before engaging with the individual tools it contains.


The Toolkit

Following the general introduction of each category, the tools are presented and analyzed one by one. Each tool is accompanied by an introductory text outlining its nature and intended use, but also by a dedicated tool sheet designed to summarize its main characteristics in a clear and accessible manner. The purpose of this structure is to support both in-depth understanding and practical usability. Each tool sheet includes a tool code, displayed in the upper left corner, which identifies the tool through a combination of the category initials and a numerical reference. This is followed by the tool name, the references from which the tool draws its theoretical or methodological foundations, and a clear statement of the goals it is intended to achieve. An activity description then provides a concise explanation of the type of interaction proposed and the way the tool is meant to be applied.

Given the sensitivity of working with dissonant heritage and disvalues, particular attention is devoted to the sections on risks and advices. These are intended to support practitioners in anticipating potential challenges, ethical concerns, or criticalities that may arise during interaction with communities. Finally, the outcomes section specifies the expected results of each tool, in terms of the type of data, insights, or materials that the activity is designed to generate. In addition, each tool sheet visually indicates the

targeted subjects through a set of icons displayed along the left-hand side, allowing users to immediately identify the primary interlocutors involved. In the lower right section of the sheet, references are provided to related materials developed within the project, including links to the downloadable document associated with the process diagram. Overall, the tool sheets are conceived as synthetic yet comprehensive devices, aimed at summarizing all the essential information required for a clear understanding and informed application of each tool. This structure is intended to enhance readability and to support professionals in selecting, adapting, and combining tools in response to the specific needs and sensitivities of each project context.

The Toolkit



Graphical display of the tool categories within the Toolkit.

INTERVIEWS

IN-01/ Structured Interviews
IN-02/ Semi-structured Interviews
IN-03/ Conversation Starters
IN-04/ Oral Memory Interview
IN-05/ Poll

OBSERVATION

OB-01/ In-Person/ On-site Observation
OB-02/ Multi-sensory Observation
OB-04/ Netnography/ Online Observation
ON-05/ Peers observing Peers
ON-07/ Virtual depictions & 3D models

MAPPING

MA-01/ Behaviour mapping
MA-02/ Physical traces mapping
MA-03/ Participatory mapping
MA-04/ Mind mapping- Concept and ideas
MA-05/ Extremes and Mainstreams
MA-06/ Memory Reconstruction

GROUP ACTIVITY

GR-01/ Group Meeting-Focus group
GR-02/ Community Gatherings
GR-03/ Public Events
GR-04/ Site Base Practices
GR-05/ Multispeaker Debate

COMMUNITY-LED

CL-01/ Day-to-day interactions with place
CL-02/ Transect walks
CL-03/ SCommunity tours - Memory maps

CREATIVE

CR-01/ Future visioning
CR-02/ Arts-based engagements
CR-03/ Urban Participatory Placemaking

/2.3

OUTCOMES

The outcomes produced through the application of the Community Toolkit can adopt multiple material and documentary forms. These outputs should be understood not merely as final products, but as integral components of the research and engagement process, each characterized by specific advantages and limitations. Their diversity reflects both the plurality of tools employed and the complexity of dissonant heritage contexts.

Written and text-based outputs constitute a first and foundational category. These include analytical reports, field diaries, interview transcripts, methodological notes, and narrative syntheses. Their primary advantage lies in their capacity to articulate complex arguments, contextualize findings, and support comparative and longitudinal analysis. Written documents allow for precision, traceability, and critical reflection, making them particularly suitable for academic research, policy-oriented work, and conservation planning. At the same time, their limitations must be acknowledged: textual outputs may struggle to convey emotional, spatial, or experiential dimensions, and they often require mediation to be accessible to non-specialist audiences. As highlighted in both the Stirling and PATH Toolkits, written materials are most effective when complemented by other forms of documentation. Visual and graphic outputs, such as drawings, sketches, diagrams, and graphic schemes, play a crucial role in translating perceptions, interpretations, and spatial relationships into accessible forms. Their strength lies in their immediacy and their ability to bridge disciplinary and cultural boundaries, particularly in architectural heritage contexts. Visual outputs can synthesize complex information and support dialogue among diverse stakeholders. However, they are inherently interpretative and may risk oversimplification or ambiguity if not adequately contextualized. As suggested by design-oriented approaches such as IDEO's Toolkit, visual materials benefit from being accompanied by explanatory narratives that clarify their intent and limitations.

Mapping and data visualization outputs represent a more structured

The Toolkit

subset of visual materials. These include thematic maps, participatory maps, timelines, matrices, and layered diagrams that organize qualitative and quantitative data spatially or conceptually. Their advantage lies in their capacity to reveal patterns, distributions, and relationships that remain invisible through textual analysis alone. Mapping outputs are particularly valuable for comparing different case studies or phases of a project. At the same time, as emphasized in the Stirling Toolkit, mapping carries the risk of conveying a false sense of objectivity, as choices regarding scale, inclusion, and categorization inevitably reflect the researcher's perspective. For this reason, maps should be treated as interpretative devices rather than definitive representations. Photographic and audiovisual documentation forms another important category of outcomes. Photographs, audio recordings, and videos capture contextual, performative, and emotional aspects of heritage and community interaction that are difficult to translate into other formats. Short films or summary videos, in particular, can synthesize complex processes and make them accessible to broader audiences. Their main advantage lies in their communicative power and their capacity to document atmospheres, gestures, and temporal sequences. However, these outputs also raise ethical and methodological challenges, including issues of consent, representation, and selective framing. PATH, in particular, underscores the importance of careful contextualization to avoid misinterpretation or instrumentalization of audiovisual materials. Creative and interpretative outputs include artworks, collages, storyboards, models, performative actions, and other expressive materials generated through creative tools. These outcomes are especially valuable in contexts marked by trauma, conflict, or emotional sensitivity, as they allow participants to articulate experiences that may resist verbalization. Their strength lies in their openness and symbolic richness. At the same time, creative outputs are highly subjective and context-dependent; without adequate interpretation, they may be misunderstood or detached from the intentions of their authors. As design-oriented Toolkits emphasize, creative outcomes should therefore be accompanied by reflective documentation that situates them within the research process.

Quantitative outputs, such as datasets, tables, charts, and statistical summaries, derive primarily from surveys, polls, and systematic observations. Their advantage lies in their comparability and their ability to provide measurable indicators that support broader interpretations. Quantitative data can help balance subjective accounts and offer insights into trends or distributions within a community.

OUTCOMES BY TOOL CATEGORY:

INTERVIEWS:

Interview transcripts; Audio and video recordings; Audio and video testimonies; Transcribed narratives; Qualitative and quantitative datasets; Coded datasets; Statistical tables; Charts and graphs; Comparative charts and summaries; Analytical and interpretative reports; Field notes; Archival materials; Memory-based reports; Lists of sensitive topics; Preliminary interpretative diagrams; Risk identification summaries

OBSERVATION:

Observation diaries; annotated photographs; sketches and notes; behavioral descriptions; sensory field notes; experiential descriptions; interpretative texts; conceptual diagrams; screenshots and digital traces; online interaction logs; thematic summaries; qualitative datasets; digital models; screen recordings; annotated visual outputs; interpretative diagrams.

MAPPING:

Behavioral maps; annotated plans; visual datasets; comparative diagrams; trace maps; photographic documentation; analytical sketches; interpretative reports; community-produced maps; layered visualizations; qualitative spatial datasets; comparative cartographies; concept maps; diagrammatic representations; narrative visual outputs; interpretative summaries; stakeholder diagrams; positional matrices; tension and risk maps; analytical charts; timelines; historical reconstructions; memory maps; synthetic visual reports.

The Toolkit

GROUP ACTIVITY:


Audio and video recordings; discussion summaries; qualitative datasets; field notes; informal interview notes; photographic documentation; relational insights; event documentation; photo and video records; observational reports; narrative summaries; practice documentation; diaries and logs; photographic records; experiential reports; recorded debates; transcripts; comparative position tables; conflict analysis summaries.

COMMUNITY-LED:

Diaries; logs of daily practices; photographic self-documentation; qualitative datasets; video recordings; audio narratives; route maps; annotated spatial diagrams; memory maps; narrative drawings; audiovisual documentation; interpretative reports.

CREATIVE:

Scenario drawings; vision maps; written future narratives; conceptual diagrams; artworks and creative objects; photographic documentation; reflective texts; symbolic representations; temporary installations; photographic and video documentation; spatial transformation sketches; evaluative summaries.



Co.Co.War - Community Toolkit

Intro

This document presents the Community Toolkit developed within the Co.Co.War project, conceived as a methodological and operational framework for engaging with architectural heritage in contexts of dissonance, contested memory, and conflict. Rather than offering prescriptive solutions, it provides a structured approach to addressing the epistemological, ethical, and relational challenges of working with difficult heritage. At its core, the Toolkit recognizes that dissonance cannot be approached through technical expertise or generic participation alone, but requires careful attention to perceptions, memories, power relations, and silences. This calls for a clear methodological logic to guide interactions, knowledge production, and risk management.

The document is organized around two interdependent components: the Community Toolkit, a flexible set of tools for dialogue and analysis, and the Community Process Diagram (CPD), which regulates their use within a sequenced and reflexive process. These elements form a single system, as the Toolkit provides operational capacity while the CPD ensures methodological coherence. The tools included are not neutral or universally applicable; each shapes interactions and produces specific forms of knowledge with ethical and relational implications. For this reason, the Toolkit is designed as a modular resource, to be selectively adapted according to the context, research objectives, and sensitivities identified throughout the process.

The tools are organized into six categories, each corresponding to a distinct mode of interaction and analytical intent:

- Interviews (IN): tools based on one-to-one or lightly structured dialogue, designed to explore individual perceptions, memories, positions, and interpretative frameworks, while allowing different degrees of openness, comparability, and depth depending on the research phase.
- Observation (OB): tools aimed at capturing spatial, social, and sensory dynamics through direct, indirect, or mediated observation, supporting reflective and non-intrusive forms of inquiry that foreground positionality, distance, and context.

- Mapping (MA): tools that translate perceptions, relationships, and experiences into visual and spatial representations, enabling synthesis, comparison, and analytical distancing without claiming objectivity or completeness.
- Group Activities (GR): tools based on collective interaction and facilitated discussion, used to observe how meanings, hierarchies, alliances, and conflicts are negotiated, stabilized, or contested within social settings.
- Community-Led tools (CL): approaches that foreground community initiative and agency, allowing researchers to observe everyday practices, routines, and self-organized forms of engagement from within the social fabric, while relinquishing a degree of control over the process.
- Creative tools (CR): practices based on artistic, visual, or performative expression, designed to address emotional, symbolic, or traumatic dimensions of dissonance that may resist verbal articulation and conventional research formats.

While the Toolkit defines what tools are available and how they may operate, it does not prescribe when or why they should be activated. This function is fulfilled by the Community Process Diagram (CPD), which constitutes the second core component of the document. The CPD is a methodological process diagram designed to structure engagement with communities as a sequenced, reflexive, and reversible pathway, rather than as a linear, cumulative, or participatory escalation. Its primary purpose is to govern relationships with communities over time, guiding the activation of tools while embedding mechanisms of verification, validation, and control over both the process itself and the data it produces. In this sense, the CPD operates as a device of methodological governance, ensuring that engagement unfolds in a calibrated, ethically aware, and analytically robust manner. The CPD articulates the research and engagement process into six consecutive and interrelated phases, each characterized by specific objectives, levels of exposure, and methodological constraints. These phases form a chain in which each step prepares the conditions for the next, while explicitly allowing for pauses, recalibrations, or returns to earlier stages when risks, gaps, or misalignments are identified.

- Phase 01 - Preliminary Consultation:

Establishes an initial condition of autonomous and desk-based inquiry. Its purpose is orientation rather than interpretation: publicly available sources, secondary documentation, and mediated representations are used to construct a preliminary understanding of the site and the nature of its dissonance, while deliberately avoiding any interaction with communities or institutions. By maintaining analytical distance at the

outset, this phase prevents premature engagement, overconfidence, and the stabilization of assumptions that have not yet been subjected to verification.

- Phase 02 - Stakeholder Identification

Introduces the relational dimension of the process through the identification and verification of stakeholders connected to the site. This phase progressively combines desk-based analysis, mediated interaction with institutions, associations, and people, and expert-based validation. Its objective is not to produce agreement or representation, but to construct a critically assessed stakeholder configuration that makes visible asymmetries of visibility, influence, and power, and that provides a robust foundation for subsequent phases.

- Phase 03 - Risk, Sensitivity, and Trauma Assessment

Functions as a protective threshold within the CPD (Community Process Diagram). Before any broader engagement with people is initiated, this phase focuses on identifying and assessing risks, sensitivities, and trauma-related issues associated with the site. Through mediated interaction and expert validation. It evaluates whether the research process is methodologically and ethically prepared to proceed, and whether certain tools, topics, or forms of exposure should be delayed, excluded, or reframed in order to prevent harm.

- Phase 04 - Dissonance Perception

It is dedicated to the investigation of dissonance perception. It documents how dissonance and disvalue are represented, narrated, and articulated at different scales, distinguishing between international representations, mediated local perceptions, and researcher-led analytical consolidation. A defining feature of this phase is the deliberate separation between perception and embodied experience: no on-site engagement is activated, allowing perceptual plurality, asymmetry, and contradiction to be documented without collapsing them into spatial encounter.

- Phase 05 - On-Site Spatial Investigation of Dissonance

Introduces direct on-site spatial investigation. At this stage, the research process engages physically with the architectural environment to explore how dissonance is encountered, mediated, and negotiated through space, materiality, movement, and atmosphere. Architecture is treated as an active medium shaping experience rather than as a neutral backdrop, and on-site engagement is carefully calibrated to different actors, tools, and levels of exposure in order to avoid uncontrolled or harmful encounters.

- Phase 06 - Orientation, Restitution and Responsible Closure

Concludes the process through analytical consolidation, representation, and mediated return. Rather than resolving dissonance or producing definitive narratives, this phase transforms heterogeneous materials into structured analytical and interpretative outputs, while also performing a reflexive assessment of the methodological choices made throughout the process. Outcomes are rendered legible, transferable, and comparable, without neutralizing conflict or reducing complexity. Taken together, the Toolkit and the CPD define a methodological ecosystem that supports both action and reflection. Tools are not applied in isolation, and phases are not conceived as rigid stages, but as interconnected components of a process designed to remain sensitive to context, power relations, and ethical limits. Verification moments, expert validation, and analytical distancing are explicitly embedded to prevent overexposure, premature stabilization of meanings, or the instrumentalization of community engagement.

This document is conceived as an integral component of the broader Co.Co.War project and operates in direct dialogue with its other outputs. In particular, it complements the *Co.Co.War Glossary: Dissonant Heritage Concepts and Terms*, the *Co.Co.War Handbook: Managing Dissonant Heritage*, which it the strategic frameworks developed within the project, the *Dissonant Heritage GeoApp* designed to spatially document and navigate dissonant contexts and the *Co.Co.War Atlas: Mapping Dissonant Heritage*. While each of these outputs addresses a specific dimension of the research, the Community Toolkit provides the methodological infrastructure that enables coherent, comparable, and ethically grounded interaction with communities across cases, scales, and contexts. In this sense, the Toolkit is not a standalone manual, but a connective and generative instrument designed to support responsible, informed, and reflexive engagement with dissonant architectural heritage.

CATEGORY CODE:

(IN)

INTERVIEWS

This category brings together a set of tools specifically conceived to support research dialogues conducted on a one-to-one basis. These tools are designed to create controlled and attentive conditions in which individual perspectives, memories, and interpretations can emerge with minimal external influence. By privileging direct interaction between the researcher and a single participant, interviews allow for the exploration of personal narratives, perceptions, and emotional responses that are often difficult to access in collective settings. Whether structured, semi-structured, based on conversation prompts, focused on oral memory, or implemented through short polls, each format responds to different research objectives while maintaining a shared emphasis on individual experience.

Within the context of dissonant heritage, one-to-one interviews play a crucial role in identifying how dissonance is perceived, internalized, or negotiated at a personal level. They allow researchers to investigate not only explicit opinions, but also implicit attitudes, silences, hesitations, and emotional reactions that may reflect deeper layers of disvalue associated with a site. For this reason, whenever possible and only with the informed consent of the interviewee, audio and video recording is recommended. Such documentation helps preserve contextual and relational aspects of the exchange, supports more accurate interpretation, and facilitates the observation of non-verbal elements such as tone of voice, pauses, body language, and emotional signals, which are often central to understanding sensitive or contested topics. Before initiating any interview activity, it is essential to define clear goals and to identify the specific type of information that the dialogue is intended to explore. Establishing these objectives in advance helps ensure that the interaction remains focused and meaningful, while still allowing sufficient flexibility for unexpected themes or narratives to emerge. This preparatory phase is particularly important when working on dissonant heritage, as interviews may touch upon traumatic memories, controversial interpretations, or unresolved conflicts. A well-defined research intention supports ethical awareness and aligns the interview process with the broader aim of understanding how communities relate to, interpret, and experience dissonant heritage. From an operational

perspective, interview-based tools require careful preparation and contextual awareness. The selection of participants should aim to reflect a diversity of positions, experiences, and relationships with the heritage in question, in order to avoid over-representing a single narrative or viewpoint. Interviews should be planned with sufficient time for explanation, consent, and follow-up, and researchers should remain attentive to power dynamics, positionality, and the potential influence of their own assumptions on the exchange. In sensitive contexts, it may be advisable to conduct multiple shorter interviews rather than a single extended session, allowing participants to engage at a pace that feels appropriate and safe.

This category also involves specific risks that must be acknowledged and managed. One-to-one interviews may surface traumatic memories, provoke strong emotional reactions, or place participants in situations of discomfort or vulnerability. There is also a risk of producing partial or highly subjective accounts that, if taken in isolation, may distort the broader understanding of the case. In addition, the presence of the researcher and the framing of questions can inadvertently influence responses, reinforcing certain narratives while silencing others. For these reasons, interview tools should be combined with complementary methods and their results interpreted within a wider methodological framework. Ethical considerations, transparency, and the careful handling of recorded materials are essential to ensure that interviews contribute constructively to the investigation of dissonant heritage and to the responsible use of the data produced.

Main advantages:

- In-depth exploration of individual perceptions
- Access to personal narratives and lived experiences
- Identification of implicit attitudes and emotional responses
- Suitable for sensitive and contested topics
- Flexible and adaptable to different research objectives

Main risks:

- Emotional distress or reactivation of traumatic memories
- Partial or highly subjective accounts
- Researcher influence on responses and narratives
- Power imbalances between researcher and participant
- Ethical and privacy concerns related to recording and data use

/IN-01

Structured Interviews

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Data gathering

Serves to collect comparable quantitative data related to targets' perception.

Activity description:

Structured interviews are a research and evaluation method in which all participants receive the same set of carefully prepared, standardized questions in the same order. This format allows the interviewer to maintain consistency throughout the process, minimizing bias and ensuring that each respondent is evaluated under comparable conditions. Because answers can be easily contrasted, structured interviews are especially useful for large studies, hiring processes, and situations requiring reliable data. Their rigidity can limit spontaneity or deeper exploration, but their strength lies in producing clear, organized, and reproducible information that supports objective analysis and informed decision-making.

Risks/ Advises:

Being a strongly guided activity, it can be leading and might reflect interviewer's perceptions and previous assumptions.

Outcomes:

Interview transcripts; coded datasets; quantitative tables; comparative charts; analytical summaries.

Target:

-  Autonomous
-  Institutions
-  Communities/
Associations
-  People
-  Experts

/IN-02

Semi-Structured Interviews

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Data gathering

Serves to collect quantitative data, that could be better explained by the interviewed subject, better understanding aspects previously unknown.

Activity description:

Semi-structured interviews are designed to obtain deeper, more substantial insights from key informants, typically lasting one to two hours. Unlike structured interviews, they follow a flexible guide rather than a strict list of questions, allowing the interviewer to adapt, probe, and explore unexpected topics as they arise. This openness encourages richer narratives, personal perspectives, and contextual details that might not surface in more rigid formats. While this approach requires strong interviewing skills and can produce more varied responses, it is highly valuable when the goal is to understand motivations, experiences, and complex phenomena in depth.

Risks/ Advises:

This method might provide a unique in-depth perception, however it represents only one part of the whole. It's advised to performed several interviews with different personalities in the community that represent contrasting views and perceptions.

Outcomes:

Interview transcripts; audio recordings; video recordings; qualitative datasets; interpretative reports.

Target:

Au Autonomous

In Institutions

Co Communities/
Associations

Pe People

Ex Experts

/IN-03

Conversation Starters

Advised Main Sources:

[IDEO.org](https://www.ideo.org/)

Goals:

Risk Evaluation

The main goal is to identify sensible topics that should be considered for the following steps. These can go from communicational difficulties to structural approaches. The tool can be included as a starting point of an interview.

Activity description:

Conversation Starters is a tool used to quickly map project possibilities, key topics, and underlying conditions through an open, creative discussion. Instead of following a fixed script, it presents broad ideas or prompts to the interviewee, encouraging spontaneous reactions, comments, and associations. By observing these responses, researchers can identify which concepts generate interest, which provoke doubt, and which raise concerns. Suggestions that trigger negative reactions can later be reframed, explored differently, or discarded altogether. This method is especially useful in early project stages, as it reveals perceptions and expectations while fostering a collaborative, imaginative dialogue.

Risks/ Advises:

The information gathered is basic, and should be done only as a preliminary tool to identify the most sensible topics, aspects or situations that might become eventual risks or threats.

Outcomes:

Field notes; lists of sensitive topics; preliminary interpretative diagrams; risk identification summaries.

Target:

-  Au Autonomous
-  In Institutions
-  Co Communities/ Associations
-  Pe People
-  Ex Experts

/IN-04

Oral Memory Interview

Advised Main Sources:

ICCROM - PATH Research Project

Goals:

Data gathering

The data acquired through this tool is highly qualitative and personal. It could even be considered a testimony.

This tool involves one-to-one interviews with individuals who have personally experienced the events being studied, either moments directly linked to the dissonance or aspects of life before it emerged. The participant is encouraged to describe everything they remember, speaking freely and without interruption. The interviewer should only introduce specific questions at the end, unless the participant gives very brief answers, in which case gentle prompts can help sustain the dialogue. Before any recording begins, the participant's clear and explicit consent must be obtained. The interview should be documented in both audio and video whenever possible. Photos, videos, or other visual materials related to the topic can also be used during the session, as they often help trigger memories and enrich the person's account.

Risks/ Advises:

Risk of resurfacing trauma and provoking strong emotional reactions, which may affect the quality of the information gathered and, more importantly, can strain the trust established between the researcher and the interviewer.

Outcomes:

Audio testimonies; video testimonies; transcribed narratives; archival materials; memory-based reports.

Target:

Au Autonomous

In Institutions

Co Communities/
Associations

Pe People

Ex Experts

/IN-05

Poll

Advised Main Sources:

[IDEO.org](https://www.ideo.org/)

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool consists of short online questionnaires designed to gather comparable responses from a broad group of participants. Although open questions can be included, it is highly recommended to use closed questions with numerical scales or predefined options, making results easier to compare. Polls should be brief, accessible, and easy to complete so they can reach as many community members as possible. Before creating the poll, the researcher must define clear goals and decide which aspects will be studied. It is also essential to determine in advance how long the poll will remain open, whether weeks or months, so the period of data collection is clearly established.

Risks/ Advises:

Risk of producing partial or superficial answers that fail to capture the complexity of the reality studied. If the topic is highly controversial, many people may avoid responding altogether, reducing participation and limiting the tool's overall effectiveness.

Outcomes:

Quantitative datasets; statistical tables; charts and graphs; comparative summaries.

Target:

-  Autonomous
-  Institutions
-  Communities/
Associations
-  People
-  Experts



Visit to the Havuts Tar Monastery Complex, Armenia, July, 2025

CATEGORY CODE:

(OB)

OBSERVATION

This category brings together tools aimed at capturing the researcher's notes, perceptions, and reflections developed through the visit, analysis, or exploration of a given context. Observation-based tools focus on the direct and indirect experience of a site, allowing researchers to document not only its physical condition but also the atmospheres, behaviors, and interactions that contribute to its contemporary meaning. Within the context of dissonant heritage, observation plays a key role in identifying how spaces are used, avoided, transformed, or symbolically charged in everyday life.

Because observation can take different forms depending on access, safety, and contextual constraints, this category is divided into two main approaches: in-person observation and remote or online observation. In-person observation is based on the researcher's physical presence on-site and allows for the direct experience of spatial, sensory, and social dynamics. Remote observation, by contrast, relies on digital environments and online materials to begin studying a place when direct access is limited or impossible. This approach is particularly relevant in contexts marked by conflict, instability, restricted access, or safety concerns, where physical presence may not be feasible or ethically appropriate.

Observation tools are not intended solely to record the current state of a site or to produce objective descriptions. They are also designed to register the researcher's interpretative process, including personal impressions, questions, uncertainties, and emerging hypotheses. In this sense, observation is understood as a reflective practice that acknowledges the researcher's positionality and the subjective dimensions of perception. At the same time, these tools can capture elements that community members themselves emphasize as meaningful, problematic, or worthy of attention, either through direct interaction or through traces left in physical or digital environments. Taken together, the tools included in this category offer a flexible set of approaches for understanding a site from multiple perspectives. By combining direct experience with digital and community-informed observation, researchers can begin to map patterns of use, absence, visibility,

and representation that contribute to the production of dissonance. Observation thus provides an essential background for other forms of engagement, supporting a more informed and context-sensitive interpretation of dissonant heritage.

From an operational point of view, observation-based tools require time, attentiveness, and careful documentation. Researchers should plan repeated observation sessions whenever possible, varying times, conditions, and points of view in order to avoid partial or episodic interpretations. In remote observation, particular care must be taken to assess the reliability, bias, and representativeness of digital sources. In all cases, observation should be considered a preliminary and complementary method, whose results gain meaning when combined with interviews, mapping activities, and group-based tools. This category also involves specific risks that need to be considered. Observation may reflect the researcher's assumptions or expectations and can unintentionally privilege certain behaviors or narratives over others. In sensitive contexts, on-site observation may expose researchers or community members to risks, while online observation raises ethical issues related to consent, privacy, and representation. For these reasons, observation tools should be applied critically and reflexively, and their outcomes interpreted within a broader methodological framework.

Main advantages:

- Direct and indirect understanding of spatial and social dynamics
- Identification of patterns of use, absence, and interaction
- Ability to work in contexts with limited or restricted access
- Support for reflective and context-sensitive interpretation
- Useful as a preliminary and complementary research method

Main risks:

- Researcher bias and subjective interpretation
- Partial or episodic observations
- Safety and access risks in sensitive contexts
- Ethical concerns related to online observation and privacy
- Risk of treating observations as definitive rather than preliminary data

/OB-01 /in person

In-Person/ On Site Observation

Advised Main Sources:

[Stirling University](#)

Goals:

Data Gathering

The data gathered through this tool should not be treated as final results, but as initial impressions that must be confirmed later.

Activity description:

This tool involves spending repeated 1—2 hour sessions at the site, ideally at different times, days, and weather conditions to gain a panoramic understanding of the scenario. It is intended not only to document how people move through and engage with the space, but also to capture the researcher's own reflections about the surrounding context. On-site observation can be combined with other methods, such as interviews or community events, to enrich the analysis. Findings may be noted through sketches, maps, or written impressions. Throughout the process, the researcher must remain aware of how their presence might influence people's behavior and subtly affect what is being observed.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of on-site observation is that the researcher's presence may influence how people behave, altering the natural dynamics of the space. In addition, notes and impressions gathered on-site should be treated as preliminary observations, not final conclusions, and must later be supported or validated through other research tools and sources.

Outcomes:

Observation diaries; annotated photographs; sketches and notes; behavioral descriptions.

Target:

Au Autonomous

In Institutions

Co Communities/
Associations

Pe People

Ex Experts

/OB-02 /in person

Multi-Sensory Observation

Advised Main Sources:

[Stirling University](#)

Goals:

Data Gathering

The data gathered through this tool should not be treated as final results, but as initial impressions that must be confirmed later.

Activity description:

This tool focuses on capturing the full, multi-sensory relationship between people and place, recognizing the researcher's own body as an active instrument in the process. A typical session lasts around one hour, though the embodied experience continues as long as the researcher remains aware of sensory input. Unlike standard visual observation, this method involves consciously engaging all senses; sight, sound, smell, touch, and even the sense of movement or atmosphere, to understand how a space is experienced on multiple levels. These sensations, along with the researcher's emotional or physical reactions, are recorded in notes. This approach helps reveal subtleties of place that might otherwise be overlooked and strengthens the depth of spatial interpretation.

Risks/ Advises:

Since this method relies heavily on personal perception, interpretations may become subjective or overly influenced by the researcher's mood or biases. Sensory impressions must therefore be cross-checked with other tools to avoid drawing premature or misleading conclusions.

Outcomes:

Sensory field notes; experiential descriptions; interpretative texts; conceptual diagrams.

Target:

- Au** Autonomous
- In** Institutions
- Co** Communities/
Associations
- Pe** People
- Ex** Experts

/0B-03 /remote

Netnography/ Online Survey

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool involves conducting observation and engagement within online spaces, where communities interact through social media platforms or other digital environments. Although these spaces may appear “public,” it is still essential for the researcher to make their presence and intentions clear, obtaining consent whenever required. Understanding group dynamics, and analyzing content requires patience, much like in offline ethnographic work. Netnography allows the researcher to learn from virtual interactions, observe conversations, and even participate when appropriate, keeping in mind that posting or commenting becomes an active intervention. Ethical considerations, such as consent, anonymity, and transparency, are just as important online as in person, and researchers must communicate clearly when conducting studies in digital communities.

Risks/ Advises:

Online interactions may create false impressions, as participants often curate or filter their behavior. Misinterpretations are common, and without careful consent and transparency, the researcher risks violating trust or community norms.

Outcomes:

Screenshots and digital traces; online interaction logs; thematic summaries; qualitative datasets.

Target:

-  Autonomous
-  Institutions
-  Communities/
Associations
-  People
-  Experts

/OB-04 /remote

Peer Observing Peers

Advised Main Sources:

[IDEO.org](https://www.ideo.org/)

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool allows the researcher to understand a community by seeing how its members document aspects of their own daily lives. Instead of relying solely on external observation, community members are invited to take an active role in the research, capturing their own experiences, concerns, and perspectives. This approach is especially valuable when social, cultural, or gender dynamics, or the sensitivity of the topic, may limit what people feel comfortable sharing directly with an outsider. By turning participants into partners and giving them simple tools to record their thoughts and behaviors, the research becomes richer, more authentic, and far more revealing than traditional methods alone.

Risks/ Advises:

Participants may feel exposed or uncomfortable documenting personal moments, and unequal group dynamics can influence what is shared. Without guidance, recordings may be incomplete or biased, requiring careful follow-up.

Outcomes:

Community-produced photographs and videos; self-documentation diaries; qualitative narratives; visual archives.

Target:

-  Au Autonomous
-  In Institutions
-  Co Communities/
Associations
-  Pe People
-  Ex Experts

/OB-05 /remote

Virtual Depicting & 3D Models

Advised Main Sources:

[Stirling University](#)

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

Digital representations of spaces, generated through scanning technologies or 3D modeling software, as a basis for individual reflection and dialogue. Ideally conducted one-to-one, it allows the researcher to interact closely with the participant while they explore and react to the virtual space. No model-making is required from the participant; the emphasis is on observing how they navigate, interpret, and respond to the digital depiction. The activity helps reveal perceptions, emotions, and values that may be difficult to express during an on-site visit, and it draws attention to spatial relationships or details that become clearer when viewed in a controlled digital environment.

Risks/ Advises:

Virtual models may simplify or misrepresent real conditions, shaping inaccurate impressions. Individual reactions can also be influenced by unfamiliarity with digital environments, requiring the researcher to guide the process carefully.

Outcomes:

Digital models; screen recordings; annotated visual outputs; interpretative diagrams.

Target:

-  **Au** Autonomous
-  **In** Institutions
-  **Co** Communities/
Associations
-  **Pe** People
-  **Ex** Experts



Site survey to Former House of the Fascist Party, Predappio, Italy, June 2025

CATEGORY CODE:

(MA)

MAPPING

This category brings together a set of tools focused on mapping, drawing, and materializing data through visual representations of different aspects of a given context. Mapping activities enable the researcher to translate observations, perceptions, and community input into readable and comparable formats that highlight spatial, social, and conceptual dynamics. Through maps, diagrams, and visual schemes, complex information can be organized, layered, and interpreted in ways that support analysis and comparison.

Mapping tools combine self-led research activities with exercises in which the community actively contributes to the production of information. Community members may be involved in identifying places, recalling events, expressing memories, or associating meanings with specific spatial elements. However, while participation plays an important role in generating content, the processes of creating, interpreting, combining, and overlapping the resulting maps remain primarily the responsibility of the researcher. For this reason, the category is classified overall as a self-made activity, where professional judgment and analytical capacity are essential to synthesize and contextualize the data produced. Depending on the research objectives, a single session may incorporate multiple mapping tools, allowing different layers of information, perspectives, and temporalities to be explored simultaneously. Mapping can therefore function both as a data collection method and as an interpretative device, enabling the researcher to identify patterns, contrasts, and areas of tension that may not emerge through other forms of engagement. This flexibility makes mapping particularly useful in contexts characterized by complexity, fragmentation, or conflicting narratives.

In the context of dissonant heritage, mapping offers specific advantages. It allows researchers to explore a case study materially—through plans, drawings, aerial images, or satellite views—and conceptually, through diagrams that reflect ideas, memories, emotions, or positions held by different groups. This dual capacity supports the investigation of how dissonance is spatially distributed, how certain areas become charged with meaning or avoidance, and how architectural forms intersect with social and symbolic dimensions.

Mapping thus becomes a powerful tool for visualizing dissonance and for exploring possible future scenarios for complex architectural contexts.

From an operational point of view, mapping tools require careful preparation and clear research intentions. Researchers must define in advance what types of information are being mapped and how different layers will be combined and interpreted. When mapping activities involve community participation, instructions should be clear and accessible, while leaving room for subjective expression. The resulting materials should be treated as interpretative representations rather than objective descriptions, and their meaning should be critically examined through comparison with other tools and sources. This category also presents specific risks. Mapping processes can oversimplify complex realities or give a false sense of objectivity to highly interpretative data. The selection of what is included or excluded from a map reflects the researcher's perspective and may unintentionally privilege certain narratives over others. In participatory contexts, dominant voices may influence the mapping process, while sensitive or contested aspects may remain unexpressed. For these reasons, mapping tools should be applied reflexively and integrated within a broader methodological framework that combines visual, narrative, and dialogical approaches.

Main advantages:

- Visualization of complex spatial, social, and conceptual dynamics
- Ability to combine multiple layers of information and perspectives
- Support for comparative and interpretative analysis
- Effective for exploring dissonance and future scenarios
- Useful link between material and symbolic dimensions of heritage

Main risks:

- Oversimplification of complex or contested realities
- Researcher bias in selecting and interpreting mapped data
- False perception of objectivity in visual representations
- Unequal participation or dominance of certain narratives
- Risk of isolating maps from broader contextual interpretation

/MA-01

Behavior Mapping

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool requires the researcher to carry out repeated site visits focused on observing and recording how people behave while occupying or interacting with a specific space. Attention is given to visible activities and apparent emotional states, such as whether users seem relaxed, tense, quiet, noisy, respectful, or at ease. Observations are registered directly onto a printed plan, map, or satellite image of the site, allowing patterns to emerge visually. A simple visual language can be used to categorize users by age group or gender through colors or symbols, and noting the time of day of each entry is essential. The value of this tool increases with multiple entries across different days, times, and significant dates, revealing non-verbal trends in how people relate to the place.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool is that the visible presence of the researcher may influence how people behave, altering natural interactions with the space. In sensitive contexts, less noticeable or complementary methods may be necessary to reduce this effect.

Outcomes:

Behavioral maps; annotated plans; visual datasets; comparative diagrams.

Target:

- Au** Autonomous
- In** Institutions
- Co** Communities/
Associations
- Pe** People
- Ex** Experts

/MA-02

Physical Traces Mapping

Advised Main Sources:

ICCROM - PATH Research Project

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This methodology focuses on identifying small, temporary traces left behind by human activity that can reveal different ways in which people relate to and use a site. These traces may include graffiti, discarded objects, worn paths, or other subtle details that appear or disappear over time, indicating activities or users that are not easily observed directly. The tool is applied by annotating printed plans, maps, or images of the site, supported by photographic documentation. To use this method effectively, a deep knowledge of the site and sufficient time are required to recognize patterns of change. This tool is particularly useful in contexts that are unsafe or inaccessible at certain times, helping identify users or activities that are otherwise difficult to approach.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool lies in the interpretation and selection process carried out by the researcher, which may distort the collected information. In addition, the data gathered always requires contextual support from other tools, making complementary methods strongly recommended.

Outcomes:

Trace maps; photographic documentation; analytical sketches; interpretative reports.

Target:

-  Au Autonomous
-  In Institutions
-  Co Communities/
Associations
-  Pe People
-  Ex Experts

/MA-03

Participatory Mapping

Advised Main Sources:

[IDEO.org](https://www.ideo.org/)

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool invites participants to record points of interest, memories, connections, feelings, and observations on a map, which may be self-drawn or based on an existing plan, photograph, or image. The maps do not need to follow scale or aerial accuracy and may combine experiences from different moments in time. The focus of this activity is not factual precision, but the exploration of what participants remember and how they mentally organize space. For this reason, it is especially important to identify recurring places, situations, or elements that appear across multiple maps. The activity can be carried out individually or in small groups, but producing a sufficient number of maps is essential to identify patterns and shared memories. Recording basic information such as age group and gender can also be useful for later analysis and comparison.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool is that participants' responses may be influenced by the researcher's presence or by comments and conversations with other participants when the activity is carried out in a group. For this reason, this mapping exercise can be effectively combined with interview tools to balance and deepen the findings in an individual dimension.

Outcomes:

Community-produced maps; layered visualizations; qualitative spatial datasets; comparative cartographies.

Target:

- Au** Autonomous
- In** Institutions
- Co** Communities/Associations
- Pe** People
- Ex** Experts

/MA-04

Mind Mapping- Concept and Ideas

Advised Main Sources:

[IDEO.org](https://www.ideo.org/)

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool is strongly connected to the interpretative dimension of a site rather than its physical layout. Participants are invited to relate adjectives, memories, ideas, and associations to a specific place, focusing on meanings, perceptions, and interpretations linked to it. The exercise can be carried out without a printed map or plan; however, photographs of key areas of the site can be helpful in stimulating discussion. Mind mapping may be done individually or in groups. When conducted one-to-one, the researcher plays a more active role by asking follow-up questions and encouraging deeper reflection. Participants should be asked to explain their responses, and recording audio and video is highly recommended. The researcher may also inquire about specific situations or elements to clarify interpretations. All resulting maps can later be compared and combined into a final synthesis map.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool lies in the researcher's influence on participants' responses, which may shape or limit what is shared. In sensitive contexts, participants may also withhold honest opinions due to security concerns. For this reason, the information gathered requires careful interpretation and contextual support from complementary tools.

Outcomes:

Concept maps; diagrammatic representations; narrative visual outputs; interpretative summaries.

Target:

-  Autonomous
-  Institutions
-  Communities/
Associations
-  People
-  Experts

/MA-05

Extreme and Mainstreams

Advised Main Sources:

[IDEO.org](https://www.ideo.org/)

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool works as a visualization method applied after preliminary research has been conducted. Its main purpose is to identify key individuals or groups within a community who represent extreme positions or strongly polarized opinions regarding a specific topic, as well as to map the relationships between them and with others. The tool also focuses on identifying those who occupy intermediate positions or share similar views, representing one or more mainstream perspectives. Multiple extremes and mainstreams may coexist at the same time, each linked to different ideas or narratives. By visually organizing these positions, the tool provides an overall understanding of how opinions are distributed within the community, making it easier to recognize areas of tension and to strategically approach the most polarized groups.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool is oversimplifying or misrepresenting positions if prior information is incomplete or biased. Careful categorization is essential, and results should be used strictly for research purposes. To protect privacy, it is advisable to avoid naming individuals and instead use anonymous labels (e.g., "User A") to represent specific positions.

Outcomes:

Stakeholder diagrams; positional matrices; tension and risk maps; analytical charts.

Target:

- Au** Autonomous
- In** Institutions
- Co** Communities/
Associations
- Pe** People
- Ex** Experts

/MA-06

Memory Reconstruction

Advised Main Sources:

[Stirling University](#)

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool can be understood as a visualization method applied after some preliminary research has been carried out. Its main goal is to create a general, deep, and comprehensive timeline that gathers the majority of information, events, actions, and strategies associated with a specific case over time. To support this process, information is organized into three categories. Participants are asked to work with a timeline layout and to record, as thoroughly as possible, the events and situations they remember. The first category focuses on factual events that contributed to the emergence of the dissonance, the second on material strategies or actions implemented at the site and their perceived success, and the third on immaterial strategies, such as memorial or artistic activities, and how these are interpreted by participants.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool is that memories are selective and incomplete, and participants may not freely express everything they think or remember for different reasons. This can result in biased perceptions or partial narratives of the site, even when a consolidated timeline is produced.

Outcomes:

Timelines; historical reconstructions; memory maps; synthetic visual reports.

Target:

-  **Au** Autonomous
-  **In** Institutions
-  **Co** Communities/
Associations
-  **Pe** People
-  **Ex** Experts

CATEGORY CODE:

(GR)

GROUP ACTIVITY

This category brings together tools that rely on collective participation and shared interaction, marking a phase in which the community assumes a more active role in shaping, guiding, and, in some cases, regulating the research activities. Group-based tools are designed to explore how meanings, perceptions, and narratives emerge through dialogue, negotiation, and interaction among multiple participants, rather than through individual accounts alone. In this sense, they allow researchers to observe not only what people think, but also how opinions are formed, challenged, or reinforced within a social setting.

Many of the tools included in this category require a solid level of trust between the community and the researcher. The researcher should not be perceived as a complete outsider, as this may significantly affect participation, openness, and the reliability of the results. For this reason, several group activities are conceived not only as data-gathering exercises, but also as opportunities to strengthen relationships, build confidence, and establish a shared sense of purpose. Creating this relational foundation is essential for achieving a deeper understanding of the site and its context, while also fostering collaboration and mutual benefit between researchers and participants.

Within the context of dissonant heritage, group activities play a particularly important role in making visible the plurality of perspectives and the dynamics of agreement, disagreement, or conflict within a community. Collective discussions can reveal how narratives are negotiated, how power relations influence expression, and how certain positions become dominant or marginalized. At the same time, group settings may offer opportunities for dialogue and mutual listening that are not easily achieved through one-to-one interactions, supporting a more nuanced understanding of contested heritage.

From an operational perspective, group-based tools require careful planning, clear facilitation, and a thorough understanding of the local context. Researchers must define clear objectives for each activity, select appropriate formats, and consider group composition in terms of size, diversity, and representativeness. The role of facilitation is crucial, particularly in sensitive or conflictive contexts, where discussions may evoke strong emotions or touch upon unresolved tensions. Adequate preparation, including risk assessment and the establishment of ground rules, is therefore essential to ensure a safe and constructive environment for all participants.

This category also involves specific risks that must be acknowledged and managed. Group activities may reproduce or exacerbate existing power imbalances, silence minority voices, or lead to polarized discussions. Emotional exposure can affect participants' well-being, and the presence of observers or recording devices may influence behavior and expression. For these reasons, group-based tools should be applied with particular attention to ethics, inclusivity, and moderation, and their outcomes should be interpreted in relation to other methods used within the research framework.

Main advantages:

- Observation of collective dynamics and negotiated meanings
- Visibility of agreements, conflicts, and power relations
- Opportunities for dialogue and mutual learning
- Strengthening of trust and relationships with the community
- Generation of rich qualitative insights through interaction

Main risks:

- Dominance of certain voices or perspectives
- Silencing or marginalization of minority positions
- Emotional exposure and potential distress
- Difficulty in managing conflictive discussions
- Influence of group dynamics on individual expression

/GR-01

Group Meeting/ Focus Group

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool involves bringing together a small group of participants typically between five and ten people, along with a moderator who guides the session. The main objective is to encourage open discussion and interaction among participants in order to understand shared viewpoints, disagreements, relationships, and possible tensions related to a site or topic. Rather than focusing on individual opinions alone, the focus group allows the researcher to observe how ideas are negotiated collectively and how positions emerge through dialogue. Depending on the research goals, discussions can center on the site itself, specific events, activities, or future scenarios. The moderator's role is to facilitate balanced participation, ensure respectful exchange, and keep the conversation aligned with the intended research focus.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool is that participants may influence one another, shaping their responses to align with dominant voices or shared opinions. This can limit the expression of conflicting views, making it advisable to combine focus groups with individual research methods.

Outcomes:

Audio recordings; video recordings; discussion summaries; qualitative datasets.

Target:

-  **Au** Autonomous
-  **In** Institutions
-  **Co** Communities/ Associations
-  **Pe** People
-  **Ex** Experts

/GR-02

Community Gatherings

Advised Main Sources:

[Stirling University](#)

Goals:

Trust Building

Activity description:

This tool involves the researcher actively engaging with the community through formal or informal gatherings held within shared spaces. It is not necessary to organize events specifically for research purposes; instead, the researcher can participate in already established ceremonies, meetings, celebrations, or voluntary activities to connect naturally with the community. This approach allows the researcher to observe interactions while informally engaging in conversations and gathering insights on specific topics. Entering these spaces is often easier and more effective when facilitated by a previously involved expert, community leader, or local contact who can act as an intermediary. Community gatherings are particularly valuable for reaching individuals or groups who may be difficult to engage through structured methods, while also helping build trust and familiarity that support deeper collaboration over time.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool is that access depends on being invited or accepted by community members, which requires a prior level of trust and engagement. Additionally, the researcher may be perceived as biased toward the group first engaged, which can affect neutrality. In highly controversial or polarized contexts, it is advisable to begin with other research tools.

Outcomes:

Field notes; informal interview notes; photographic documentation; relational insights.

Target:

-  Au Autonomous
-  In Institutions
-  Co Communities/
Associations
-  Pe People
-  Ex Experts

/GR-03

Public Events

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Trust Building

Activity description:

This tool involves attending public events that are strictly connected to the site, such as official ceremonies, memorials, commemorations, or activities organized by local government institutions or related organizations. These events offer opportunities for observation, discussion, and participation within a structured public context directly linked to the site and its meaning. Through these occasions, the researcher can observe collective behaviors, narratives, and rituals associated with the place. Unlike other tools, participation is limited to events that have a clear and direct relationship with the site. As in all group-based activities, it is essential to make the research presence visible and to obtain informed consent, ensuring ethical engagement while documenting interactions and shared practices.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool is that participation often depends on being invited or having access granted by community members or institutions, which requires a prior level of engagement and trust. Without this, the researcher's presence at such events may be limited or not possible.

Outcomes:

Event documentation; photo and video records; observational reports; narrative summaries.

Target:

-  Au Autonomous
-  In Institutions
-  Co Communities/
Associations
-  Pe People
-  Ex Experts

/GR-04

Site-based Practices

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Trust Building

Activity description:

This tool involves the researcher participating directly in practices that take place at the site, usually on a voluntary and bottom-up basis. Unlike public events that are often formal or organized through top-down institutional structures, these activities emerge from everyday use, community initiative, or shared responsibility toward the site. By listening, sharing, and contributing alongside participants, the researcher gains insight into how the site is experienced, cared for, and activated in practice. Participation helps build trust, strengthen relationships, and reduce distance between researcher and community. Site-based practices reveal social dynamics, routines, and meanings that may remain invisible through observation alone, offering a grounded understanding of lived relationships with place.

Risks/ Advises:

The researcher's involvement may influence behaviors or create expectations of commitment. They may also be perceived as aligned with specific groups, making clear communication of roles and limits essential.

Outcomes:

Practice documentation; diaries and logs; photographic records; experiential reports

Target:

-  Au Autonomous
-  In Institutions
-  Co Communities/
Associations
-  Pe People
-  Ex Experts

/GR-05

Multispeaker Debate

Advised Main Sources:

ICCROM - PATH Research Project

Goals:

Data gathering

Activity description:

This tool consists of structured sessions of discussion supported by facilitated mediation, designed to bring together multiple voices around a shared topic or site. The objective is to create a controlled yet open space where different perspectives, positions, and narratives can be expressed, compared, and debated publicly. A moderator or facilitator plays a key role in guiding the conversation, ensuring respectful exchange, balancing speaking time, and preventing escalation in sensitive contexts. Multispeaker debates are particularly useful for addressing contested issues, clarifying points of disagreement, and making visible the diversity of interpretations within a community. When carefully prepared, this tool can promote dialogue, mutual listening, and a deeper collective understanding of complex or dissonant situations.

Risks/ Advises:

A major risk is the appropriation of the debate by dominant individuals or groups, which can silence other voices. Without strong facilitation, power imbalances may reinforce existing tensions rather than support constructive dialogue.

Outcomes:

Recorded debates; transcripts; comparative position tables; conflict analysis summaries.

Target:

-  Autonomous
-  Institutions
-  Communities/
Associations
-  People
-  Experts



Inner view of the Former House of the Fascist Party, Predappio, Italy during the Experimental Lab, May, 2025

CATEGORY CODE:

(GR)

COMMUNITY- LED

Community-led approaches place the local community at the center of the research process, emphasizing forms of engagement in which participants actively contribute to defining, guiding, and developing the activities. Rather than focusing primarily on researcher-led interactions, these tools foreground community initiative, knowledge, and agency, while the researcher assumes a supportive and observational role. The emphasis is on creating conditions in which community members can articulate perspectives and practices that emerge from within their own social and spatial contexts.

To implement community-led tools effectively, a high level of trust between the researcher and the community is essential. Such trust often develops over time and may be facilitated through collaboration with local actors or key individuals who are already embedded within the community and capable of mobilizing participation. These intermediaries can play a crucial role in mediating access, clarifying intentions, and supporting meaningful engagement, particularly in sensitive or contested contexts. Within the context of dissonant heritage, community-led activities allow researchers to observe how dissonance is experienced, interpreted, and managed from within the community itself. The outcomes of these tools are not limited to tangible materials or explicit information produced during the activities. Equally important is the opportunity to observe processes: how community members interact with one another, how they organize collective actions, how they respond to challenges, and how they negotiate meanings related to the site. These dynamics offer valuable insights into everyday practices, movement patterns, and the informal ways in which heritage is continuously engaged with, interpreted, and transformed. From an operational perspective, community-led tools require researchers to relinquish a degree of control over the research process and to remain attentive to emerging directions shaped by participants. Clear communication regarding roles, expectations, and boundaries is essential in order to

avoid misunderstandings or unrealistic assumptions about responsibilities and outcomes. Researchers should be prepared to adapt timelines, formats, and methods in response to community needs, while maintaining ethical awareness and methodological coherence.

Such approaches also involve specific risks that must be carefully considered. Community-led processes may privilege already active or influential groups, potentially excluding less visible voices. Internal community conflicts or power imbalances may surface during activities, and the researcher's limited control may make it difficult to intervene or redirect the process. Furthermore, expectations raised through active participation may extend beyond the scope of the research, requiring careful management and transparency. For these reasons, community-led tools should be integrated within a broader methodological framework and supported by complementary approaches that help contextualize and balance the insights generated.

Main advantages:

- Strong empowerment of community agency
- Access to insider perspectives and everyday practices
- Observation of self-organization and collective dynamics
- Generation of situated and context-rich knowledge
- Strengthening of trust and long-term relationships

Main risks:

- Exclusion of less active or marginalized voices
- Reinforcement of internal power imbalances
- Limited researcher control over process and outcomes
- Management of expectations beyond the research scope
- Ethical challenges related to responsibility and representation

/CL-01

Day-to-Day Interactions

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool aims to capture everyday interactions between people and a site, revealing how familiar spaces are used, perceived, and integrated into daily life. It may involve closely following a participant throughout their routine or asking them to independently record their activities, movements, and reflections over time. The focus is often on individuals with a strong or expert connection to the site, allowing the researcher to understand long-term dynamics and effects that are not immediately visible. While this method provides deep and detailed insights, it is important to maintain a broader perspective, as the tool tends to concentrate on individual experiences rather than collective patterns. A significant amount of time is required to gather meaningful material, and careful analysis is needed to account for the reflective and performative nature of the recording process.

Risks/ Advises:

To obtain a detailed and meaningful diary, a considerable time commitment is required. Limited time availability may therefore restrict the depth and effectiveness of this tool.

Outcomes:

Diaries; logs of daily practices; photographic self-documentation; qualitative datasets.

Target:

-  Autonomous
-  Institutions
-  Communities/
Associations
-  People
-  Experts

/CL-02

Transect Walks

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool consists of guided walks through the site led by a community participant and accompanied by the researcher. As the participant moves through the space, they share experiences, memories, and observations connected to specific locations, routes, or features. Transect walks link discussion directly to movement and lived experience, allowing sensory, emotional, and spatial aspects of the place to emerge naturally. This method is especially valuable for individuals with a strong connection to the site, helping bring attention to areas linked to memories or daily activities. When possible, and only with the participant's explicit consent, video recording the walk is recommended, as it helps capture gestures, movement, and contextual details that support later analysis.

Risks/ Advises:

The main risk of this tool is that the participant may guide the walk toward narratives or locations that reflect a single perspective, potentially overlooking other viewpoints. In sensitive contexts, certain topics or areas may also be avoided, limiting the diversity of experiences captured.

Outcomes:

Video recordings; audio narratives; route maps; annotated spatial diagrams.

Target:

-  **Au** Autonomous
-  **In** Institutions
-  **Co** Communities/ Associations
-  **Pe** People
-  **Ex** Experts

/CL-03

Community Tour/ Memory Maps

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool focuses on the memories of individual participants related to specific events connected to the site, including difficult or traumatic experiences. Its main objective is to reconstruct how dissonance originated, manifested, and evolved over time through the personal perspectives of those who lived it. The activity can be developed using different methods, but one particularly effective approach is the creation of memory maps, where participants are asked to recall or recreate the spaces in which events occurred while narrating their memories. These narratives can be supported through interactive storytelling, digital narration, maps, and timelines, allowing memories and conflicts to be restituted and visualized over time. The emphasis is placed on lived experience rather than factual accuracy, highlighting how participants understand and interpret the site's past.

Risks/ Advises:

Memories may contain errors or distortions that influence interpretation, and there is a risk of oversimplifying or sensationalizing sensitive narratives. This tool may also surface traumatic experiences, provoking strong emotional responses; therefore, appropriate trauma-aware strategies should be considered.

Outcomes:

Memory maps; narrative drawings; audiovisual documentation; interpretative reports.

Target:


Au Autonomous

In Institutions

Co Communities/
Associations

Pe People

Ex Experts



Workshop Result, Yerevan, Armenia, July, 2025

CATEGORY CODE:

(CR)

CREATIVE

Creative approaches rely on artistic practices, visual expression, and alternative forms of representation to support communication around complex, sensitive, or traumatic topics. By moving beyond purely verbal or conventional research methods, these tools create conditions in which experiences, emotions, and interpretations can be expressed in more open and accessible ways. Drawing, making, performing, or visually representing ideas allows participants to articulate meanings that may be difficult, uncomfortable, or impossible to convey through words alone.

Within the context of dissonant heritage, creative tools play a particularly important role in addressing issues related to memory, trauma, and contested narratives. By relying on non-verbal or symbolic languages, these approaches can open safer spaces for dialogue, reflection, and shared understanding, reducing the pressure associated with direct verbalization. Creative activities can therefore support participation by individuals or groups who might otherwise feel excluded or reluctant to engage in more formal research settings.

The Creative category is not conceived as a closed or fixed set of methods. On the contrary, it actively encourages researchers and participants to adapt existing tools or to introduce new creative practices in response to the specific context, sensitivities, and needs of a site or community. Flexibility and experimentation are central to this approach, allowing creative processes to evolve over time and to respond to emerging themes, emotions, or conflicts. From an operational perspective, creative tools require careful facilitation and a strong awareness of context. Researchers should clearly communicate the purpose of the activity, create inclusive and non-judgmental environments, and remain attentive to participants' comfort levels. Documentation of creative processes and outcomes—through photography, video, or written reflection—should be conducted ethically and with informed consent. Creative outputs should be understood as interpretative expressions rather than direct representations of reality, and their meaning should be discussed and contextualized through complementary tools and dialogue.

These approaches also involve specific risks that must be considered. Creative activities may surface strong emotions or traumatic memories, requiring sensitivity and, in some cases, additional support mechanisms. Participants may feel exposed, uncomfortable, or unsure about their skills or the value of their contributions. Creative outputs may also be misinterpreted, politicized, or instrumentalized if removed from their original context. For these reasons, creative tools should be applied reflexively and integrated within a broader methodological framework that supports ethical engagement and careful interpretation.

Main advantages:

- Expression beyond verbal and conventional research methods
- Support for engagement with sensitive or traumatic topics
- Inclusive participation through symbolic and creative languages
- Stimulation of imagination, collaboration, and reflection
- Generation of rich, interpretative insights

Main risks:

- Emotional exposure or reactivation of trauma
- Discomfort or reluctance toward creative practices
- Misinterpretation or decontextualization of creative outputs
- Ethical concerns related to representation and authorship
- Need for careful facilitation and contextual sensitivity

/CR-01

Future Visioning

Advised Main Sources:

Stirling University

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool invites participants to imagine and represent possible future scenarios related to a site, whether utopian or dystopian. Participants are asked to illustrate elements they consider essential for a positive future or aspects they fear losing in a negative one. One variation of this method involves creating a “postcard to the future,” combining an image of personal significance with a written message addressed to a future recipient. To reduce reluctance toward drawing, alternative techniques such as collage or mixed media can be used. The activity is designed for groups of six to ten participants and can be combined with other group-based tools. It is important to document both the final material and the discussion and social interactions that emerge during the process through audio or video recording.

Risks/ Advises:

Some participants may feel uncomfortable or reluctant to engage in artistic or drawing-based activities, which can limit participation or the depth of expression.

Outcomes:

Scenario drawings; vision maps; written future narratives; conceptual diagrams.

Target:

-  Au Autonomous
-  In Institutions
-  Co Communities/
Associations
-  Pe People
-  Ex Experts

/CR-02

Arts-based Engagements

Advised Main Sources:

[Stirling University](#)

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool explores artistic responses to the significance of a place through a wide range of creative practices, including drawing, painting, carving, knitting, baking, and other forms of making. It invites researchers to adapt the method to activities already present within the community, using familiar practices to foster communication, discussion, and engagement. Arts-based engagements can help overcome taboos or complex situations where participants may not feel comfortable speaking openly, allowing expression through non-verbal means. These activities may be community-led or researcher-initiated and can result in temporary actions or more permanent interventions. A high level of community trust is especially valuable, and researchers may consider organizing multiple sessions to build familiarity, strengthen relationships, and support deeper participation.

Risks/ Advises:

Artistic activities may be misunderstood, politicized, or rejected by some community members. They can also surface sensitive issues, requiring careful facilitation and strong ethical awareness.

Outcomes:

Artworks and creative objects; photographic documentation; reflective texts; symbolic representations.

Target:

-  Au Autonomous
-  In Institutions
-  Co Communities/
Associations
-  Pe People
-  Ex Experts

/CR-03

Urban Participatory Placemaking

Advised Main Sources:

ICCROM - PATH Research Project

Goals:

Data Gathering

Activity description:

This tool focuses on reactivating public spaces through shared, temporary actions and small-scale interventions. It is particularly useful for exploring forms of commemoration or ephemeral change that can alter how a site is interpreted, experienced, or discussed, demonstrating that transformation is possible even through limited actions. These rapid interventions are often combined with participatory observation, allowing the researcher to understand community reactions and dynamics in real time. However, applying this tool requires a strong level of trust with the community and a deep understanding of the social and political context. In some cases, interventions may be perceived as provocative by opposing groups. For this reason, it may be advisable to test actions in alternative locations within the city rather than directly on the site, gradually influencing collective interpretation and acceptance.

Risks/ Advises:

Temporary interventions may trigger conflict, opposition, or misinterpretation. Without careful planning and risk assessment, actions can unintentionally escalate tensions or expose participants to social or political backlash.

Outcomes:

Temporary installations; photographic and video documentation; spatial transformation sketches; evaluative summaries.

Target:

- Au** Autonomous
- In** Institutions
- Co** Communities/
Associations
- Pe** People
- Ex** Experts



Students during guided visit to the Partisan Memorial Cemetery, Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina, May, 2025

/3.1


GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION & SUMMARY OF THE TOOLKIT

In addition to providing a structured set of practical tools for dialogue and interaction with communities, the Community Toolkit also proposes an interpretative framework that can be translated into a graphical form. This graphical dimension is conceived as a synthetic and comparative device, capable of summarizing the tools selected and the methodological orientation adopted within a specific project. The conceptual basis for this representation is provided by the diagram presented on page 22, which illustrates the Toolkit through a homogeneous, circular distribution of the six tool categories.

Graphical Representation

Within this framework, the Toolkit is not understood merely as a collection of individual tools, but as a system whose internal balance and composition can be visually interpreted. This is achieved, first, through the use of standardized tool sheets, each identified by a numerical code and a category label, and second, through the explicit visualization of the six categories as equally distributed segments within a circular scheme. The intention is to emphasize the 360-degree structure of the Toolkit, highlighting the plurality of approaches and forms of engagement that together define its methodological scope. The same diagrammatic structure can be repurposed as a synthetic instrument to represent how the Toolkit is applied within a specific research or project context. By associating each category with a segment of variable size, the diagram can visually express both the quantity of tools selected and the relative weight assigned to each category during the research process. In this way, the graphical representation becomes a dynamic summary of the methodological choices made, rather than a static illustration of the Toolkit's structure. Within such a representation, each segment expands or contracts depending on the number and type of tools employed in that category. A project characterized by a large Interviews segment and a comparatively small Community-Led segment, for example, may indicate an approach in which experts retain a stronger coordinating

role and community participation is structured primarily through mediated, researcher-led interactions. Conversely, a diagram showing larger Mapping and Observation segments and a smaller Interviews segment may suggest a more analytical orientation, relying heavily on spatial analysis, visual interpretation, and indirect forms of engagement. This type of graphical synthesis makes it possible to compare different projects at a glance, highlighting differences in methodological balance and engagement strategies.



The following graph shows a hypothetical research plan in which greater use has been made of tools from the first group in the Toolkit (IN - Interviews), while the other activities (community conducted) have a lesser presence. This distribution reflects the particular conditions and needs of the case study, which have been addressed through the conscious selection of the tools to be used.

By visualizing the relative distribution of tools across categories, the diagram allows researchers and practitioners to reflect on how dialogue with communities has been structured, which forms of interaction have been prioritized, and which dimensions may have been underrepresented. In this sense, the graphic does not function as an evaluative metric, but as a reflective instrument that supports methodological awareness. Beyond facilitating comparison between projects, this representation also provides an immediate indication of the types of outcomes likely to emerge from a given methodological configuration. A Toolkit application dominated by interviews and group activities may generate a higher proportion of qualitative data, narratives, and discursive material, while configurations emphasizing mapping, observation, or creative tools may produce visual, spatial, or interpretative outputs.

Graphical Representation

By reading the diagram in conjunction with the documented outcomes of each tool, it becomes possible to understand not only how a project was conducted, but also the nature of the results it produced, whether quantitative, qualitative, visual, or hybrid. In this way, the graphical representation operates as a synthesis of both process and outcome. It condenses complex methodological decisions into a readable form, supports comparison across different case studies, and provides a shared visual language for discussing the balance between expert-led analysis and community-driven engagement. As such, it complements the detailed descriptions and tool sheets included in the Toolkit, offering an additional layer of interpretation that reinforces the Toolkit's role as both a practical and reflective instrument for working with dissonant heritage.



The following diagram, on the other hand, shows a different use of tools, where the most frequently used categories belong to the groups called (Community - Conducted). This example also demonstrates a strategic selection of tools that responds to the particularities of the case study.

/4.1

COMMUNITY PROCESS DIAGRAM (CPD)

Community Process Diagram CPD

The Community Process Diagram (CPD) is conceived as a methodological framework designed to guide researchers through the progressive investigation of dissonance and disvalue in heritage contexts. Rather than functioning as a linear checklist or a prescriptive protocol, the CPD articulates a structured yet flexible research pathway capable of addressing complexity, conflict, and uncertainty through a sequence of interconnected phases. The CPD is closely related to, but conceptually distinct from, the Community Toolkit. While the Community Toolkit provides a structured repertoire of tools to support engagement with communities and the collection and processing of data, the diagram defines when, why, and under which conditions these tools can be activated within a coherent research process. In this sense, it does not duplicate or replace the Toolkit; instead, it operates as its methodological backbone, orienting the selection, sequencing, and combination of tools in relation to the evolving objectives of the research.

The relationship between the two documents can therefore be understood as complementary. The Toolkit answers the question “*Which tools are available?*”, whereas the CPD addresses the question “*How should the research process unfold?*”. By separating tools from process, the framework avoids the risk of tool-driven research and ensures that methodological choices remain grounded in analytical intent, ethical awareness, and contextual sensitivity. The CPD is grounded in the recognition that dissonant heritage cannot be understood through a single analytical lens or at a single moment of inquiry. Instead, it requires a gradual and reflexive process that combines autonomous research, mediated observation, direct engagement with communities, and continuous critical validation. For this reason, the CPD is organized into a limited number of main phases, each corresponding to a specific methodological function within the overall research trajectory.

The CPD is structured around the following main phases:

Phase 01 - Preliminary Consultation

Phase 02 - Stakeholder Identification

Phase 03 - Risk, Sensitivity, and Trauma Assessment

Phase 04 - Dissonance Perception

Phase 05 - On-Site Spatial Investigation of Dissonance

Phase 06 - Orientation, Restitution and Responsible Closure

Each phase represents a distinct moment in the progression from initial knowledge acquisition to structured understanding and orientation. Together, they define a coherent pathway that moves from contextual framing to stakeholder identification, from risk assessment to perceptual analysis, and finally from on-site interaction to synthesis and restitution. In its initial phases, the CPD supports the construction of a shared knowledge base and the identification of relevant actors without presupposing prior familiarity with the site or its conflicts. Through desk-based research and mediated observation, the process begins by outlining the historical, social, and symbolic dimensions of dissonance and by mapping the constellation of stakeholders potentially involved. This analytical groundwork is then progressively tested and refined through interaction with institutions, associations, and communities, and critically validated through expert consultation. Subsequent phases shift the focus from structure to perception. The CPD explicitly distinguishes between international imaginaries, mediated community narratives, and on-site experiences, acknowledging that dissonance is perceived differently depending on scale, distance, and positionality. By separating and later comparing these perceptual layers, the CPD avoids premature synthesis and allows divergences, omissions, and contradictions to emerge as analytical findings rather than as methodological problems.

A distinctive feature of the CPD lies in its treatment of engagement and interaction. Direct engagement with communities is intentionally postponed until risks, sensitivities, and trauma-related issues have been identified and validated. When on-site interaction is activated, it is structured as a progressive sequence that separates data collection, analytical consolidation, and mediated confrontation. This articulation ensures that experiential data are critically processed before being exposed to collective interpretation,

reducing the risk of symbolic violence, re-traumatization, or forced consensus. The final phases of the CPD extend beyond engagement and perception. Phase 05 consolidates on-site interaction through analytical synthesis and co-interpretation, while Phase 06 is dedicated to final synthesis, restitution, and orientation. These concluding phases make explicit that the CPD does not end with participation or dialogue, but with the production of structured knowledge resources. The outcomes generated throughout the process are conceived to be directly usable within the Community Toolkit and to inform subsequent phases of the project, ensuring continuity between understanding and action.

Importantly, the CPD does not aim to resolve dissonance or to prescribe actions. Its final phase does not produce recommendations or decisions, but rather clarifies conditions, constraints, sensitivities, and unresolved tensions that must be acknowledged in any subsequent process. In this sense, the CPD functions as a bridge between analytical investigation and future practice. By translating complex and heterogeneous findings into structured, comparable, and transferable outcomes, it enables an informed and responsible use of the Community Toolkit while preserving the distinction between methodological inquiry and operational decision-making. Taken as a whole, the CPD operates simultaneously as a guide for action and as a tool for reflection. By defining the logic of the process and its relationship to the Toolkit, it provides a coherent framework for navigating the complexity of dissonant heritage contexts, ensuring that research remains analytically rigorous, ethically grounded, and openly reflexive throughout its entire trajectory.

Community Process Diagram CPD

/4.2

STRUCTURE OF THE PHASES AND SECTIONS

Introduction

Each phase of the Community Process Diagram is introduced by a dedicated introductory section that situates the phase within the broader research pathway. Rather than functioning as a simple description, this introduction provides a narrative framing that clarifies the role of the phase, its objectives, and its relationship to the phases that precede and follow it. In this way, the introduction helps the reader understand why a specific phase is necessary at that moment of the process and how it contributes to the progressive investigation of dissonance. The introductory section also specifies the type of interlocutors involved and the level of engagement activated, distinguishing between phases based on autonomous analysis, mediated interaction, or direct dialogue. This framing is essential to maintain methodological coherence and to make explicit the gradual transition from desk-based research toward more direct forms of community engagement.

Guiding/Core Questions

At the heart of each phase lies a core guiding question, which articulates the central concern that the phase is intended to address. This question does not aim to produce an immediate or definitive answer; rather, it serves as an orienting reference that shapes the analytical direction of the phase. Its function is to focus attention, frame priorities, and provide a shared point of reference for the activities carried out. The core guiding question is further articulated through a set of guiding questions that explore different dimensions of the issue at hand. These questions support reflection and inquiry, helping the researcher identify key aspects, uncertainties, and tensions. Together, they allow the phase to remain open and exploratory, encouraging iterative reasoning and adaptation rather than linear or prescriptive conclusions.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Tools and Methodological Approach

Each phase includes a section that explains the tools and methodological approach adopted. This part of the document does more than list instruments; it describes why specific tools are selected, how they relate to the objectives of the phase, and in what way they are appropriate for the type of engagement being activated. The relationship between tools, interlocutors, and levels of interaction is made explicit, ensuring that methodological choices are clearly justified. By articulating the methodological approach in this way, the CPD emphasizes that tools are not neutral or interchangeable. Instead, they are carefully chosen and combined in response to the evolving needs of the research process, supporting a balance between analytical rigor, ethical awareness, and contextual sensitivity.

Raw Data and Data Results

The use of tools inevitably generates raw data, which constitute the first material outcome of each phase. These raw data may take many forms, including notes, recordings, maps, narratives, or visual materials. However, they are not immediately interpretable or usable in their initial form. For this reason, each phase explicitly includes a moment of organization, comparison, and synthesis through which raw data are transformed into data results. Data results represent an intermediate level of elaboration. They do not yet correspond to final outcomes, but they provide a structured and meaningful organization of the collected materials. This intermediate step is crucial, as it prevents premature interpretation and ensures that conclusions are grounded in a careful and transparent analytical process.

Outcomes

Each Phase concludes with one or more outcomes, conceived as autonomous and downloadable documents that capture the state of the research at a specific moment. Outcomes are not intended as isolated products or final conclusions, but as working documents that accompany the research process as it unfolds. Each outcome consolidates the data, interpretations, and decisions developed during the phase, making them accessible and traceable.

The progressive production of outcomes supports methodological clarity and continuity. By documenting each step of the process, outcomes allow the research to be reviewed, revised, and shared, both within the research team and with external interlocutors. Taken together, they form a cumulative system of documentation that reflects the iterative nature of the CPD. In this sense, outcomes play a key role in ensuring transparency and coherence throughout the research pathway. They enable the investigation of dissonance to proceed in a structured yet flexible manner, preserving the connections between phases and supporting a shared understanding of how knowledge is built over time.

Additionally, to ensure a flexible and adaptable structure, the CPD Diagram includes a risk identification and assessment phase (Phase 03 — Risk, Sensitivity, and Trauma Assessment), aimed at responding more effectively to the challenges and specific characteristics of each case study, which may influence, in different ways, the results obtained through the implementation of the Toolkit's tools. These influences may stem from existing traumas, taboos, and other complex socio-cultural dynamics rooted in the conflict itself. At the same time, this phase supports a deeper understanding of the case study's complexities and may provide relevant insights for a more informed implementation of the subsequent phases of the CPD.

/4.3

GRAPHICAL ANALYSIS AND SECTION STRUCTURE

Each section of the Community Process Diagram (CPD) is characterized by a consistent graphical and conceptual structure, designed to support both methodological clarity and visual readability. The diagram is conceived not only as a procedural sequence, but also as an interpretative graphical system in which each phase unfolds through a series of recurring and recognizable elements. At the beginning of each section, a phase title is presented, identified by a progressive numerical code. This title situates the section within the overall process and defines its position in the methodological

Community Process Diagram CPD

sequence. Immediately following the phase title, a question mark symbol introduces what may appear as a single guiding question. However, this element does not refer to a single, isolated question; rather, it represents a set of key questions that underpin the specific phase. These questions articulate the core issues to be addressed at that stage of the process and are explicitly listed and developed within the accompanying textual documentation. The question mark therefore functions as a visual reference to a broader set of analytical prompts, rather than as a literal or closed question. A third graphical element indicates the mode of action associated with the phase. This symbol clarifies whether the activity is primarily conducted as an Individual Analytical Action or as a Collective Engagement Action. This distinction is intended to make explicit whether the phase relies mainly on autonomous work carried out by the researcher or on interaction, dialogue, and participation involving external interlocutors. This differentiation supports reflexivity by encouraging the researcher to be aware of when the process requires independent analysis and when it necessitates engagement beyond the research team. Following this, each section includes a reference to the tools that may be activated during that phase. These tools are identified through their specific codes, which correspond to the complete list and classification provided in the Community Toolkit. Graphically, tools are represented by white rectangles outlined with dashed lines, signalling their role as methodological instruments that can be selected and combined according to the needs of the phase. This visual convention distinguishes tools from other elements of the diagram and reinforces their function as adaptable components within the process.


The application of tools leads to the production of raw data or data results, which are represented graphically by white rectangles framed by a red outline. This element indicates materials that are still open, preliminary, and subject to interpretation, such as notes, recordings, maps, or datasets. These raw materials then contribute to the development of draft sheets and final outcomes, which are visually identified by rectangles of the same size filled with a solid red background. This chromatic distinction highlights the transition from preliminary data to synthesized, structured, and communicable results. In addition to its vertical articulation, the CPD is explicitly designed to allow for a horizontal and overall reading of the

process. Once the diagram is completed, it can be read from left to right as a continuous research trajectory. At the central level—conceptually identified as level zero—runs the process line of the research itself. This line represents the autonomous analytical path followed by the research process and by the researcher, regardless of the number of people or institutions involved in its actual implementation. Above this central line, the diagram visualizes all interactions with actors connected to the site under investigation. These upper layers correspond to Institutions, Associations / Communities, and People. Their position makes explicit when and how each category of actors is involved throughout the process. This organization allows the reader to immediately identify moments of engagement, dialogue, or consultation with specific social groups and to reflect on their role within each phase. Below the central research line, the diagram includes a distinct validation layer dedicated to Experts. This lower level represents moments of expert consultation, verification, and critical assessment. Experts involved at this level do not necessarily have a direct relationship with the site, but are selected for their expertise on dissonance, trauma, conflict, memory, or related thematic fields. Their role is to validate data, interpretations, and methodological choices, ensuring analytical rigor and ethical awareness. The separation between engagement with site-related actors and expert validation reinforces the distinction between experiential knowledge and critical, external verification. This vertical organization enables a clear horizontal reading of the diagram once the process is complete. By scanning the CPD from left to right at different levels, it becomes possible to immediately identify when the research process interacted with institutions, associations, people, or experts, and to understand how these interactions contributed to the progressive construction and validation of knowledge.

Finally, the graphical representation of the CPD is based on a clear and consistent visual language. Phase titles identify each methodological step. Core and guiding questions are represented by a black triangular symbol containing a white question mark, signaling the analytical focus of the phase. Tools are indicated by white rectangles with dashed outlines, highlighting their role as selectable methodological instruments. Raw data and draft results are represented by white rectangles with solid red borders, marking materials that are preliminary and open to interpretation. Final outcomes are identified by solid red rectangles with black text, clearly distinguishing

synthesized, structured, and communicable results from earlier stages of the process. Taken together, this system of symbols, colors, spatial arrangements, and layered readings allows the CPD to function as a shared visual language. It supports methodological coherence, transparency, and comparability across different projects, while enabling both detailed phase-by-phase analysis and an immediate, overall understanding of the research process.

*Community
Process Diagram
CPD*



CPD Diagram, Phase 1 - Preliminary Consultation (Graphical Structure and Representation)

Glossary of Key Terms and Symbols

While all key terms are already defined in the Co.Co.War Glossary: Dissonant Heritage Concepts and Terms, we briefly recall here those that are particularly relevant for understanding the diagram and the Toolkit.

[1] Associations / Communities

Organized groups formed through voluntary participation, often representing shared interests, experiences, or positions. These groups may articulate highly polarized or explicitly positioned viewpoints in relation to dissonant heritage.

[2] Collective Engagement Action

A phase based on interaction, dialogue, or participation involving external interlocutors beyond the research team, including institutions, associations, communities, or people.

[3] Data Results

The first level of synthesis derived from raw data, produced through analytical elaboration and organization of preliminary materials.

[4] Disvalue

The set of negative, uncomfortable, or contested perceptions associated with a site, often rooted in its history. Disvalue does not negate cultural or architectural value, but conditions how heritage is perceived and experienced.

[5] Draft Sheet

An intermediate synthesis of raw data, used to structure, organize, and interpret preliminary results. Draft sheets function as working documents and may be updated throughout the research process.

[6] Experts

Professionals and scholars whose engagement with dissonant heritage is grounded in disciplinary expertise rather than positional interest. Experts support validation, interpretation, and methodological guidance, particularly in relation to risk, trauma, and ethical considerations.

Community Process Diagram CPD

[7] Guiding / Core Questions

A set of key questions that structure the analytical intent of each phase. These questions orient the research process and are represented graphically by a question mark symbol. Each phase is organized around one core guiding question, articulated through additional guiding questions detailed in the accompanying documentation.

[8] Heatmaps and Emotional Maps

Spatial representations that visualize the distribution and intensity of disvalue, trauma, or emotional responses across a site, derived from on-site data.

[9] Imaginary

The set of representations, narratives, symbols, and meanings through which a site is collectively imagined and interpreted, either at an international, mediated, or on-site level.

[10] Individual Analytical Action

A phase primarily conducted through autonomous work by the researcher, focused on observation, interpretation, synthesis, and desk-based analysis. This action represents the research process itself and does not imply individual authorship or isolation.

[11] Institutions

Actors holding a formally recognized social, political, religious, or administrative role within a given context. Institutional actors respond primarily in relation to their mandate or role, which may introduce specific constraints or risks in the research process.

[12] International Site Perception

The way a site is represented and understood at a global scale through online sources, media, and academic or cultural discourse, often detached from local experience.

[13] Methodological Bifurcation

The intentional division of a phase into parallel lines of investigation, such as mediated versus on-site perception, to address different dimensions of dissonance.

[14] Outcome

A consolidated and communicable result produced at the end of one or more phases. Outcomes are represented graphically by solid red rectangles and take the form of structured reports, maps, diagrams, or visual syntheses.

[15] On-Site Perception

Perception emerging from direct interaction with the site, grounded in physical presence, spatial experience, and embodied responses.

[16] People

Individuals not necessarily affiliated with institutions or associations, whose perceptions may be informal, implicit, or unarticulated. This category allows the research to capture diffuse, everyday, or non-institutionalized perceptions.

[17] Phase

A distinct methodological stage within the Community Process Diagram (CPD), identified by a progressive number and a specific analytical focus.

[18] Raw Data

Preliminary materials generated through the application of tools, including notes, recordings, maps, images, narratives, and datasets. Raw data are represented graphically by white rectangles outlined in red.

[19] Risk

Potential social, emotional, political, or ethical issues that may arise during the investigation or public discussion of dissonant heritage. Risks are identified, assessed, and validated during Phase 03.

Community Process Diagram CPD

[20] Sensitivity / Trauma

Elements of the site's history or representation that may provoke strong emotional reactions, distress, or conflict. These aspects require particular care in the formulation of questions and engagement strategies.

[21] Stakeholders

Individuals, groups, or institutions that are directly or indirectly involved in, affected by, or influential in relation to the site and the dissonance under investigation. Stakeholders are progressively identified, expanded, and validated throughout Phase 02.

[22] Tool

A methodological instrument drawn from the Community Toolkit and identified by a specific code. Tools are represented graphically by white rectangles with dashed outlines and can be combined and adapted according to the needs of each phase.

[23] Validation

The process of critically assessing and confirming data, interpretations, or methodological choices, primarily through expert consultation.

/4.4

ACTORS

The Research Process (Independent Researcher)

Within the CPD, the figure often represented as the *Independent Researcher* should not be understood as indicating an isolated or autonomous research practice. Rather, this representation functions as a conceptual projection of the research process itself, which may in reality be carried out by a single researcher, a research group, an institution, or multiple actors working collaboratively. The use of an individual figure serves purely as a graphical and methodological simplification, allowing the process to be traced and read coherently across phases. In this sense, the CPD does not follow a person, but rather the unfolding of the research activity, regardless of its organizational or institutional configuration.

Institutions

Within the CPD, *Institutions* are defined as individuals or collective bodies that hold a formally recognized social, political, religious, or administrative role within a given context. These actors may include public authorities, governmental bodies, religious institutions, cultural administrations, or other entities whose positions derive from election, appointment, or institutional mandate. The decision to identify Institutions as a distinct category, separate from communities and associations, reflects the need to acknowledge that institutional representatives often respond not only as individuals, but primarily in relation to the role they embody. In different cultural, political, or religious contexts, this may constitute an intrinsic risk factor, as responses and positions may be shaped by institutional responsibilities, political implications, or symbolic authority rather than personal convictions. For this reason, interactions with institutional actors require specific attention and justification within the CPD framework, as their contributions may reflect broader power structures and official narratives.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Associations/Communities

The category of *Associations / Communities* refers to organized groups whose participation is typically based on voluntary or individual choice rather than formal mandate. Unlike institutions, associations are often formed around shared interests, experiences, or positions, such as associations of victims, relatives of victims, heritage advocacy groups, or movements opposing or supporting the preservation or transformation of a site. Membership in these groups frequently implies an explicit positioning or alignment, which may itself be a constitutive element of the dissonance under investigation. While associations and community groups represent essential interlocutors and must be actively engaged, their perspectives are often highly polarized. The CPD therefore treats this category as distinct from institutions, recognizing both its legitimacy and its potential to articulate strongly positioned or factional viewpoints.

People

The category of *People* refers to individuals who do not necessarily belong to organized groups, institutions, or associations, and who may not hold a predefined or publicly articulated position with respect to the dissonance under investigation. This group includes members of the wider population who may or may not have a direct interest, emotional attachment, or prior engagement with the heritage site or issue. While seemingly neutral, this category should not be assumed to be free of bias or preexisting positions; individuals may still hold personal, latent, or unarticulated views shaped by experience, memory, or social context. Engaging with People allows the CPD to capture less formalized perceptions and to identify diffuse or emerging forms of dissonance that may not yet be structured into collective narratives.

Experts

Finally, the category of *Experts* encompasses individuals whose engagement with dissonant heritage is grounded primarily in professional, scientific, or disciplinary expertise. This group may include peacekeepers, psychologists, sociologists, heritage specialists, art historians, architectural historians, political historians, and other scholars or practitioners whose

interest lies not in advocating for a particular position, but in understanding dissonance as a phenomenon within their respective fields of study. Within the CPD, experts are not primarily consulted to define the degree or intensity of dissonance, but rather to support the validation, interpretation, and critical assessment of the research process itself. Their role is to provide methodological oversight, theoretical grounding, and reflexive distance, ensuring that the investigation remains coherent, ethically sound, and analytically robust. The work carried out within the Co.Co.War project helps facilitate the identification of a diverse group of experts with complementary skills who can be involved in the validation and monitoring of the process outlined in the diagram. Indeed, the scientific themes related to dissonance require a strongly multidisciplinary approach, making it essential to engage a wide range of expertise to effectively support the development and management of the project.



Guided visit to the Partisan Memorial Cemetery, Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina, May 2025.

/4.5

OUTCOMES

The outcomes produced within the Community Process Diagram (CPD) are conceived as progressive synthesis documents, directly linked to the individual phases and sub-phases of the methodological process. They are not intended as final or conclusive results, but rather as intermediate and cumulative reports that capture, in a structured and traceable form, the state of the research at specific moments of its development.

Each outcome corresponds to a specific phase or sub-phase of the CPD and synthesizes the data collected, the analytical results produced, and the methodological decisions taken at that stage. In this sense, outcomes function as consolidation tools: they allow researchers to organize heterogeneous materials, transform raw data into interpretable results, and make explicit the logical and methodological connections between different steps of the process. Beyond their descriptive role, outcomes also have a reflexive function, as they document hypotheses, uncertainties, limits, and critical passages that emerge during the investigation. All outcomes are conceived as autonomous and downloadable documents, typically produced in report format (e.g. PDF), and designed to be archived, consulted, and compared over time. This approach enables researchers to build a structured research archive, in which each methodological step is clearly documented and retrievable. The progressive production of outcomes supports transparency, facilitates critical review of the research process, and allows selective sharing of results with other researchers, experts, or institutions. A key feature of the outcomes is their comparability. Since each document follows a structure coherent with the CPD framework, outcomes make it possible to compare different phases within the same case study, as well as different case studies developed using the same methodological approach. In this way, the CPD does not only generate case-specific results, but also produces a documentary basis that supports cross-case analysis, comparative research, and broader methodological reflection.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Finally, outcomes play a strategic role in the relationship between the CPD and the Community Toolkit. They constitute the operational bridge between the process of understanding and subsequent project phases. While they do not replace the Toolkit or provide prescriptive guidance, outcomes offer a body of structured knowledge that enables informed and context-sensitive use of the Toolkit in later stages of the project. In this sense, outcomes function both as a record of the research process and as an active resource for future research, communication, and potential action. At the same time, it is important to note that the various outcomes generated during the phases of the CPD Community Toolkit constitute significant insights that can be subsequently used in the application of the Co.Co.War Handbook: Managing Dissonant Heritage. In this sense, the results are interconnected and play a fundamental role in ensuring the proper implementation of the overall framework.

CPD Phases Outcomes Explanation

Below is a detailed description of the outcomes of the CPD phases, distinguishing between preliminary outcomes, understood as results to be verified later in the process, and final outcomes, which consist of the analyzed and validated results of each phase's activities. The description follows the sequence from Phase 01 to Phase 06, outlining the different outcomes included and represented in the CPD Diagram.

PHASE 01 — PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION

Outcome #01 — Preliminary Draft Sheet

A structured preliminary knowledge base collecting historical, geographical, documentary, bibliographic, and visual information related to the site. It outlines the first hypotheses on the nature of dissonance and defines the starting point of the research process.

PHASE 02 — UNDERSTANDING AND IDENTIFYING STAKEHOLDERS

Outcome #02.1 — Preliminary Stakeholders List

A first, desk-based identification of potential stakeholders connected to the site and its dissonance. The list is provisional and reflects the researcher's initial analytical hypothesis, to be tested and expanded in subsequent phases.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Outcome #02.2 — Intermediate Stakeholders List

An expanded stakeholder list developed through interaction with institutions, associations, communities, and people. It reflects perceived relevance and influence as articulated by the context and introduces an initial relational understanding among actors.

Outcome #02.3 — Final Stakeholders List

A validated and consolidated stakeholder framework reviewed by experts. This document provides a reliable and inclusive reference for all subsequent phases of engagement and analysis within the CPD.

Final Outcome — Phase 02 - STAKEHOLDER FRAMEWORK

A comprehensive stakeholder configuration integrating desk-based analysis, mediated interaction, and expert validation. It documents roles, visibility, influence, and relational asymmetries, and functions as the relational foundation for subsequent phases.

PHASE 03 — ASSESSING RISKS, SENSITIVITIES, AND TRAUMA

Outcome #03.1 — Preliminary Risk List

A synthesis of traumas, sensitivities, and critical issues associated with the site and its dissonance. It identifies potential ethical, emotional, and social risks and prepares the ground for responsible community engagement.

Outcome #03.2 — Validated Risk Framework and Engagement Guidelines

An expert-validated framework consolidating identified risks and translating them into methodological orientations. It defines zones of attention and conditions for engagement without prescribing actions or outcomes.

Final Outcome — Phase 03 - CONTEXTUALIZED RISK AND SENSITIVITY FRAMEWORK

A contextualized risk and sensitivity framework integrating preliminary identification and expert validation. It functions as a transversal reference guiding perceptual analysis, on-site engagement, and representational choices.

PHASE 04 — DISSONANCE PERCEPTION

Outcome #04.1 — International Site Perception Framework

An analytical reconstruction of how the site is represented and narrated at an international level. The document highlights dominant imaginaries, omissions, and narrative distortions related to dissonance and disvalue.

Outcome #04.2 — Community Disvalue Perception Report

A report documenting how dissonance and disvalue are perceived and articulated by institutions, associations, communities, and people at a mediated level. It explicitly connects local narratives to the validated risk framework.

Outcome #04.3 — Comparative Perception Validation Report

A cross-analytical document comparing international and local/community perceptions. It identifies convergences, divergences, and asymmetries, strengthening the interpretative robustness of the perceptual analysis.

Final Outcome — Phase 04 - STRUCTURED PERCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE

A structured perceptual landscape integrating international representations and mediated local perceptions, preserving plurality and contradiction without producing reconciliation or hierarchy.

PHASE 05 — ON-SITE SPATIAL INVESTIGATION OF DISSONANCE

Outcome #05.1 — On-site Perception and Spatial Experience Dataset

A corpus of raw, situated materials documenting embodied and spatial experiences of dissonance on site. It includes maps, narratives, and observations capturing how dissonance is physically encountered.

Outcome #05.2 — Synthetic Spatial— Emotional Mapping

A set of interpretative maps, heatmaps, and emotional maps produced by the research team. It translates experiential data into analytical spatial representations without generating design prescriptions.

Outcome #05.3 — Mediated Spatial Interpretation

A set of synthetic and interpretative documents that translate raw experiential data into structured spatial representations. These include interpretative maps, heatmaps, emotional maps, and comparative spatial diagrams that articulate patterns of convergence, divergence, and tension across the site.

Final Outcome — Phase 05 - SITUATED SPATIAL AND EXPERIENTIAL ANALYSIS

It presents an integrated understanding of how spaces are perceived, used, and experienced within their specific context. It may include observations of spatial behaviors, sensory and experiential insights, and interpretations of how users interact with and assign meaning to the environment. The outcomes can highlight patterns of use, spatial tensions, and intangible dimensions, such as atmosphere, memory, or perception, contributing to a nuanced reading of the site that supports further analysis and decision-making.

Community Process Diagram CPD

PHASE 06 — ORIENTATION, RESTITUTION AND RESPONSIBLE CLOSURE

An integrated analytical understanding of how dissonance is materially and spatially mediated through architecture, movement, atmosphere, and bodily response.

Outcome — Phase 06.1 — Final Analytical Synthesis

A cumulative and cross-analytical reading of the entire CPD, bringing together perceptual, spatial, relational, and risk-related outcomes without hierarchizing them. It clarifies patterns, contradictions, and unresolved tensions across phases.

Outcome — Phase 06.2 — Restitution and Differentiated Communication

A set of analytically mediated materials designed to support responsible restitution and differentiated communication with diverse audiences. It translates complex outcomes into readable formats while preserving ethical and methodological constraints.

Outcome — Phase 06.3 — Orientation

An orientation framework outlining conditions, constraints, and zones of attention emerging from the research process. It supports future reflection and use without translating knowledge into prescriptions or recommendations.

Final Outcome — Phase 06 - INTERPRETATIVE FRAMEWORK

A final analytical and interpretative framework integrating all outcomes produced throughout the CPD. It renders the research process explicit, legible, and transferable, ensuring continuity between understanding, communication, and future actions without collapsing complexity into prescription.

COMMUNITY PROCESS DIAGRAM (CPD)


PHASE

01

Preliminary Consultation

Phase 01 constitutes the entry point of the Community Process Diagram and is conceived as a phase of autonomous and exploratory analysis. Its primary objective is to construct an initial and structured knowledge framework starting from a condition of limited or non-existent prior familiarity with the site. At this stage, the research process relies exclusively on desk-based and indirect tools, drawing on publicly available sources, secondary documentation, and mediated representations.

The purpose of Phase 01 is orientation rather than interpretation. It aims to identify the nature of the dissonance at stake, its historical and symbolic dimensions, and the first hypotheses regarding actors, conflicts, and sensitivities. No interaction with communities, institutions, or people is activated, and all findings produced remain explicitly provisional. Phase 01 provides the analytical groundwork upon which all subsequent phases are built, while deliberately avoiding premature engagement or stabilization of interpretations.



Phase 01 - Preliminary Consultation, CPD Diagram.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 01 Preliminary Consultation

Preliminary Consultation represents the initial stage of the methodological pathway defined by the Community Process Diagram (CPD). This phase is carried out in full autonomy and corresponds to the first moment of knowledge acquisition regarding the case study and the issues related to dissonance. The CPD explicitly assumes a condition of zero or minimal prior knowledge of the site and its associated conflicts, and is designed to structure the entire research process starting from this initial point of engagement. This first phase is therefore intended as an exploratory and analytical moment, in which the researcher begins to approach the case study through a systematic reconnaissance of available information. The Preliminary Consultation is primarily based on secondary sources, including academic literature, historical documentation, institutional archives, digital repositories, online materials, press articles, and existing representations of the site. At this stage, direct interaction with communities is not yet activated; the objective is instead to construct a first organized knowledge framework that supports subsequent phases of dialogue and interpretation.

The work carried out during Phase 01 leads to the collection of raw data and initial data results, which are progressively organized and synthesized. This process culminates in the production of a first structured document, defined as a Preliminary Draft Sheet. This document represents the first formal outcome of the CPD and constitutes a shared and transparent knowledge base upon which the following phases of the process will build.

Guiding/Core Questions for Phase 01

What kind of dissonance characterizes this site or context?

The guiding questions developed for Phase 01 — Preliminary Consultation are all rooted in a central and overarching inquiry: *What kind of dissonance is at stake?*

This question does not aim at producing a definitive classification, but rather at opening a structured field of investigation capable of capturing the multiple and heterogeneous dimensions through which dissonance manifests itself. At this early stage of the process, the objective is not to resolve or interpret dissonance, but to recognize its presence, nature, and complexity, and to begin identifying the elements that contribute to its formation. The questions therefore function as analytical prompts that help the researcher orient the collection and organization of preliminary information, highlighting tensions, ambiguities, and gaps in existing narratives. This central question can be articulated through a limited set of related inquiries that help explore the different dimensions of dissonance and frame the subsequent phases of the CPD. At this stage, attempting to answer these questions does not imply producing exhaustive or verified conclusions. Rather, the aim is to identify hypotheses, uncertainties, and areas requiring further investigation, and to make explicit the assumptions and limits of the initial knowledge base. The answers gathered during Phase 01 remain provisional and open, and serve primarily to orient the research trajectory and to inform the design of subsequent phases of dialogue, consultation, and analysis within the CPD. The central question of Phase 01 can be articulated through the following guiding questions, which provide a structured reference for the initial collection and organization of information:

- What kind of dissonance characterizes this site or context?
- What kind of dissonance is at stake in relation to this site?
- Is the dissonance primarily historical, political, social, cultural, symbolic, or emotional in nature?
- Does the dissonance originate from a specific event, from a long-term historical process, or from multiple overlapping causes?
- Is the dissonance associated with trauma, violence, exclusion, oppression, or contested memory?
- Is the dissonance openly acknowledged, or does it remain largely implicit, silenced, or normalized?
- What kind of conflict is linked to this dissonance?
- Is the conflict open and explicit, or latent and periodically reactivated?
- When did the dissonance emerge?
- How has the dissonance evolved over time?
- Have reinterpretations, moments of rupture, or generational shifts altered

the meaning of the dissonance?

- How is the site represented in institutional, public, and digital sources?
- Which narratives appear dominant in these representations?
- Which narratives are marginalized, contested, or absent?
- Which actors appear to be involved or implicated in the dissonance?
- Who benefits from, and who is disadvantaged by, the current condition of the site?
- Are there indications that the dissonance is still active or unresolved?
- Are there potential emotional, social, or political risks associated with studying or publicly addressing this site?

Tools and Methodological Approach

To address Phase 01 — Preliminary Consultation, the research process relies exclusively on indirect, desk-based tools. This phase is conceived as a moment of autonomous analysis, in which the objective is not interaction, but the construction of a preliminary and structured knowledge framework. All activities carried out at this stage aim to identify existing narratives, representations, and information related to the site, starting from publicly available sources and secondary materials.

From this perspective the primary tool activated during Phase 01 is OB-03 — Netnography / Online Observation. In this phase, netnography is used in an exploratory and non-intrusive manner to observe how the site is discussed, represented, and framed in digital environments. The analysis focuses on websites, social media platforms, online archives, press articles, blogs, and other publicly accessible digital sources. The purpose is not to conduct a systematic analysis of perception, but rather to identify recurring themes, keywords, conflicts, silences, and preliminary indicators of dissonance within the online public discourse. Used in this way, OB-03 supports the early identification of potential issues, controversies, or contested narratives, while remaining fully consistent with the non-interactive nature of Phase 01.

In addition to OB-03, other tools may be employed to support and enrich the preliminary analysis. MA-06 — Memory Reconstruction can be

Community Process Diagram CPD

applied through secondary sources to develop an initial timeline of the site, identifying key historical events, transformations, and moments of rupture that may have contributed to the emergence of dissonance. This tool helps contextualize the site historically and supports the formulation of initial hypotheses.

MA-04 — Mind Mapping, used as an internal analytical tool, allows the researcher to organize concepts, themes, and interpretative connections emerging from the preliminary research. In Phase 01, mind mapping functions as a synthesis device that supports clarity and reflexivity, helping to structure the growing body of information without producing formal outcomes. Finally, OB-05 — Virtual Depictions and 3D Models, when available, can support a first spatial understanding of the site through satellite images, digital models, virtual tours, or archival reconstructions. This tool is particularly useful when physical access to the site is not immediately possible and complements textual and documentary analysis with a preliminary spatial reading. The use of these tools remains aligned with the core principle of Phase 01: all activities are conducted without direct interaction with communities, institutions, or stakeholders. The emphasis is placed on analytical identification, hypothesis formulation, and knowledge organization, providing a solid foundation for the engagement and validation processes developed in the subsequent phases of the CPD.

Risks associated with Phase 01 interactions

Although Phase 01 is fully desk-based, it still entails risks of source and visibility bias, early framing effects, and analytical overconfidence, which may prematurely stabilize assumptions that must instead remain provisional until verified through the engagement and validation mechanisms of the following phases.

Outcome #01 — Preliminary Draft Sheet

Outcome #01 — Preliminary Draft Sheet is conceived as a synthetic document aimed at collecting, organizing, and summarizing all the preliminary information available on the site or sites affected by dissonance. Its purpose is to consolidate heterogeneous data into a structured and accessible format,

allowing the researcher to clearly identify the initial state of knowledge at the beginning of the process.

The Preliminary Draft Sheet brings together historical, geographical, and contextual information, as well as visual materials, documents, bibliographic references, and preliminary sources. These materials may initially be organized within an Excel file, a database, or a structured digital archive, used to collect and cross-reference information. Subsequently, the content is synthesized into a structured sheet format, conceived as a downloadable PDF report directly linked to the CPD and always available as a reference document. The Draft Sheet functions as a living document, intended to be updated and refined as the research progresses. Its role is to clearly summarize all the information that can be derived from Phase 01, ensuring methodological transparency and providing a solid foundation for the activation of subsequent phases. The Preliminary Draft Sheet may include, for example:

- identification of the site or sites concerned
- geographical location and coordinates
- typology of the heritage asset (building, complex, urban space, infrastructure, etc.)
- essential chronological information
- historical and political background
- key events related to the emergence of dissonance
- current condition and use (when inferable from sources)
- historical and contemporary images
- maps, plans, and graphic representations
- bibliographic and online references
- links to official documents and digital archives
- screenshots and excerpts from online platforms, social media, or digital publications highlighting recurring narratives or controversies (derived from online observation)
- preliminary timelines or chronologies reconstructed from secondary sources (derived from memory reconstruction)
- conceptual diagrams or keyword clusters summarizing dominant themes and emerging hypotheses (derived from mind mapping)
- satellite images, virtual tours, or digital models used for preliminary

Community Process Diagram CPD

spatial understanding (derived from virtual depictions)

Overall, Phase 01 — Preliminary Consultation provides a structured and verifiable knowledge base that is essential for approaching the subsequent stages of the CPD in an informed and responsible manner. The Preliminary Draft Sheet functions not only as the first operational outcome of the process, but also as a key reference document that accompanies the entire investigation of dissonance, supporting coherence, transparency, and methodological rigor.

PHASE 01 — Overall Outcomes of the Phase

Preliminary Analytical Framework

The overall outcome of Phase 01 consists of a Preliminary Analytical Framework, generated through the collation and critical organization of materials produced during the desk-based and autonomous investigation. This outcome does not function as a validated interpretation of the site, nor as an authoritative account of its history, meanings, or conflicts. Instead, it constitutes an explicitly provisional synthesis that defines the initial analytical horizon from which the entire research process develops. The Preliminary Analytical Framework brings together background information, historical references, publicly available narratives, institutional documentation, academic literature, and other mediated sources accessed without direct engagement with communities or stakeholders.

Importantly, the Preliminary Analytical Framework is not superseded as the process advances. It is retained as a comparative layer that allows later phases to trace how understanding evolves through engagement, perception analysis, and on-site experience. Discrepancies between the preliminary framework and subsequent findings are not treated as errors, but as analytically meaningful shifts that reveal how dissonance is differently constructed, perceived, or experienced across scales and contexts. The Preliminary Analytical Framework is conceived as an autonomous and downloadable document composed of a limited number of core analytical instruments, considered essential for its usability by other researchers, practitioners, or institutions. Among these, one tool is regarded as fundamental.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Outcome - Preliminary Analytical Sheet

The core analytical instrument associated with Phase 01 is the Preliminary Analytical Sheet. This sheet is designed as a structured and replicable device that guides the organization and critical assessment of desk-based knowledge without producing interpretative closure. It functions as an internal analytical record rather than as a communicative or restitutive output. The Preliminary Analytical Sheet typically includes a series of fixed sections that document the state of knowledge at the outset of the research. These sections may include: a concise description of the site and its historical context as it emerges from available sources; an initial identification of the forms of dissonance involved (historical, political, social, symbolic, or emotional); a summary of dominant narratives and representations circulating in public or institutional discourse; an explicit listing of uncertainties, contradictions, and gaps in available information; and preliminary notes on potential sensitivities or issues that may require caution in subsequent phases. Crucially, the sheet also contains a dedicated section for analytical self-positioning, in which the research team records assumptions, hypotheses, and interpretative inclinations arising from the desk-based investigation. This reflexive component ensures transparency and allows later phases to revisit, challenge, or recalibrate early framings in light of new data and experiences. The Preliminary Analytical Sheet does not aim to validate information, resolve contradictions, or establish priorities. Its function is preparatory and reflexive: it makes explicit the conditions under which the research begins and provides a documented point of departure for the progressive construction of knowledge throughout the Community Process Diagram.

Taken together, the Preliminary Analytical Framework and the Preliminary Analytical Sheet ensure that Phase 01 establishes a clear, transparent, and critically grounded starting point. They enable the research process to proceed with awareness of its own limits, assumptions, and blind spots, laying the methodological foundations for subsequent phases of stakeholder identification, risk assessment, perceptual analysis, and on-site engagement.



Havuts Tar Monastery Complex, Armenia, July, 2025


PHASE

02

Understanding and Identifying Stakeholders

Phase 02 introduces the relational dimension of the research process by focusing on the identification and verification of stakeholders connected to the dissonant heritage under investigation. While the analysis still avoids direct engagement with people on sensitive content, it moves beyond autonomous desk-based work and introduces structured interaction aimed at mapping who is involved, affected, or influential in relation to the site. This phase is articulated into three sub-phases that reflect a progressive logic. Phase 02.1 remains analytical and hypothesis-driven, focusing on the preliminary identification of potential stakeholders. Phase 02.2 introduces mediated interaction with institutions, associations, and people to collectively identify key actors and relational dynamics. Phase 02.3 suspends interaction and activates expert-based validation to critically assess the completeness and balance of the stakeholder framework. The objective of Phase 02 as a whole is to produce a robust, inclusive, and validated stakeholder configuration that can support later phases of risk assessment, perception analysis, and on-site engagement.

Community Process Diagram CPD



Phase 02 - Stakeholder Identification, CPD Diagram.

Phase 02

Understanding and Identifying Stakeholders

Phase 02 — Understanding / Assessing Dissonance represents the first moment in which the research process explicitly shifts from autonomous analysis toward the identification of interlocutors and stakeholders relevant to the investigation of dissonance. While Phase 01 was dedicated to building a preliminary knowledge base starting from a condition of zero knowledge, Phase 02 introduces a relational dimension, even though interaction with communities has not yet been activated.

Community Process Diagram CPD

The main objective of this phase is to identify, define, and progressively structure the network of stakeholders that may play a role in the understanding of dissonance and in the collection of relevant data. This phase is articulated through a series of sub-phases, each contributing to the progressive refinement of interlocutors and to the preparation of subsequent moments of direct engagement.

Phase 02 is composed of three interconnected sub-phases that together structure a gradual and iterative process of stakeholder identification, validation, and verification:

- Phase 02.1 — Mapping Potential Stakeholders
- Phase 02.2 — Collective Identification of Key Stakeholders
- Phase 02.3 — Stakeholders Verification

At this stage, the CPD still operates primarily from the perspective of the researcher and of the research process. The identification of stakeholders initially relies on analytical inference, documentary research, and online reconnaissance, rather than on direct consultation with people, communities, or institutions. This first interpretative hypothesis is then progressively expanded, tested, and critically assessed through interaction with external interlocutors and expert validation across the three sub-phases.

Through this internal articulation, Phase 02 moves from a preliminary and desk-based understanding of the stakeholder landscape toward a more inclusive, verified, and methodologically robust framework. The outcome of this phase is not only a definitive list of stakeholders, but also a structured understanding of their relative relevance, positions, and potential influence, which is essential for responsibly addressing dissonance in the subsequent phases of the CPD.

Phase 02.1 — Mapping Potential Stakeholders

Phase 02.1 — Mapping Potential Stakeholders represents the first analytical step within Phase 02 and is dedicated to the preliminary identification and spatial, social, and institutional localization of stakeholders potentially involved in, or affected by, the dissonance associated with the case study. This sub-phase is conceived as a desk-based and interpretative activity, carried out before any direct engagement with local actors.

The purpose of this step is to construct an initial map of the stakeholder landscape as it appears through existing documentation, bibliographic sources, institutional records, and online materials. Rather than defining fixed roles or responsibilities, this mapping exercise aims to highlight the presence, visibility, and potential relevance of different actors within the broader context of the site and its dissonant condition. The resulting framework is intentionally provisional and is meant to support subsequent phases of verification, refinement, and direct dialogue.

Guiding/Core Questions for Phase 02.1

Who are the stakeholders potentially involved?

At this stage, these questions are addressed from the perspective of the researcher and are developed without activating direct interaction with the local context. The objective is not to validate or confirm stakeholder roles, nor to establish definitive hierarchies of relevance, but to construct an informed and documented analytical hypothesis that can orient the subsequent phases of the research process. The guiding questions focus on identifying which actors appear to be involved in the history, management, or representation of the site, and which individuals, groups, or institutions emerge most clearly from the available documentation. Particular attention

Community Process Diagram CPD

is given to actors who are recurrently mentioned in bibliographic, archival, or digital sources, as well as to those who appear to hold decision-making power, public visibility, or symbolic authority in relation to the site. At the same time, the analysis seeks to identify actors who may be directly affected by the site or by the dissonance associated with it, including groups that are frequently referenced in narratives or documents but are not directly represented or institutionally recognized. The presence of potentially conflicting positions, divergent interpretations, or latent tensions among different stakeholders is also considered as an important indicator of dissonance at this preliminary stage.

Overall, these questions are intended to support the construction of a preliminary analytical framework rather than a definitive stakeholder map. The framework produced at this stage is explicitly acknowledged as partial, provisional, and potentially biased, reflecting the limits of desk-based research and mediated sources. Its function is to make assumptions and gaps visible and to provide a transparent starting point that will be tested, expanded, and critically revised through direct engagement and expert validation in the subsequent phases of the CPD.

For clarity and operational use, the core inquiry of Phase O2.1 is articulated through the following guiding questions. These questions make explicit the analytical dimensions outlined above and support the construction of a preliminary and desk-based hypothesis on the stakeholder landscape, which will be tested and refined in subsequent phases:

- Who are the stakeholders potentially involved in relation to the site and its dissonance?
- Which actors appear to be involved in the history of the site?
- Which actors appear to be involved in the management, governance, or transformation of the site?
- Which actors are involved in the representation or narration of the site in public or institutional contexts?
- Which individuals, groups, or institutions emerge most clearly from the available documentation?
- Which actors are recurrently mentioned in bibliographic, archival, or digital sources?

- Which stakeholders appear to hold decision-making power in relation to the site?
- Which actors appear to have public visibility or symbolic authority connected to the site?
- Which actors seem to be directly affected by the site or by the dissonance associated with it?
- Are there groups that are frequently referenced in narratives or documents but are not directly represented or institutionally recognized?
- Are there indications of conflicting positions, divergent interpretations, or latent tensions among different stakeholders?
- Are there actors whose absence or marginal visibility may indicate exclusion, silencing, or imbalance within the stakeholder landscape?

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase O2.1 represents the initial analytical step in the process of stakeholder identification within the Community Process Diagram. Its function is to construct a preliminary and hypothesis-driven understanding of the stakeholder landscape associated with the site and its dissonance, starting exclusively from desk-based and mediated sources. At this stage, the research process does not activate direct engagement with institutions, associations, communities, or people. Instead, it operates in a condition of analytical distance, aiming to outline a first, provisional configuration of actors that will be tested, expanded, and verified in subsequent phases. From a methodological standpoint, Phase O2.1 is grounded in the recognition that early stakeholder identification is inevitably shaped by visibility, representation, and availability of information. Publicly visible actors, formally recognized institutions, and dominant narratives tend to emerge more readily through existing sources, while informal, marginal, or less organized stakeholders often remain obscured. For this reason, Phase O2.1 does not seek to produce a definitive or validated stakeholder list, but rather to articulate an initial analytical hypothesis that makes assumptions, gaps, and uncertainties explicit. The primary tool employed in this phase is OB-03 Netnography / Online Observation. Through OB-03, the research team systematically observes how the site and its dissonance are represented across digital environments, including institutional websites, online archives, media coverage, social platforms, and publicly accessible documents. The

Community Process Diagram CPD

objective is not to assess perception in depth, but to identify recurrent actors, organizations, spokespersons, and groups that appear connected to the site through governance, advocacy, opposition, commemoration, or public discourse. Netnography allows the research process to trace patterns of visibility, frequency of appearance, and narrative positioning, while remaining fully consistent with the non-interactive and non-intrusive nature of this phase.

OB-03 is complemented by Mind Mapping (MA-04), which is activated exclusively within the autonomous research line as a tool for analytical synthesis and clarification. MA-04 does not function as a participatory or representational device at this stage. Instead, it supports the research team in organizing and structuring the heterogeneous information gathered through netnography. Through mind mapping, identified actors, roles, affiliations, and preliminary relationships are visually organized, allowing overlaps, clusters, and potential gaps to emerge. This process helps transform dispersed and fragmentary observations into a readable analytical framework, without stabilizing hierarchies or producing exclusions.

A defining feature of Phase 02.1 lies in the sequential relationship between these two tools. Netnography (OB-03) functions as the primary data-gathering instrument, while Mind Mapping (MA-04) operates as a secondary tool of synthesis, activated after the observation phase. Together, they allow the research team to move from dispersed mediated information toward a structured preliminary stakeholder hypothesis, while maintaining awareness of the partial and situated nature of the sources employed. Phase 02.1 deliberately excludes interview-based tools, group activities, community-led tools, and any form of direct engagement. This exclusion is not a limitation, but a methodological safeguard intended to prevent premature interaction and to avoid stabilizing stakeholder configurations before they are exposed to dialogue and validation. By maintaining an autonomous and desk-based approach, Phase 02.1 prepares the analytical ground for Phase 02.2, where the preliminary stakeholder framework will be confronted with perspectives emerging from institutions, associations, and people, and for Phase 02.3, where expert-based validation will critically assess its completeness and balance. The outcome of Phase 02.1 is a Preliminary Stakeholders List, conceived as a working document rather than a finalized output. This list reflects

the research team's initial analytical interpretation of the stakeholder landscape, derived from mediated sources and organized through internal synthesis. Its value lies not in its accuracy, but in its transparency: it makes visible which actors emerge at this stage, which remain absent, and which assumptions guide the early stages of the research process.

Risks associated with Phase 02.1 interactions

Despite its fully autonomous and desk-based configuration, Phase 02.1 involves specific methodological risks that must be explicitly acknowledged. The exclusive reliance on mediated and publicly available sources, activated through netnography (OB-03), may privilege actors who are already visible, institutionally recognized, or digitally present, while marginal, informal, or less organized stakeholders remain underrepresented or entirely absent. As a result, early stakeholder identification may reflect existing asymmetries of visibility rather than the actual complexity of the social field surrounding the site. There is also a risk of narrative bias embedded in online and documentary sources. Digital representations, institutional websites, media coverage, and archival materials often frame the site and its dissonance through stabilized or strategic narratives that may obscure conflict, downplay contestation, or selectively emphasize certain actors and roles. Without direct interaction, such framings may appear coherent or authoritative, even when they are partial, contested, or politically situated. The use of Mind Mapping (MA-04) as a tool of internal synthesis introduces additional analytical risks. While mind mapping supports clarity and organization, it may inadvertently impose structure, coherence, or relational logic onto fragmentary and heterogeneous data. This process may create premature assumptions regarding stakeholder relevance, influence, or alignment, particularly if visual clustering is mistaken for empirical confirmation rather than analytical hypothesis. Finally, there is a risk of analytical overconfidence at this early stage of the process. The production of a Preliminary Stakeholders List, even when explicitly framed as provisional, may generate a false sense of completeness or stability if its hypothetical nature is not continuously emphasized. For these reasons, all outputs produced in Phase 02.1 are treated strictly as preliminary and are explicitly designed to be challenged, expanded, and corrected through mediated interaction in Phase 02.2 and expert-based validation in Phase 02.3.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Outcome #02.1 — Preliminary Stakeholders List

The work conducted during Phase 02.1 leads to the production of Outcome #02.1 — Preliminary Stakeholders List. This outcome consists of a structured report that identifies a first list of stakeholders considered relevant to the research process. The Preliminary Stakeholders List is developed without direct consultation with local actors or communities. It is based exclusively on the analysis of secondary sources and online materials, and reflects the researcher's initial interpretation of the stakeholder landscape. For this reason, it should be understood as a working hypothesis, not as a definitive or validated representation. The document brings together information emerging from desk-based research, online observation, and documentary analysis. It may include, for example:

- a list of identified stakeholders derived from institutional documents, online sources, and public records
- brief descriptions of stakeholders' roles or positions, reconstructed through official statements, websites, or archival references
- indications of their potential relevance to the dissonance, inferred from their visibility, involvement in past events, or symbolic association with the site
- references to the sources from which stakeholders were identified, including bibliographic materials, press articles, institutional websites, and digital archives
- preliminary notes on possible relationships, overlaps, or conflicts between stakeholders, emerging from cross-referencing different sources
- temporal indications highlighting stakeholders' involvement at different moments, derived from preliminary memory reconstruction
- conceptual diagrams or internal mappings used to organize and cluster stakeholders according to type, role, or domain of action

Phase 02.2 — Collective Identification of Key Stakeholders

Phase 02.2 — Collective Identification of Key Stakeholders represents a decisive transition within Phase 02, marking the shift from an analytically

driven, desk-based identification of stakeholders to a phase of direct interaction and dialogue with the local context. While Phase 02.1 focused on mapping potential stakeholders based on secondary sources and the researcher's interpretation, Phase 02.2 introduces the first structured engagement with external interlocutors.

At this stage, the CPD's horizontal line begins to actively intersect with other layers of the diagram. The research process moves beyond autonomous analysis and starts engaging with institutions and associations or communities, as well as with individual people where appropriate. The objective is not yet to enter into an in-depth dialogue on dissonance itself, but to verify, expand, and recalibrate the stakeholder landscape previously identified. Phase 02.2 is therefore dedicated to understanding how different actors perceive relevance, influence, and importance within the context of the site. By asking stakeholders themselves to identify who they consider most relevant, the research process begins to open up to multiple perspectives and to address potential blind spots, exclusions, or overemphases present in the Preliminary Stakeholders List.

Guiding/Core Questions for Phase 02.2

Who counts the most?

Although the question is phrased in terms of "who counts the most," its purpose is not to rank stakeholders or to define objective hierarchies of power. Rather, it is intended to capture relational and situated perceptions of relevance, making visible how different actors attribute importance, authority, and influence from their own positional standpoint. This core question is central to Phase 02.2 and is deliberately simple in formulation, yet complex in implication. It aims to elicit perceptions of relevance, influence, and authority from different interlocutors, acknowledging that "importance" may be defined in multiple and sometimes conflicting ways depending on positionality, experience, and institutional role. At this stage, the objective of the investigation is to move beyond a researcher-led identification of stakeholders and to explore how relevance, influence, and importance are perceived from within the context itself. Phase 02.2 is therefore concerned not with establishing an objective hierarchy of stakeholders, but with understanding how different actors define who "counts" in relation to the

Community Process Diagram CPD

site. By eliciting perceptions from institutions, associations, communities, and people, this phase seeks to reveal plural, and sometimes conflicting, constructions of importance, authority, and visibility. The aim is to expose asymmetries between formal roles and perceived influence, to identify blind spots or omissions in the preliminary mapping, and to capture the relational and contested nature of the stakeholder landscape as it is experienced by those involved.

The core question is articulated through a set of guiding questions that structure the interaction with stakeholders:

- Which actors do institutions consider most influential or relevant in relation to the site?
- Which associations or community groups are perceived as central by other associations or by institutions?
- Which actors do people identify as key voices or decision-makers?
- Are there stakeholders repeatedly mentioned across different interviews?
- Are there actors mentioned who were not included in the Preliminary Stakeholders List?
- Do different groups identify different hierarchies of importance?
- Are there discrepancies between formal influence and perceived relevance?

These questions support the construction of a more inclusive and plural understanding of the stakeholder landscape.

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase 02.2 marks a critical transition within the Community Process Diagram, as it represents the first moment in which the research process actively engages institutions, associations, communities, and people to verify and recalibrate the preliminary stakeholder framework developed through desk-based analysis. The objective of this phase is not to investigate dissonance or disvalue directly, but to understand how relevance, influence, and importance are perceived and attributed by different actors in relation to the site. A fundamental methodological assumption underpins this phase: institutions, associations, and people do not occupy equivalent positions within the social and symbolic field of dissonant heritage. They

speak from structurally different standpoints, shaped by formal mandates, collective positioning, or informal and fragmented experience. For this reason, Phase 02.2 does not adopt a symmetrical or uniform application of tools across all interlocutors. Instead, tools are selected and calibrated in relation to the specific characteristics, capacities, and risks associated with each group. This differentiation is not incidental, but essential to avoid distortions, institutional bias, or the premature polarization of the stakeholder landscape.

Structured interviews (IN-01) constitute the backbone of this phase and are employed across all interlocutor categories. Their standardized format allows the research process to collect comparable data when asking actors to identify those they consider most relevant or influential in relation to the site. This comparability is essential for detecting recurring names, converging perceptions, and discrepancies between different groups. Semi-structured interviews (IN-02) complement this approach by allowing interviewees to explain their choices, clarify relationships, and articulate implicit assumptions regarding relevance and influence. While these two tools are applied to institutions, associations, and people alike, their interpretation is always contextualized in relation to the position from which each interlocutor speaks. Group meetings and focus groups (GR-01) are activated primarily with associations and organized community groups. In these contexts, relevance and influence are rarely individual judgments; rather, they emerge through negotiation, consensus, and sometimes conflict. Group-based settings allow the research process to observe how hierarchies are collectively constructed, how certain actors become dominant reference points, and how dissenting positions are negotiated or silenced. By contrast, this tool is not systematically applied to institutions, where formal hierarchies and representational roles tend to limit the openness of collective discussion.

Two additional tools are introduced in Phase 02.2 to strengthen the exploratory capacity of stakeholder identification while maintaining a low level of emotional and symbolic exposure. Conversation Starters (IN-03) are used as a preliminary and exploratory device, either preceding or embedded within interviews. This tool does not aim to elicit narratives, memories, or evaluations of the site. Instead, it is designed to trigger spontaneous associations related to the context, allowing interlocutors to identify relevant actors without immediately activating defensive, institutionalized, or strategic responses. Conversation Starters are particularly effective when

Community Process Diagram CPD

working with associations and people, as they facilitate the emergence of informal references, marginal actors, or taken-for-granted figures who might not surface through direct questioning. When applied to institutions, their use is deliberately limited and carefully moderated, as institutional representatives tend to respond from predefined roles, which can neutralize the exploratory potential of this tool. Participatory Mapping (MA-03) is introduced in this phase in a deliberately non-spatial and non-site-based form. Rather than mapping physical space, participants are invited to visualize relationships, perceived hierarchies, and zones of influence among stakeholders using abstract diagrams or simplified schematic supports. This tool is particularly valuable when working with associations and communities, where it allows relational tensions, power asymmetries, and informal alliances to become visible. With institutions, participatory mapping is applied in a more structured and facilitated manner to avoid the reproduction of official organizational charts. When used with people, the tool is simplified and guided, focusing on relational proximity rather than systemic representation, in order to avoid technical abstraction and cognitive overload.

Once the interaction-based activities with institutions, associations, and people have been completed, the research process enters a subsequent analytical step conducted entirely within the autonomous research line. At this stage, the focus shifts from engagement to synthesis. Tools such as Mind Mapping (MA-04) and Extremes and Mainstreams (MA-05) are activated not as instruments of interaction, but as analytical devices designed to consolidate, organize, and clarify the materials generated through the previous phases of dialogue. Their function is to support the research team in transforming heterogeneous inputs into a structured analytical framework, without introducing new data or intervening in the relationship with interlocutors. Throughout Phase 02.2, analytical tools such as Extremes and Mainstreams (MA-05) and Mind Mapping (MA-04) are used by the research team to organize and interpret the data collected. These tools do not intervene directly in interaction with interlocutors; rather, they support the synthesis of heterogeneous inputs, allowing the identification of recurring actors, emerging hierarchies, and early forms of polarization without yet producing exclusions or definitive classifications. The differentiated application of tools across institutions, associations,

and people is a deliberate methodological choice. Treating these groups as interchangeable would risk conflating formal authority with perceived relevance, amplifying already visible actors, and overlooking marginal or informal stakeholders. By calibrating tools according to interlocutor type, Phase 02.2 expands the stakeholder framework while preserving analytical rigor and preparing the ground for the verification process developed in Phase 02.3.

Risks associated with Phase 02.2 interactions

Despite its cautious design, Phase 02.2 involves specific methodological and ethical risks. Institutional interviews may reinforce existing power structures by repeatedly highlighting formally recognized actors. Group-based activities with associations may amplify dominant voices and marginalize internal dissent. Tools such as Conversation Starters and Participatory Mapping, if insufficiently facilitated, may unintentionally expose latent conflicts or generate expectations of future influence. There is also a risk of premature stabilization of the stakeholder landscape, where early visibility is mistaken for actual relevance. For these reasons, all results produced in Phase 02.2 are treated as provisional and are explicitly subjected to expert-based verification in Phase 02.3.

Outcome #02.2 — Intermediate Stakeholders List

The work carried out during Phase 02.2 leads to Outcome #02.2 — Intermediate Stakeholders List. This document builds directly upon the Preliminary Stakeholders List produced in Phase 02.1, but significantly expands and refines it through the inclusion of stakeholders identified during the interview process and collective discussions.

The Intermediate Stakeholders List reflects a more inclusive and informed representation of the stakeholder landscape, as it incorporates perspectives emerging from institutions, associations, communities, and individuals. The use of structured and semi-structured interviews allows the research process to capture individual perceptions of relevance and influence, while group meetings and focus groups contribute to identifying collectively recognized actors and shared hierarchies. Analytical tools applied during the synthesis

phase further support the interpretation of these inputs by highlighting recurring names, patterns of convergence, and early forms of polarization. Through this combination of tools, the research process moves beyond the researcher's initial assumptions and acknowledges the plurality of views regarding relevance, influence, and positioning. The resulting document therefore represents not only an expanded list of stakeholders, but also an initial relational understanding of how different actors are perceived within the context of the site.

The outcome is conceived as a structured report, which may include:

- an updated and expanded list of stakeholders derived from interviews and collective discussions;
- indications of how and by whom each stakeholder was identified, distinguishing between individual and collective sources;
- preliminary notes on perceived importance or influence, emerging from comparative analysis of responses;
- contact information, when available, to support subsequent phases of engagement;
- references to the interviews, group meetings, and analytical processes from which the data emerged.

As with previous outcomes, this document remains provisional and subject to further refinement. However, it constitutes a critical step toward the construction of a shared and transparent stakeholder framework. By integrating multiple tools and perspectives, the Intermediate Stakeholders List provides a solid basis for the subsequent phase of verification and expert validation, supporting a more robust process of prioritization and deeper engagement within the CPD.

Phase 02.3 — Stakeholders Verification

Phase 02.3 — Stakeholders Verification represents the final step within the stakeholder mapping process developed in Phase 02. This phase builds directly upon Outcome #02.2 — Intermediate Stakeholders List and is dedicated to verifying the accuracy, completeness, and reliability of the stakeholder landscape identified so far. Its primary objective is to assess whether all relevant stakeholders have been included and whether the

Community Process Diagram CPD

information collected through community interaction requires correction, integration, or refinement. As indicated by the graphical structure of the CPD, this phase does not activate further engagement with communities or institutions, but instead introduces a verification process that moves downward, toward the level of expert consultation. This shift reflects a methodological decision: information emerging from communities, associations, institutions, and people must be critically reviewed and validated through an external and analytically grounded perspective.

Phase 02.3 therefore functions as a control and validation mechanism. It aims to verify whether the Intermediate Stakeholders List is sufficiently inclusive, whether relevant actors may still be missing, and whether the list reflects an excessive polarization or imbalance resulting from the positions expressed during interviews. This verification is essential before proceeding to the next phase of the CPD, which addresses the assessment of dissonance itself.

Guiding/Core Questions for Phase 02.3

Is somebody missing?

At this stage, the objective of the investigation is to critically assess and verify the stakeholder landscape constructed in the previous phases. Phase 02.3 is not intended to identify new stakeholders through direct engagement, but to evaluate the completeness, balance, and reliability of the Intermediate Stakeholders List through an external and expert-based perspective. This phase functions as a control and validation moment, aimed at identifying omissions, distortions, or excessive polarizations that may have emerged during stakeholder identification and prioritization. By involving experts with thematic or methodological expertise on dissonance, conflict, and sensitive heritage contexts, the research process seeks to ensure that the stakeholder framework is sufficiently inclusive and analytically robust before proceeding to subsequent phases.

For clarity and operational use, the core inquiry of Phase 02.3 is articulated through the following guiding questions. These questions structure the verification process and support a critical assessment of the stakeholder mapping developed so far.

- Is the Intermediate Stakeholders List complete and sufficiently representative of the context?
- Are all relevant stakeholder categories adequately included in the current framework?
- Are there stakeholders who appear systematically underrepresented or entirely absent?
- Does the stakeholder list reflect an excessive polarization of positions or viewpoints?
- How balanced and appropriate is the current stakeholder configuration, considering potential overrepresentation or exclusion, associated risks and sensitivities, and the possible need for revision based on expert perspectives?
- Can the stakeholder list be considered sufficiently robust to support the transition to the assessment of dissonance in the following phases?

These questions are designed to support a rigorous and transparent verification process, ensuring that the stakeholder framework does not reproduce blind spots or unbalanced narratives.

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase 02.3 represents the verification and validation stage of the stakeholder identification process. Its function is not to expand the stakeholder landscape further, but to critically assess the completeness, balance, and reliability of the framework developed through desk-based analysis and mediated interaction. This phase introduces a clear methodological shift: the research process temporarily suspends engagement with institutions, associations, and people and moves toward expert-based validation. This shift is grounded in a central methodological concern. Stakeholder identification in dissonant heritage contexts is inherently shaped by visibility, positionality, and power relations. Actors who are vocal, institutionally embedded, or publicly recognizable tend to emerge more easily, while others remain systematically underrepresented or invisible. Phase 02.3 is therefore designed as a corrective/validation mechanism, introducing analytical distance and external expertise to counterbalance the situated perceptions collected in Phase 02.2. Beyond the validation of the stakeholder framework, expert feedback collected in

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 02.3 also provides early indications of potential sensitivities, critical narratives, and zones of attention that may require particular caution in the subsequent phases of risk assessment (Phase 03) and perception analysis (Phase 04).

The primary tool employed in this phase is the semi-structured interview (IN-02), adapted to a validation-oriented format. Experts are invited to review the Intermediate Stakeholders List and to assess whether relevant actors are missing, overrepresented, or insufficiently contextualized. Unlike previous uses of semi-structured interviews, the objective here is not exploration but evaluation. Experts are asked to articulate reasoned judgments based on disciplinary knowledge, comparative experience, and familiarity with similar contexts of dissonance. When the complexity of the case or the diversity of expert perspectives requires it, multispeaker debates (GR-05) are activated. These moderated discussions allow experts from different disciplinary backgrounds to confront and compare their assessments openly. This collective format makes disagreements explicit and prevents the silent normalization of a single interpretative framework. It also supports the identification of structural blind spots that may not emerge through individual interviews alone. In addition, Peer Observing Peers (OB-04) is introduced exclusively as an indirect reference tool. It is not activated as a field-based observation method, nor does it involve new forms of community exposure. Instead, it is used as a comparative and reflective resource, drawing on existing documentation, prior research experiences, or analogous case studies known to experts. This indirect use supports the identification of patterns of invisibility, exclusion, or misrepresentation that may not be apparent within the specific case under investigation. A defining feature of Phase 02.3 is its iterative logic: expert validation is not conceived as a symbolic endorsement, but as a decision point. If experts identify significant omissions or structural imbalances, the CPD explicitly requires a return to Phase 02.2 to integrate newly identified stakeholders through additional mediated interaction. This iterative mechanism prevents premature closure and reinforces the methodological robustness of the stakeholder framework. The outcome of Phase 02.3 is the Final Stakeholders List, a validated and consolidated document that integrates desk-based analysis, community identification, and expert verification. This outcome is not merely a directory of actors, but a critically assessed framework that supports subsequent phases of dissonance assessment and perception analysis.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Risks associated with Phase 02.3 interactions

Phase 02.3 also involves specific risks. Expert validation may introduce external biases or disciplinary assumptions that do not fully align with local dynamics. There is a risk of over-correction, where expert perspectives marginalize situated knowledge gathered in earlier phases. Multispeaker debates may privilege dominant academic voices, reproducing hierarchies within the expert field itself. Finally, the use of comparative references may lead to analogical reasoning that obscures the specificity of the case. For these reasons, expert input is treated as a critical lens rather than an authoritative verdict, and its role is to support balance, not to replace earlier findings.

Outcome #02.3 — Final Stakeholders List

The completion of Phase 02.3 leads to Outcome #02.3 — Final Stakeholders List. This document represents the validated and consolidated version of the stakeholder framework and constitutes the definitive outcome of Phase 02. It is conceived as a structured and downloadable PDF report that integrates all stakeholders identified through desk-based research, community interaction, and stakeholder validation, and subsequently reviewed and confirmed through expert consultation. The Final Stakeholders List reflects a balanced and critically assessed representation of the stakeholder landscape. Its primary function is to ensure that the subsequent phases of the CPD are grounded in an inclusive, reliable, and methodologically robust set of interlocutors. Unlike previous stakeholder lists, which are explicitly provisional, this outcome is intended to function as a stable reference framework for the assessment of dissonance, perception analysis, and on-site engagement.

In addition to providing a consolidated list of stakeholders, the Final Stakeholders List may include:

- a categorized and structured list of stakeholders, distinguishing between institutions, associations/communities, people, and other relevant actor groups;
- brief descriptive profiles outlining each stakeholder's role, relationship to the site, and relevance to the dissonance under investigation;
- indications of how each stakeholder was identified and validated,

distinguishing between desk-based identification, community nomination, and expert verification;

- preliminary relational frameworks, such as influence maps, power diagrams, or polarization schemes, illustrating relationships, hierarchies, and potential tensions among stakeholders;

- visual representations highlighting areas of convergence, divergence, or conflict within the stakeholder landscape;

- annotations on critical sensitivities, exclusions, or asymmetries identified during expert validation, which may require particular attention in subsequent phases;

- references to interviews, workshops, or expert consultations that contributed to the validation process.

Through these elements, the Final Stakeholders List functions not only as a comprehensive directory of actors, but also as a strategic and analytical tool. It enables the research process to move forward with a clearly defined, inclusive, and validated stakeholder framework, supporting informed decision-making about engagement strategies and ensuring methodological continuity across the subsequent phases of the CPD.

PHASE 02 — Outcome

Stakeholder Frameworks

The overall outcome of Phase 02 is the Stakeholder Framework, a structured and validated analytical resource that consolidates the results of the stakeholder identification process developed throughout the three sub-phases of Phase 02. This outcome represents a critical transition within the Community Process Diagram (CPD), marking the passage from an initial, hypothesis-driven exploration of the social field to a consolidated configuration of actors that can be operationally mobilized in subsequent phases of the research and engagement process. The Stakeholder Framework is generated through a progressive and controlled sequence. It originates from the preliminary, desk-based identification of potential stakeholders (Phase 02.1), which produces an explicitly provisional analytical hypothesis grounded in mediated and publicly available sources. This hypothesis is then expanded and recalibrated through mediated interaction

Community Process Diagram CPD

with institutions, associations, communities, and people (Phase 02.2), allowing the research process to register how relevance, influence, and involvement are perceived from different positional standpoints. Finally, the framework is subjected to expert-based validation (Phase 02.3), which introduces critical distance and comparative insight in order to identify omissions, distortions, or imbalances produced by visibility, power asymmetries, or narrative dominance. The Stakeholder Framework is therefore not the result of a single methodological action, but the outcome of a triangulated process combining analytical inference, situated perception, and expert calibration. Its primary objective is not to define representation or legitimacy, nor to prescribe engagement strategies, but to render the relational structure of the social field surrounding the site analytically legible. Within the logic of the CPD, this outcome performs a preparatory and enabling function. By documenting who is involved, affected, influential, marginal, or silenced in relation to the site and its dissonance, the Stakeholder Framework provides the necessary analytical ground for Phase 03, conditions the perceptual investigations of Phase 04, and informs the calibrated on-site engagement strategies adopted in Phase 05. At the same time, it remains explicitly open and revisable, allowing later phases to retroactively highlight emerging actors or reconfigure existing relationships.

Beyond its internal role within the CPD, the Stakeholder Framework is conceived in direct relation to the subsequent phases of the Co.Co.War Handbook, which address the identification and articulation of strategies for intervention, conservation, transformation, and communication of dissonant heritage. While the Handbook operates at a strategic and action-oriented level, the Stakeholder Framework does not anticipate or prescribe such strategies. Instead, it provides the analytical precondition that enables strategic reflection to be grounded in a documented understanding of power relations, degrees of involvement, and relational tensions, rather than in abstract or undifferentiated notions of community or stakeholders. In this sense, the outcome functions as an interface between methodological inquiry and strategic orientation, ensuring continuity between understanding and action without collapsing one into the other. The Stakeholder Framework is conceived as an autonomous and downloadable document composed of a limited number of core

analytical components, considered essential for its usability by other researchers, practitioners, or institutions. Among these, two documents are necessarily included.

Validated Stakeholder List

The first core component of the Stakeholder Framework is the Validated Stakeholder List, a structured register of actors identified throughout Phase 02 and critically assessed through expert validation. This list does not function as a simple directory, but as an analytical device that documents how stakeholders emerge, how they are perceived, and under which conditions they become visible within the research process. Each stakeholder entry includes, at a minimum, the stakeholder category, the mode of identification, the level of visibility within public and mediated discourse, the perceived relevance or influence in relation to the site, and notes on uncertainty, contestation, or marginality. The list is conceived as a working and comparative document. It preserves traceability between sub-phases, makes gaps and asymmetries visible, and allows later phases to identify shifts in relevance or emerging actors. Its value lies not in completeness, but in transparency. This representation is intentionally non-hierarchical. Ordering does not imply legitimacy or priority, and the inclusion of notes on uncertainty or marginality is considered as analytically relevant as the identification of highly visible actors.

Power / Interest Matrix

The second core component of the Stakeholder Framework is the Power / Interest Matrix, adopted as a four-quadrant analytical diagram. Within the Co.Co.War framework, this matrix is not used to define engagement strategies or management priorities, but to identify conditions of caution, asymmetries of influence, and potential risks associated with stakeholder positioning in contexts of dissonant heritage. The diagram is structured along two axes. The horizontal axis represents the degree of interest, understood as the level of involvement, investment, or concern a stakeholder has in relation to the site and its dissonance. The vertical axis represents power, understood not only as formal authority, but as the capacity to influence narratives, access, decision-making processes, or public visibility. The intersection of these axes generates four analytical quadrants, each corresponding to a distinct condition within the stakeholder landscape. Within the Co.Co.War framework, the four quadrants are interpreted analytically rather than normatively. Stakeholders with high power and high interest are treated as potentially sensitive actors whose involvement requires careful calibration. Stakeholders with high power but low interest represent latent authorities whose indirect or delayed intervention may significantly affect the process. Stakeholders with low power and high interest are often directly affected but structurally vulnerable, requiring particular attention to exposure and expectations. Stakeholders with low power and low interest are not considered irrelevant, as they may indicate silent, marginalized, or emerging positions within the social field.

Community Process Diagram CPD



Students during a site survey, Havuts Tar Monastery Complex, Armenia, July, 2025

PHASE


03

Assessing the Existing Dissonance

Phase 03 functions as a protective threshold within the CPD. Its purpose is not to collect perceptions or narratives, but to identify, assess, and validate risks, sensitivities, and trauma-related issues associated with the site before any direct engagement with people is initiated. This phase responds to the recognition that dissonant heritage often involves unresolved conflicts, emotional vulnerabilities, and symbolic tensions that require careful handling. Phase 03 is articulated into two sub-phases. Phase 03.1 focuses on the identification of sensitive issues through mediated interaction with institutions, associations, and specific mediating figures who possess contextual knowledge of past conflicts and public reactions. Phase 03.2 introduces expert-based validation to critically evaluate the framing of these risks and to assess whether the research process is methodologically prepared to proceed.

By inserting this threshold, Phase 03 ensures that subsequent engagement is grounded in ethical awareness and contextual understanding, and that potentially harmful tools or topics are identified and managed before exposure occurs.

Community Process Diagram CPD



Phase 03 - Assessing the Existing Dissonance, CPD Diagram.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 03 Assessing the Existing Dissonance

Phase 03 — Assessing the Existing Dissonance represents a critical methodological transition within the CPD, as it marks the moment in which the research process begins to engage explicitly with the substantive content of dissonance. While the previous phases were primarily concerned with building a knowledge base and structuring the stakeholder landscape, Phase 03 shifts the focus toward the identification and assessment of risks, sensitivities, and trauma-related issues associated with the site. This engagement with content, however, is deliberately conducted without direct interaction with the wider population. The defining feature of Phase 03 lies in its preventive and protective function. Before activating any form of in-depth engagement with people, the CPD requires a careful evaluation of the potential consequences of addressing dissonant, conflictual, or traumatic issues in a public or community-wide context. Phase 03 is therefore designed to identify which aspects of the site and its history may still be sensitive, contested, or emotionally charged, and to assess the risks associated with different forms of inquiry, representation, or dialogue. To achieve this objective, Phase 03 is articulated into two distinct and sequential sub-phases, each characterized by a specific form of interlocution and analytical focus. Phase 03.1 — Emotive and Trauma Issues is dedicated to the identification of sensitivities and potential sources of harm, drawing on the mediated and reflective inputs of institutions and associations. Phase 03.2 — Expert-Based Validation and Guidance subsequently introduces an external and critical perspective, aimed at validating, contextualizing, and refining the risks identified in the previous step through expert knowledge and comparative insight. The sequential ordering of these two moments is intentional, as the identification of risks and sensitivities must precede their critical assessment and methodological framing. At this stage of the CPD, engagement is intentionally limited to institutions, associations, and experts, while direct interaction with people is postponed. This methodological choice reflects an ethical precaution: engaging people

Phase 03 — Assessing the Existing Dissonance represents a critical methodological transition within the CPD, as it marks the moment in which the research process begins to engage explicitly with the substantive content of dissonance. While the previous phases were primarily concerned with building a knowledge base and structuring the stakeholder landscape, Phase 03 shifts the focus toward the identification and assessment of risks, sensitivities, and trauma-related issues associated with the site. This engagement with content, however, is deliberately conducted without direct interaction with the wider population. The defining feature of Phase 03 lies in its preventive and protective function. Before activating any form of in-depth engagement with people, the CPD requires a careful evaluation of the potential consequences of addressing dissonant, conflictual, or traumatic issues in a public or community-wide context. Phase 03 is therefore designed to identify which aspects of the site and its history may still be sensitive, contested, or emotionally charged, and to assess the risks associated with different forms of inquiry, representation, or dialogue. To achieve this objective, Phase 03 is articulated into two distinct and sequential sub-phases, each characterized by a specific form of interlocution and analytical focus. Phase 03.1 — Emotive and Trauma Issues is dedicated to the identification of sensitivities and potential sources of harm, drawing on the mediated and reflective inputs of institutions and associations. Phase 03.2 — Expert-Based Validation and Guidance subsequently introduces an external and critical perspective, aimed at validating, contextualizing, and refining the risks identified in the previous step through expert knowledge and comparative insight. The sequential ordering of these two moments is intentional, as the identification of risks and sensitivities must precede their critical assessment and methodological framing.

At this stage of the CPD, engagement is intentionally limited to institutions, associations, and experts, while direct interaction with people is postponed. This methodological choice reflects an ethical precaution: engaging people without prior awareness of existing traumas, unresolved conflicts, or social sensitivities may expose participants to harm, re-traumatization, or symbolic violence. Before activating broader participation, it is therefore essential to understand how similar issues have been addressed in the past, how the community has reacted to previous initiatives, which topics remain active or unresolved, and which forms of questioning or engagement may be

Community Process Diagram CPD

inappropriate, counterproductive, or ethically problematic. Phase 03 thus functions as a preparatory threshold within the CPD. It does not aim to resolve dissonance or to collect perceptions, but to create the conditions under which subsequent engagement can occur responsibly. By identifying zones of sensitivity, potential risks, and necessary precautions, this phase ensures that later interactions with people are grounded in contextual knowledge, ethical awareness, and methodological care, reinforcing the overall robustness and integrity of the research process.

Phase 03.1 — Emotive and Trauma Issues

Phase 03.1 is dedicated to the identification of emotive issues, traumas, and sensitivities associated with the dissonance under investigation. The objective of this sub-phase is to understand which aspects of the site, its history, or its representation may still generate strong emotional reactions, social tension, or conflict within the community.

To achieve this, the research process engages institutions and associations, as well as selected community representatives where appropriate, drawing on their experience, historical memory, and institutional knowledge. The focus is not on collecting personal testimonies from people, but on understanding collective reactions and past experiences related to similar engagements. Although this sub-phase addresses community-related dynamics, it does not aim to collect direct perceptions or lived experiences from people; rather, it focuses on identifying risks, sensitivities, and potential sources of trauma through mediated and reflective inputs provided by institutions, associations, and past collective reactions.

Guiding/Core Questions for Phase 03.1

Which aspects of the site or its history are considered particularly sensitive or traumatic?

The guiding questions for this sub-phase are intended to support a careful and preliminary identification of sensitive, traumatic, or critical aspects related to the site and its history. Rather than collecting direct testimonies or personal narratives, this moment of inquiry is designed to understand which elements of the dissonance require particular caution before engaging more broadly with the community. A first set of questions focuses on identifying which aspects of the site, its past, or its representations are considered particularly sensitive or traumatic. This includes exploring whether these traumas are still active or unresolved within the community, or whether they persist as latent tensions that may be reactivated under certain conditions. Attention is given to understanding how such issues are embedded in collective memory and whether they continue to influence contemporary perceptions and behaviours.

Further questions address past experiences of public engagement. They seek to understand how the community has reacted when these topics were previously addressed through exhibitions, commemorations, public debates, or institutional initiatives. Particular emphasis is placed on identifying whether earlier actions triggered conflict, resistance, polarization, or emotional distress, as these reactions provide important indicators of risk and vulnerability. The inquiry also aims to clarify which questions, themes, or narratives should be handled with special care, moderated, or temporarily avoided at this stage of the research. Conversely, it considers which topics might be addressed later in the process, and under which conditions—such as the presence of mediation, expert support, or specific communicative strategies—this could occur safely and responsibly.

Overall, these questions are not intended to define the content of future engagement, but to delineate zones of sensitivity and attention. By identifying main issues and critical points at this stage, the research process can be calibrated to avoid harm, reduce the risk of reactivating trauma, and design subsequent phases of dialogue and consultation in a way that is ethically informed, context-aware, and methodologically robust.

For clarity and operational use, the core inquiry of Phase 03.1 is articulated through the following guiding questions, which make explicit the analytical dimensions outlined above and support the identification of sensitive, traumatic, and critical issues requiring particular care in subsequent Phases of the CPD:

- Which aspects of the site or its history are considered particularly sensitive or traumatic?
- Are these sensitive or traumatic aspects still active or unresolved within the community?
- Do some issues persist as latent tensions that may be reactivated under specific conditions?
- How are these sensitive issues embedded in collective memory?
- Do these aspects continue to influence contemporary perceptions, attitudes, or behaviours?
- How has the community reacted in the past when these topics were addressed publicly?
- Have previous exhibitions, commemorations, public debates, or institutional initiatives triggered conflict, resistance, polarization, or emotional distress?
- Which questions, themes, or narratives appear to require particular caution or moderation at this stage of the research?
- Are there topics that should be temporarily avoided in early phases of engagement?
- Which sensitive issues might be addressed at a later stage of the process, and under which conditions?
- Would mediation, expert support, or specific communicative strategies be required to address certain topics safely?
- What indicators suggest potential emotional, social, or ethical risks associated with engaging the community on these issues?

Community Process Diagram CPD

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase 03.1 represents a threshold within the Community Process Diagram. Its role is not to deepen participation, expand perception analysis, or collect additional narratives, but to actively prevent methodological harm before broader engagement with people is initiated. This sub-phase is

conceived as a protective filter that interrupts the progressive opening of the process in order to assess whether, how, and under which conditions engagement with dissonant content may occur.

It is therefore essential to clarify what Phase O3.1 is not. It is not a phase of participation, nor a phase of testimony collection. It does not aim to give voice to communities, to gather lived experiences, or to document memory. Any attempt to treat this phase as an opportunity for expression would contradict its core function and risk exposing interlocutors to emotional distress, re-traumatization, or symbolic violence. Phase O3.1 does not seek to “understand dissonance better” through additional data, but to identify which aspects of dissonance must be approached with caution—or temporarily avoided—in subsequent phases.

For this reason, engagement in Phase O3.1 is intentionally limited to institutions, associations, and specific mediating figures who possess contextual knowledge of past conflicts, public reactions, and unresolved sensitivities. Direct interaction with people is deliberately postponed. The objective is to reconstruct a collective and historical awareness of trauma and sensitivity without activating personal exposure. Semi-structured interviews (IN-O2) constitute the core methodological tool of this sub-phase. These interviews are conducted with institutional representatives, association leaders, and community mediators who are familiar with the site’s history and with previous public or semi-public engagements. The interviews are explicitly framed to discourage personal testimony and instead focus on identifying sensitive topics, critical moments, and known reactions. Interlocutors are asked to reflect on how the community has responded in the past to exhibitions, commemorations, debates, or institutional initiatives, and to identify which themes have generated conflict, resistance, or silence. The flexibility of the semi-structured format allows the researcher to adapt questioning to different interlocutors while maintaining a clear focus on risk identification rather than narrative production. Group meetings and focus groups (GR-O1) may be activated selectively when working with associations or organized community groups. In this context, the group setting is not used to stimulate dialogue or confrontation, but to observe how sensitive issues are collectively framed, normalized, or avoided. The researcher’s role is strongly facilitative and observational, aimed at detecting patterns of agreement, discomfort, polarization, or withdrawal that signal potential risk zones. The selection of tools in Phase O3.1 is therefore guided by a negative

logic: tools are chosen not for their capacity to produce data, but for their ability to reveal limits, thresholds, and points of fragility within the research process itself. In this sense, Phase 03.1 does not expand the inquiry but deliberately constrains it.

Risks associated with Phase 03.1 interactions

Despite its precautionary design, Phase 03.1 involves specific methodological and ethical risks that must be explicitly acknowledged. Engagement with institutional and associative interlocutors may unintentionally reproduce dominant or already legitimized narratives, thereby obscuring less visible, informal, or marginalized forms of trauma and sensitivity. In collective settings, shared frames of interpretation may normalize silence, discourage the articulation of dissenting or uncomfortable sensitivities, or implicitly establish boundaries around what can be said and what remains unspeakable. Additional risks emerge in relation to the possible, highly controlled use of Oral Memory Interviews (IN-04). Even when activated only in exceptional cases and under carefully defined conditions, memory-based tools may inadvertently reactivate emotional distress, surface narratives that exceed the intended scope of risk assessment, or generate expectations of further engagement and recognition. Such effects may blur the boundary between identifying sensitivities and collecting testimonies, potentially exposing both participants and the research process to unintended forms of symbolic or emotional harm. For these reasons, all materials and indications produced in Phase 03.1 are treated as provisional, non-conclusive, and context-dependent. They are not considered substantive research outcomes, but rather signals of potential risk, sensitivity, or fragility within the process itself. To prevent premature stabilization, misinterpretation, or overexposure, these findings are explicitly subjected to expert-based validation in Phase 03.2, where they are critically assessed, contextualized, and, if necessary, recalibrated before any subsequent phase of perception analysis or on-site engagement is activated.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 03.2 — Expert-Based Validation and Guidance

Phase 03.2 — Expert-Based Validation and Guidance represents the second and concluding moment of Phase 03 and is entirely dedicated to expert-based validation and methodological guidance. In contrast to Phase 03.1, which focused on collecting risk-related insights from institutions and associations, this sub-phase involves exclusively experts, whose role is to critically assess, validate, and contextualize the findings previously collected. Graphically, this phase is positioned in the lower section of the CPD, reinforcing its function as a verification and validation layer. The decision to engage experts only after interacting with institutions and associations is both methodological and ethical. It reflects the principle that expert validation should not precede, but rather follow, the identification of sensitivities emerging from actors who are directly embedded in and affected by the dissonant context. Phase 03.2 therefore functions as a transition point within the CPD. It bridges insights gathered from the local and directly involved context with a broader analytical and comparative perspective, and prepares the research process for subsequent phases of direct engagement with people.

Guiding/Core Questions for Phase 03.2

How to approach the community?

This guiding question is a direct declination of the overarching inquiry of Phase 03 and focuses on translating identified risks and sensitivities into concrete and responsible strategies for community engagement. It frames Phase 03.2 as a moment of methodological decision-making rather than data collection, emphasizing the need to critically assess how the research process should proceed before engaging people directly.

In this context, experts are invited to reflect on whether the risks and sensitivities identified in Phase 03.1 are adequately defined and properly contextualized, and whether the collected insights correspond to known patterns of trauma and dissonance observed in similar contexts. Particular attention is given to identifying elements that may require further caution, reframing, or mediation before any direct engagement with people takes place. Experts are also asked to consider which topics can be addressed openly and which should instead be approached through indirect or mediated strategies.

The reflection further extends to methodological choices, including the identification of the most appropriate tools from the Community Toolkit for the next stages of the process, as well as considerations related to language, tone, and framing when addressing trauma and dissonance. Finally, experts are encouraged to draw on methodological precedents and best practices that may inform the design of subsequent phases. Together, these reflections support a critical validation of the Preliminary Risk List while simultaneously projecting the research process toward the next stages of engagement in a cautious, informed, and methodologically grounded manner. For clarity and operational use, the core inquiry of Phase 03.2 is articulated through the following guiding questions:

- Are the risks and sensitivities identified in Phase 03.1 adequately defined and sufficiently clear?
- Are these risks properly contextualized in relation to the specific historical, social, cultural, and political context of the site?
- Do the identified sensitivities correspond to known patterns of trauma and dissonance observed in similar contexts?
- Are there elements that require additional caution, reframing, or mediation before any direct engagement with people takes place?
- Which topics can be addressed openly in subsequent phases of the CPD?
- Which topics should instead be approached through indirect, mediated, or deferred strategies?
- Are there themes or narratives that should be postponed to later stages of the research process?
- Which forms of questioning, representation, or engagement may be inappropriate or potentially harmful at this stage?
- What methodological strategies can be adopted to reduce the risk of re-traumatization or symbolic violence?
- Which tools from the Community Toolkit are most appropriate for the next stages of the process, given the identified risks and sensitivities?
- What considerations regarding language, tone, framing, and mediation should guide future engagement with people?
- Are there methodological precedents or best practices from comparable contexts that can inform the design of subsequent phases?

Community Process Diagram CPD

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase O3.2 is developed through a set of tools specifically suited to expert-based validation, critical reflection, and methodological guidance. At this stage, tools are not used to generate new perceptions of the site, but rather to assess, verify, and contextualize the risks and sensitivities identified in Phase O3.1, and to support informed decisions on how to proceed with subsequent community engagement. The primary tool activated in this phase is IN-O2 Semi-structured interviews, whose flexibility allows experts to engage critically with the Preliminary Risk List by validating or questioning the identified issues and offering nuanced interpretations grounded in their disciplinary expertise. This tool is particularly effective for addressing complex topics such as trauma, memory, religious or political sensitivity, and conflict dynamics, as it provides space for explanation, comparison with similar contexts, and reflection on the potential consequences of community engagement. When Phase O3.2 is structured as a collective moment, GR-O5 Multispeaker debate may also be employed to allow different experts to confront and compare their perspectives within a moderated setting. This approach is especially valuable for identifying convergences and divergences among disciplinary viewpoints and for discussing how different forms of dissonance may require distinct communicative or methodological approaches. Through structured debate, the research process benefits from a shared critical assessment of risks and from the emergence of collective recommendations. In addition, analytical tools such as MA-O5 Extremes and mainstreams support experts in assessing whether the risks and sensitivities identified in earlier phases reflect broader patterns or are disproportionately influenced by extreme or highly polarized positions. By mapping extremes and mainstreams, experts can help determine whether certain reactions or narratives should be considered representative, marginal, or potentially misleading, contributing to a more balanced understanding of dissonance and preventing the overemphasis of outlier positions when designing future engagement strategies. Finally, MA-O4 Mind mapping is used as a synthesis and structuring tool that allows experts to organize key concepts, sensitive themes, linguistic cautions, and methodological recommendations emerging from validation discussions. This process supports the translation of expert insights into a coherent framework capable of guiding the formulation of questions, the selection of tools, and the communicative tone adopted in

subsequent phases involving people. Taken together, these tools support the transformation of expert feedback into a validated and operational framework, enabling the research process to move from the identification of risks toward the definition of concrete strategies for engaging with communities, and ensuring that subsequent phases are informed by critical validation, ethical awareness, and methodological coherence.

Risks associated with Phase 03.2 interactions

Phase 03.2 also entails specific risks. Expert perspectives may introduce external biases or disciplinary assumptions that obscure local specificity. Multispeaker debates may reproduce hierarchies within the expert field itself. Comparative reasoning may lead to analogies that oversimplify the case. Finally, the simulation of tools may generate an illusion of control over complex social dynamics. For these reasons, expert input is treated as a guiding and corrective resource rather than as a prescriptive authority.

Outcome #03.2 — Validated Risk Framework and Engagement Guidelines

The completion of Phase 03.2 results in a consolidated document that simultaneously fulfills two complementary functions. On the one hand, it provides a clear and structured identification of the main traumas, sensitivities, and critical issues associated with the community and the dissonance under investigation. On the other hand, it offers a set of validated suggestions, objectives, and areas of attention that are intended to guide the subsequent phases of the CPD. This document synthesizes expert-based validation with insights emerging from previous interactions with institutions and associations, transforming risk awareness into actionable methodological guidance. It highlights which themes require particular care, which topics may be addressed more openly, and which forms of engagement or questioning should be postponed, reframed, or mediated. In doing so, it supports the transition from risk assessment to the design of responsible and context-sensitive community engagement strategies. Rather than functioning as a prescriptive manual, this outcome is conceived as a reference framework that prepares the research process for the following phases. It clarifies priorities, defines zones of attention,

Community Process Diagram CPD

and outlines potential objectives for engaging with people, ensuring that subsequent interactions are informed by an explicit understanding of trauma, dissonance, and social sensitivity.

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase O3.2 represents the moment in which the research process deliberately steps back from the field and introduces an external layer of critical validation. Its purpose is not to resolve identified risks, nor to prescribe engagement strategies, but to assess whether the sensitivities and traumas identified in Phase O3.1 are adequately framed and whether the research process is methodologically prepared to proceed.

Phase O3.2 introduces a reflective and corrective moment in which the research process itself becomes the object of evaluation. It does not extend stakeholder engagement, nor does it provide a space for negotiation, conflict arbitration, or the legitimization of specific narratives. For this reason, Phase O3.2 involves exclusively experts, selected for their disciplinary competence and comparative experience in fields such as dissonant heritage, trauma studies, memory studies, conflict mediation, sociology, anthropology, or heritage conservation. These experts are not engaged as representatives of positions related to the site, but as external observers whose role is to provide analytical distance and methodological oversight. Semi-structured interviews (IN-O2) remain the primary tool in this phase, but their function is explicitly redefined. Interviews are oriented toward validation rather than exploration. Experts are invited to review the Preliminary Risk List and to assess whether identified issues are relevant, missing, overemphasized, or insufficiently contextualized. They are encouraged to draw on comparable cases and theoretical frameworks rather than to offer operational solutions. When multiple expert perspectives are involved, multispeaker debates (GR-O5) are activated to support structured confrontation. These moderated discussions make disagreements explicit and prevent the silent consolidation of a single interpretative framework. The debate format is particularly important in contexts where risks relate to politically, religiously, or emotionally charged narratives. A distinctive feature of Phase O3.2 is the explicit redefinition of certain tools as instruments of simulation and reflection rather than production. Peer Observing Peers (OB-O4) is introduced exclusively as an indirect reference tool. It is not activated as a participatory method and does

not involve new forms of observation or documentation. Instead, experts draw on documented cases, prior research, or professional experience to reflect on how visibility, self-representation, and internal observation tend to operate in comparable contexts. This allows the identification of structural risks of overexposure, exclusion, or misrepresentation without activating those risks in the field. Phase 03.2 is explicitly iterative and non-conclusive. Expert validation does not function as an authoritative verdict but as a decision point. If significant gaps or misalignments are identified, the CPD requires a return to earlier phases. In this sense, Phase 03.2 reinforces the idea that some tools may be deliberately excluded or delayed, not because they are inadequate, but because their activation at a given moment would be methodologically or ethically inappropriate.

Community Process Diagram CPD

PHASE 03 — Outcome

Contextualized Risk and Sensitivity Framework

The overall outcome of Phase 03 is the Contextualized Risk and Sensitivity Framework, a structured and validated analytical resource conceived to clarify the conditions under which engagement with dissonant heritage may proceed responsibly. This outcome constitutes a critical threshold within the Community Process Diagram (CPD), as it does not extend the investigation of dissonance, but deliberately suspends its progression in order to assess risks, sensitivities, and potential harm before deeper perceptual analysis or on-site engagement is activated. The Framework does not aim to resolve conflict, trauma, or dissonance, nor to define strategies of intervention. Its function is to make explicit the limits, constraints, and conditions of possibility that must govern subsequent phases of the process.

The genesis of the Contextualized Risk and Sensitivity Framework reflects the specific logic of Phase 03. It is produced through the synthesis of mediated inputs collected during Phase 03.1, involving institutions, associations, and contextual mediators with knowledge of past conflicts, public reactions, and unresolved sensitivities, and through their subsequent critical validation during Phase 03.2 by experts selected for their disciplinary competence and comparative experience. Throughout

this phase, the research process deliberately avoids direct engagement with people and refrains from collecting testimonies, experiential narratives, or embodied perceptions. The objective is not to gather additional knowledge about dissonance, but to identify which dimensions of the site, its history, or its representation may activate emotional distress, symbolic violence, political escalation, or ethical failure if approached prematurely or without adequate mediation. The Contextualized Risk and Sensitivity Framework therefore does not function as a catalogue of problems to be addressed or as a definitive mapping of trauma. It operates instead as an analytical filter that transforms warnings, silences, historical awareness, and expert judgment into explicit methodological constraints. Its primary objective is to determine whether, how, and under which limits subsequent phases of the CPD may proceed, and which forms of engagement must be delayed, reframed, or excluded at the current stage of the process. Within the overall logic of the CPD, this outcome performs a protective and enabling role. By clarifying thresholds of exposure and zones of heightened sensitivity, it conditions the scope of perceptual investigation in Phase 04, informs the calibration of on-site engagement strategies in Phase 05, and provides a critical reference for the strategic reflections developed in the subsequent phases of the Co.Co.War Handbook. While the Handbook addresses how strategies for intervention, conservation, transformation, or communication may be articulated, the Contextualized Risk and Sensitivity Framework ensures that such strategies are formulated within clearly articulated ethical and methodological boundaries. In this sense, the outcome functions as a necessary interface between analytical inquiry and strategic orientation, preserving continuity between understanding and action without collapsing one into the other. The Contextualized Risk and Sensitivity Framework is conceived as an autonomous and downloadable document composed of a limited number of core analytical instruments, considered essential for its usability by other researchers, practitioners, or institutions. Among these, three instruments are regarded as fundamental. For further information it is advised to check the *Co.Co.War Handbook: Managing Dissonant Heritage*, where detailed information regarding the assessment of risks and sensitivities are described.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Risk and Sensitivity Map

The first component is the Risk and Sensitivity Map, conceived as a synthetic analytical representation that organizes the main zones of fragility, sensitivity, and potential harm identified during Phase O3. This instrument does not locate risks spatially, nor does it attribute responsibility to specific actors. Instead, it visualizes thematic and symbolic concentrations of risk, allowing the research process to grasp how different forms of sensitivity intersect, overlap, or reinforce one another. The Risk and Sensitivity Map may include references to traumatic events, contested symbols, silenced narratives, unresolved historical conflicts, or patterns of avoidance, without transforming them into objects of engagement. Its function is to preserve awareness of what must be approached with caution, rather than to stabilize interpretation or generate actionable content. This representation is explicitly interpretative, provisional, and context-dependent. It is intended to support internal methodological decision-making rather than public communication or restitution.

Exposure Threshold Diagram

The second core component is the Exposure Threshold Diagram, an analytical device designed to translate identified risks and sensitivities into operational thresholds of exposure. This diagram clarifies which degrees of engagement are acceptable, which are conditional, and which are inadmissible at a given moment of the process. The diagram is structured along two axes: the horizontal axis represents the degree of exposure, ranging from mediated or indirect engagement to direct, embodied, or public exposure, while the vertical axis represents the level of risk, ranging from low to high. The Exposure Threshold Diagram does not prescribe engagement strategies or define permanent exclusions. It functions instead as a situational decision-support tool that allows the research process to justify delays, exclusions, or the sequencing of tools and interactions in a transparent and accountable manner, while acknowledging that thresholds may shift as the process evolves.

Tool Eligibility Matrix

The third core component is the Tool Eligibility Matrix, which translates identified risks and exposure thresholds into explicit methodological consequences. This matrix establishes which tools from the Community Toolkit may be activated, which may be activated only under specific conditions, and which must be excluded at the current stage of the process. It is structured as a traffic-light system in which rows correspond to tools or categories of tools and columns indicate their eligibility status. The Tool Eligibility Matrix is explicitly non-prescriptive. It does not define how tools should be applied, nor does it anticipate future phases or strategic decisions. Its function is to ensure that methodological choices remain consistent with the ethical and analytical constraints identified in Phase O3, preventing premature exposure, re-traumatization, or symbolic violence.

Taken together, the Risk and Sensitivity Map, the Exposure Threshold Diagram, and the Tool Eligibility Matrix constitute the core of the Contextualized Risk and Sensitivity Framework. They enable the research process, and any subsequent user of the Toolkit, to understand where risks are concentrated, how exposure must be calibrated, and which methodological actions are admissible at a given moment. The Contextualized Risk and Sensitivity Framework does not conclude the assessment of dissonance, nor does it resolve conflict or trauma. It functions instead as a protective reference point, designed to accompany subsequent phases of the CPD and to inform strategic reflection within the Co.Co.War Handbook, ensuring that further investigation and intervention proceed within clearly articulated limits while acknowledging uncertainty, fragility, and incompleteness as constitutive conditions of dissonant heritage contexts

PHASE

04

Dissonance Perception


Phase 04 is dedicated to the investigation of how dissonance and disvalue are perceived, represented, and articulated at different scales and through different forms of mediation. Its objective is not to reconcile perceptions, to establish shared meanings, or to reduce conflict, but to make perceptual plurality, asymmetry, and divergence analytically visible. In this sense, Phase 04 does not function as a space of dialogue or negotiation, but as a phase of documentation and critical observation of how meaning is constructed around dissonant heritage. Dissonance is understood here primarily as a perceptual condition rather than as an intrinsic property of the site. It emerges through narratives, representations, memories, silences, and discursive framings that circulate across different social, cultural, and spatial distances. For this reason, Phase 04 deliberately avoids any attempt to synthesize perceptions into a coherent or consensual narrative. Instead, it focuses on identifying contrasts, overlaps, gaps, and misalignments between different perceptual layers, acknowledging that these tensions are constitutive of dissonant heritage rather than obstacles to be resolved. A defining methodological principle of Phase 04 is the clear separation between perception and experience. At this stage of the Community Process Diagram, the research process does not engage with the site as an embodied or spatial environment. No on-site activities, sensory exposure, or experiential tools are activated. This separation is not accidental, but intentional: engaging spatially with the site before perceptual framings have been documented and


Community

Process Diagram

CPD

critically examined would risk collapsing mediated narratives and embodied reactions into an undifferentiated experiential field. Phase 04 therefore operates at a distance, preserving the analytical distinction between how the site is imagined, remembered, narrated, or represented, and how it will later be physically encountered. To maintain this separation, Phase 04 distinguishes between different scales and modalities of perception. International and translocal representations are examined as mediated cultural constructs shaped by distance, translation, institutional framing, and disciplinary paradigms. Local perceptions are investigated through mediated interaction, focusing on how dissonance and disvalue are narrated, recalled, or discussed rather than directly experienced. Finally, researcher-led analytical consolidation provides a controlled space in which these heterogeneous materials can be compared, structured, and critically assessed without imposing hierarchy or consensus. Throughout Phase 04, perceptual plurality is treated as an analytical resource rather than as a problem to be managed. Divergent perceptions are not evaluated in terms of accuracy, legitimacy, or moral adequacy. Instead, they are documented as situated positions shaped by positionality, memory, power relations, and forms of mediation. By making asymmetries explicit—between global and local narratives, institutional and informal framings, dominant and marginal voices—Phase 04 creates the conditions for a more informed and cautious engagement with the site in its spatial and embodied dimension. The outcomes of Phase 04 do not provide design guidelines, communicative strategies, or operational recommendations. They function instead as a perceptual map that highlights zones of tension, silence, polarization, and ambiguity. This map does not anticipate or constrain the interpretation of spatial experience, but prepares the methodological ground for Phase 05, where dissonance will be encountered through direct interaction with the built environment. In this way, Phase 04 acts as a critical buffer between mediated perception and embodied experience, ensuring that on-site engagement is approached with awareness of the perceptual landscape that precedes it.





Phase 04 - Dissonance Perception, CPD Diagram.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 04 Dissonance Perception

Phase 04 is dedicated to the investigation of dissonance perception and, more broadly, to the analysis of how disvalue is constructed, represented, and experienced in relation to the site. While the previous phases focused on structuring the research process, identifying stakeholders, and assessing risks and sensitivities, Phase 04 shifts attention toward the perceptual dimension of dissonance.

This phase is articulated into four sub-phases that are addressed progressively. A key methodological distinction structures this phase: the first two sub-phases investigate perception through indirect or mediated sources, asking what is known, represented, and imagined about the site without direct engagement; the latter two sub-phases focus on direct interaction with communities and interlocutors, and whenever possible involve activities carried out on-site. This distinction reflects the need to separate perceptions formed at a distance from those emerging through physical presence, lived experience, and direct interaction with the site.

Phase 04 therefore combines analytical observation and situated engagement. Its purpose is to compare different perceptual scales and to understand whether representations of dissonance converge or diverge when moving from international imaginaries to site-based and community-based perceptions.

Phase 04 is composed of three interconnected sub-phases that together structure a gradual and iterative process of stakeholder identification, validation, and verification:

- Phase 04.1 — International Site Perception
- Phase 04.2 — Community Perception of (dis)value
- Phase 04.3 — Cross-Analysis and Researchers' Validation of Perception Data

The proposed structure reflects a gradual transition from indirect forms of perception to direct, embodied, and emotional engagement with the site. Titles remain provisional and may be refined as the research develops. This structure reflects a progressive movement from mediated and distant forms of perception toward a critically validated understanding of dissonance across perceptual scales. Rather than separating perception into abstract categories such as “imaginary,” “state,” or “emotions,” Phase 04 is organized around analytically distinct but interrelated levels of perception. The final sub-phase ensures methodological robustness by introducing a moment of researcher-led validation before the process moves toward on-site interaction and embodied engagement in Phase 05.

Phase 04.1 — International Site Perception

Phase 04.1 is dedicated to the investigation of the international perception of the site, understood as the set of representations, narratives, and imaginaries circulating beyond the local context. This sub-phase explores how the site is framed at an international scale and how dissonance and disvalue are acknowledged, transformed, neutralized, or omitted within global representations. Compared to the earlier formulation of this phase, Phase 04.1 is no longer conceived as a purely observational and desk-based activity. Instead, it is structured around two parallel and complementary lines of inquiry. On the one hand, the phase includes an autonomous analytical investigation conducted by the researcher through mediated sources. On the other hand, it introduces a targeted involvement of experts, whose role is to critically interpret and contextualize international representations of the site.

The objective of this dual approach is not only to document how the site appears in international discourse, but also to understand how such representations are produced, stabilized, and legitimized. By combining autonomous observation with expert reflection, Phase 04.1 moves beyond a descriptive inventory of sources and becomes an interpretative framework capable of identifying dominant narratives, blind spots, and distortions in the international imaginary.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Guiding/Core Question for Phase 04.1

What is the international perception of the site in relation to dissonance and disvalue?

This guiding question frames Phase 04.1 as an exploratory investigation of how the site is perceived from outside its immediate cultural, social, and geographical context, and how dissonance is positioned within international narratives. The core guiding question is articulated through a set of complementary inquiries that orient both autonomous research and expert engagement. These questions include how the site is represented in international online sources, media, and academic literature; which aspects of the site are emphasized, celebrated, or aestheticized, and which are omitted or marginalized; whether dissonance is explicitly addressed, reframed into neutral narratives, or entirely removed; whether dissonance contributes to the visibility or notoriety of the site at an international level; and whether traumatic, conflict-related, or controversial dimensions are acknowledged or erased. Particular attention is also given to identifying discrepancies between official narratives and alternative or informal representations, as well as tensions between heritage valorization and the silencing of disvalue.

These questions support the identification of dominant international imaginaries and help clarify how disvalue is constructed, diluted, or concealed at a distance.

For clarity and operational use, the core inquiry of Phase 04.1 is articulated through the following guiding questions, which make explicit the analytical dimensions outlined above and support the investigation of international imaginaries and representations of dissonance and disvalue:

- How is the site represented in international online sources, media, and academic literature?
- Which narratives, images, or interpretative frames dominate international representations of the site?
- Which aspects of the site are emphasized, celebrated, or aestheticized at an international level?
- Which dimensions of the site are marginalized, simplified, or omitted in international representations?

- Is dissonance explicitly addressed in international narratives, or is it reframed into neutral or valorizing accounts?
- Are elements of disvalue, conflict, or discomfort diluted or removed in global representations?
- Does dissonance contribute to the international visibility, notoriety, or symbolic value of the site?
- Are traumatic, conflict-related, or controversial dimensions acknowledged, downplayed, or erased?
- Are there discrepancies between official or institutional narratives and alternative, informal, or non-official representations at an international scale?
- Do international representations reveal tensions between heritage valorization and the silencing of disvalue?
- How do distance, mediation, and cultural framing influence the construction of international imaginaries of the site?
- What patterns of omission, simplification, or narrative displacement emerge across different international sources?

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase 04.1 represents the moment in which the research process addresses dissonance perception at an international and mediated scale. Its purpose is not to understand how the site is experienced locally, nor to engage actors connected to the site, but to reconstruct how the site circulates, is represented, and is framed beyond its immediate context. This sub-phase provides a distant perceptual baseline that allows the research process to later distinguish between international imaginaries and locally situated perceptions.

Rather than engaging communities or validating international narratives, Phase 04.1 operates as an analytical space in which mediated perceptions are examined as cultural constructs shaped by distance, translation, and disciplinary or institutional frameworks. For this reason, it does not seek to assess the accuracy, legitimacy, or ethical adequacy of global representations. For this reason, Phase 04.1 does not involve institutions, associations, communities, or people connected to the site. Engagement is limited to autonomous observation and expert interpretation. The exclusion of local actors is intentional and prevents premature comparison or contamination between global and local perceptual layers. The primary tool

Community Process Diagram CPD

activated in Phase 04.1 is OB-03 Netnography / Online Observation. This tool is used to observe and document how the site is represented across international digital environments, including institutional and cultural websites, academic publications, online archives, press articles, and social media platforms. The analysis focuses on dominant narrative frames, recurring visual tropes, keywords, and interpretative patterns, as well as on omissions, silences, and strategies of neutralization or aestheticization of dissonance and disvalue. Netnography is applied in a non-participatory manner, without interaction with content producers, and according to explicit criteria of language scope and temporal range.

Autonomous observation is complemented by expert interpretation through IN-02 Semi-structured Interviews. Experts are selected for their experience with dissonant heritage in international contexts and are invited to critically interpret the representations identified through netnography. Their role is not to provide new empirical data about the site, but to situate international narratives within broader disciplinary, cultural, or ideological paradigms and to identify recurring biases or blind spots. When multiple expert perspectives are involved, GR-05 Multispeaker Debate may be activated to support structured comparison. This tool allows convergences and divergences in expert interpretation to emerge explicitly and prevents the silent consolidation of a single analytical perspective.

Risks associated with Phase 04.1 interactions

Phase 04.1 entails a series of interrelated risks. At an epistemological level, there is a risk of conflating visibility with relevance: highly visible international narratives may be mistaken for dominant or representative interpretations, while less visible or non-digitalized perspectives remain excluded. There is also a risk of linguistic and cultural bias, as international representations are often mediated through a limited number of dominant languages and heritage paradigms. At a methodological level, netnography may privilege polished, institutionalized, or curated representations, reproducing processes of aestheticization or depoliticization of dissonance. The absence of explicit references to conflict or trauma may be misinterpreted as their absence, rather than as the result of silencing or narrative displacement. From an analytical perspective, expert interpretation may introduce disciplinary assumptions that normalize certain framings of dissonance

while marginalizing others. Multispeaker debates may reinforce dominant academic voices, reproducing hierarchies within the expert field itself. For these reasons, the outcomes of Phase O4.1 are treated strictly as analytical references. They are not used to validate or invalidate local perceptions, but to establish a comparative framework that will later be confronted with mediated and on-site perceptions.

Raw Data and Data Results

The application of these tools generates raw data in the form of collected digital materials, excerpts, visual references, expert interview notes, and discussion records. These materials are then organized, compared, and interpreted to produce data results that articulate the dominant international imaginaries of the site, the role assigned to dissonance within them, and the mechanisms through which disvalue is emphasized, neutralized, or erased. At this stage, data results are conceived as an intermediate analytical layer that prepares the ground for subsequent phases. They do not function as a standalone conclusion, but as a reference framework against which local, community-based, and on-site perceptions will be compared in Phase O4.2 and beyond.

Outcome #O4.1 — International Site Perception Framework

The work carried out during Phase O4.1 leads to the production of an outcome dedicated to the reconstruction and interpretation of the international perception of the site. This outcome is conceived as a structured and analytical document that synthesizes how the site is represented, narrated, and interpreted beyond the local context, with specific attention to the presence, transformation, or removal of dissonance and disvalue. Given the revised structure of Phase O4.1, this outcome is generated through two complementary and concurrent lines of inquiry. The first line is based on autonomous, desk-based research conducted by the researcher, while the second line involves targeted consultation with experts whose field of study or professional practice engages with dissonant heritage at an international level. The outcome therefore integrates both mediated representations and expert-informed interpretations, avoiding a purely descriptive or passive reading

of international imaginaries. From the autonomous research perspective, the outcome draws on the systematic observation of international digital environments, including online media, academic publications, institutional websites, digital archives, and cultural platforms. These materials allow the identification of dominant narratives, recurring images, keywords, and interpretative frames through which the site is presented internationally. Particular attention is given to whether dissonance is explicitly addressed, reframed into neutral or celebratory narratives, or entirely overshadowed by architectural, aesthetic, or historical values. Absences, silences, and inconsistencies are considered as significant as explicit statements, as they often indicate strategies of neutralization or removal of disvalue.

At the same time, the outcome integrates insights derived from expert-based engagement. Selected experts—such as scholars, heritage professionals, curators, historians, or practitioners with international experience—are invited to reflect on the site’s international perception from their disciplinary and contextual standpoint. This expert involvement is not aimed at collecting new data on the site itself, but at critically interpreting how international narratives are constructed, circulated, and legitimized. Experts are asked to comment on whether the representations identified through desk-based research correspond to broader international patterns, disciplinary biases, or cultural frameworks, and to identify potential blind spots or distortions in the prevailing imaginaries. The tools activated in Phase 04.1 therefore include OB-03 Netnography / Online Observation as the primary instrument for collecting mediated representations, complemented by IN-02 Semi-structured interviews adapted to expert consultation. In some cases, GR-05 Multispeaker debate may also be employed to facilitate collective reflection among experts, allowing different disciplinary perspectives to be compared and discussed. Analytical tools such as MA-04 Mind mapping may be used during the synthesis phase to organize narratives, themes, and interpretative positions emerging from both autonomous research and expert input.

The resulting outcome takes the form of an interpretative framework rather than a mere collection of sources. It articulates how the site is positioned within international discourse, identifies dominant and marginal narratives,

Community Process Diagram CPD

and highlights tensions between visibility and omission of dissonance. The document may include thematic syntheses, comparative excerpts, visual references, and expert commentaries that together construct a multi-layered understanding of international perception. This outcome plays a strategic role within the CPD. It provides a reference point against which local and on-site perceptions can later be compared, making it possible to identify convergences and divergences between international imaginaries and community-based interpretations. In this sense, the International Site Perception Framework does not function as a standalone conclusion, but as a critical component of the broader analysis of dissonance, contributing to the subsequent phases focused on community perception, on-site engagement, and final synthesis.

The International Site Perception Framework may include:

- a structured overview of international representations of the site, drawn from online media, academic literature, institutional platforms, and cultural websites;
- a selection of representative excerpts, images, keywords, and narratives illustrating how the site is framed at an international scale;
- an analysis of dominant international imaginaries, identifying recurring interpretative frames, aesthetic strategies, and narrative patterns;
- documentation of omissions, silences, or marginalizations of dissonance and disvalue within international representations;
- a critical assessment of whether dissonance is explicitly addressed, neutralized, aestheticized, or removed in global narratives;
- comparative notes highlighting discrepancies between official or institutional representations and alternative, informal, or non-official international sources;
- interpretative insights derived from expert consultation, including comments on disciplinary biases, cultural frameworks, or heritage paradigms influencing international perception;
- reflections on the role of distance, mediation, and cultural translation in shaping international imaginaries of the site;
- visual materials or annotated references supporting the analysis of international narratives and representations;
- thematic syntheses or conceptual diagrams organizing key findings related to international perception and disvalue.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 04.2 — Community Perception of (dis)value

Phase 04.2 is dedicated to the investigation of community perception on disvalue. At this stage, the research process focuses explicitly on how dissonance and disvalue are perceived, articulated, and experienced by institutions, associations, communities, and people in relation to the site. This phase introduces a methodological bifurcation that applies to all these interlocutors. For each group, the investigation develops along two complementary lines. The first addresses a general or mediated perception, detached from direct physical experience of the site and constructed through narratives, memories, and representations. The second addresses on-site perception, grounded in physical presence, spatial experience, and direct interaction with the site. This distinction is necessary because these two forms of perception activate different tools, generate different types of data, and lead to different outcomes. Together, they allow the research process to capture disvalue as both a symbolic and a spatial phenomenon, and to relate these perceptions to the risks and sensitivities identified and validated in Phase 03.

Guiding/Core Questions for Phase 04.2

How is disvalue perceived by institutions, associations, communities, and people?

This guiding question frames Phase 04.2 as an investigation into how dissonance and disvalue are articulated, narrated, and made meaningful by different categories of interlocutors at a mediated level. Rather than focusing on on-site experience, this phase addresses symbolic, discursive, and narrative constructions of disvalue, as they emerge through memories, representations, and collective interpretations of the site. The objective is not to assess the intensity or legitimacy of these perceptions, but to document how disvalue is described, framed, and differentiated across institutional, associative, community-based, and individual perspectives. The guiding questions therefore aim to explore which aspects of the site are most frequently associated with disvalue, which traumas or conflicts are emphasized or downplayed, and whether perceptions are grounded in direct experience, mediated narratives, or inherited memories. Particular attention is given to identifying convergences and divergences between

different groups, as well as to understanding how these perceptions relate to the risks and sensitivities previously identified and validated in Phase O3. In this way, Phase O4.2 provides a critical bridge between risk assessment and subsequent on-site engagement, ensuring that symbolic and narrative dimensions of disvalue are explicitly accounted for before activating embodied interaction with the site.

For clarity and operational use, the core inquiry of Phase O4.2 is articulated through the following guiding questions:

- How do institutions, associations, communities, and people describe the disvalue associated with the site?
- Which traumas, conflicts, or problematic historical aspects are most frequently mentioned across different interlocutors?
- Are these perceptions primarily based on direct experience, mediated narratives, collective memory, or inherited interpretations?
- Do different groups articulate disvalue in convergent, complementary, or conflicting ways?
- Are certain forms of disvalue emphasized by specific interlocutors while minimized or omitted by others?
- How do institutional narratives of disvalue differ from those articulated by associations, communities, or people?
- Are there recurring metaphors, keywords, or symbolic references used to describe disvalue?
- Do silences, ambiguities, or implicit references play a role in how disvalue is communicated?
- How do mediated perceptions of disvalue relate to the risks, sensitivities, and critical issues validated in Phase O3?
- Are there discrepancies between expert-validated risks and community-articulated perceptions of disvalue?
- Which aspects of disvalue appear to be normalized, contested, or still unresolved within the community?
- How might these mediated perceptions influence subsequent on-site engagement and interpretative processes?

Community Process Diagram CPD

Tools and methodological approach

Within the overall structure of the Community Process Diagram, Phase 04.2 marks the transition from analytical validation toward the documentation of mediated perceptions related to dissonance and disvalue. This phase investigates how dissonance and disvalue are perceived, framed, and articulated by actors connected to the site, while deliberately maintaining a mediated and non-experiential level of engagement. Its function is not to document embodied or on-site experience, but to explore symbolic, narrative, and representational constructions of disvalue as they circulate among institutions, associations, and people. By operating at a distance from direct spatial encounter, Phase 04.2 preserves analytical separation between perception and experience, preventing the premature activation of emotional, sensory, or spatial exposure. From a methodological perspective, Phase 04.2 is explicitly delimited in scope and intent. This sub-phase does not function as a space for negotiation, restitution, or collective interpretation, nor does it aim to reconcile divergent perspectives or produce shared narratives. Instead, it operates as a documentation phase that makes perceptual plurality and asymmetry visible, allowing the research process to register how disvalue is framed differently according to positionality, memory, and discursive context. For this reason, Phase 04.2 involves institutions, associations, and people, but applies tools in a differentiated manner according to actor type. The methodological objective is not symmetry of participation, but comparability of perceptual articulation across heterogeneous interlocutors. To document mediated perceptions across different actor categories, Phase 04.2 relies primarily on interview-based tools. The core tool employed across all actor categories is the semi-structured interview (IN-02). Interviews allow participants to articulate disvalue in their own terms, drawing on memory, indirect experience, and circulating narratives rather than on immediate spatial interaction. While institutional interviews tend to reflect formalized narratives and interpretative frameworks, associations articulate positioned and often contested readings, and people express fragmented, indirect, and experience-based perceptions. In all cases, interviews are explicitly framed to avoid eliciting on-site experience or embodied engagement, focusing instead on how the site is remembered, imagined, or discussed at a distance. Alongside interviews, Phase 04.2 selectively introduces

lightweight survey tools to capture broader perceptual patterns. Polls (IN-05) are used primarily with people and wider community segments to identify recurring associations, contrasts, and distributions of disvalue-related themes. Their purpose is not to quantify opinion or measure consensus, but to detect patterns of circulation and contrast within the perceptual field. Polls are not used with institutions and are applied cautiously with associations in order to avoid strategic positioning or mobilized responses that could distort the exploratory character of the phase.

In order to address the spatial dimension of perception without activating on-site experience, Phase 04.2 employs mapping tools in a strictly mediated and memory-based configuration. Behaviour Mapping (MA-01) and Physical Traces Mapping (MA-02) are activated exclusively through narrated, recalled, or imagined experience, rather than through direct or on-site observation. Participants are invited to describe, from memory or perception, patterns of use, avoidance, symbolic marking, or traces associated with the site as they remember or imagine them. No guided visits, on-site elicitation, or verification of spatial conditions are activated in this phase. In this configuration, mapping functions as an interpretative device that reveals how dissonance is spatially perceived and constructed, rather than how it is physically enacted. A defining methodological choice of Phase 04.2 lies in the deliberate exclusion of experiential and on-site tools from the engagement with people. Observation-based tools (OB), community-led spatial tools (CL), group activities (GR), and creative tools (CR) are not activated in relation to people at this stage. This exclusion is a methodological safeguard intended to preserve the distinction between mediated perception and embodied encounter. Introducing on-site or experiential tools at this point would risk collapsing this distinction, contaminating the analytical separation between Phase 04 and the subsequent on-site phases. By maintaining a controlled and mediated engagement, Phase 04.2 ensures that disvalue emerges as a perceived, narrated, and socially constructed phenomenon, preparing the ground for later spatial investigation without anticipating or pre-empting it. Despite its mediated and non-experiential design, Phase 04.2 involves specific analytical and interpretative risks. Mediated interviews and memory-based mapping may privilege dominant narratives or widely circulating representations, potentially obscuring more fragile, ambivalent, or marginalized perceptions. There is a risk that institutional or associative framings overshadow the fragmented and indirect perceptions expressed by

people. Poll-based tools may oversimplify complex symbolic associations, producing an illusion of coherence or distribution that exceeds the robustness of the data. Memory-based spatial descriptions may also reflect selective recall, projection, or imaginative reconstruction rather than lived practice. For this reason, the outputs produced in Phase 04.2 are treated as provisional and analytically open. They are not interpreted as accurate representations of spatial experience, but as indicators of how dissonance and disvalue are perceived, narrated, and circulated prior to any on-site engagement. These materials are subsequently subjected to analytical consolidation and comparative validation in Phase 04.3, where asymmetries, omissions, and divergences are critically assessed before the activation of embodied and spatial tools in the following phases.

Risks associated with Phase 04.2 interactions

Phase 04.2 entails significant methodological and ethical risks. At a narrative level, there is a risk that dominant institutional or associative framings overshadow more fragile, fragmented, or hesitant perceptions expressed by people. Semi-structured interviews may unintentionally encourage coherent storytelling, thereby smoothing contradictions and ambivalences that are analytically relevant. This risk is particularly relevant in a phase that intentionally operates without on-site or embodied engagement, as coherence may emerge from narrative convention rather than from lived spatial experience. Polls carry the risk of oversimplification. Even when designed cautiously, they may flatten complex emotional or symbolic associations into discrete categories, producing an illusion of comparability or distribution that exceeds the actual robustness of the data. Memory-based mapping introduces additional risks. Narrated Behaviour Mapping (MA-01) and Physical Traces Mapping (MA-02) may reflect selective recall, symbolic projection, or retrospective rationalization rather than actual practices. These tools may also unintentionally surface sensitive information about avoidance, informal use, or contested traces, raising ethical concerns if not carefully contextualized. At a process level, there is a risk that participants interpret Phase 04.2 as an opportunity to assert claims, seek recognition, or influence future decisions. This may generate expectations that the research process is not designed to fulfill at this stage. For these reasons, all outputs remain explicitly analytical and are not framed as shared or validated representations.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Outcome #04.2 — Community Perception of (dis)value Report

This outcome takes the form of a structured and analytical report dedicated to documenting how disvalue and dissonance are perceived at a general and mediated level by institutions, associations, communities, and people. The report synthesizes narratives, conceptual associations, and interpretative frameworks that emerge from interviews, group discussions, and mind-mapping activities conducted off-site.

The document brings together qualitative descriptions of trauma, conflict, and problematic historical dimensions associated with the site, identifying recurring themes, shared concerns, and points of divergence among different interlocutors. Particular attention is devoted to how disvalue is articulated through language, metaphors, silences, and symbolic references, and to how these perceptions relate to broader social, political, or cultural narratives. The Community Disvalue Perception Report is explicitly connected to the validated risk framework developed at the end of Phase 03. It allows the research process to verify whether the risks, sensitivities, and critical issues identified by experts are also reflected in the way dissonance is narrated and understood by the community at a mediated level. In this sense, the report functions as a bridge between risk assessment and direct site-based engagement. From an operational perspective, this outcome can serve multiple purposes. It provides a reference document for researchers and practitioners when designing subsequent engagement activities, supports the formulation of appropriate questions and communication strategies, and contributes to the documentation of intangible and non-spatial dimensions of dissonance. It may also be used as a background document for institutional discussions, exhibitions, or publications.

The Community Perception of (dis)value Report may include:

- a structured synthesis of how dissonance and disvalue are articulated by institutions, associations, communities, and people at a mediated level;
- qualitative descriptions of dominant themes, narratives, and symbolic associations related to disvalue emerging from interviews and group discussions;

- identification of recurring references to trauma, conflict, exclusion, or contested memory across different interlocutors;
- documentation of convergences and divergences in how disvalue is perceived and narrated by different stakeholder categories;
- excerpts or anonymized quotations illustrating representative ways in which disvalue is described, framed, or avoided;
- analysis of silences, ambiguities, or implicit forms of disvalue that emerge through language, metaphors, or narrative gaps;
- comparative notes linking community perceptions of disvalue to the risks and sensitivities validated in Phase 03;
- conceptual syntheses or thematic diagrams organizing mediated perceptions of dissonance and disvalue;
- methodological notes clarifying the conditions under which perceptions were collected and interpreted;
- references to interviews, group meetings, and analytical tools that contributed to the construction of the report.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 04.3 — Cross-Analysis and Researchers’ Validation of Perception Data

Phase 04.3 represents a critical moment of analytical consolidation and autonomous verification within Phase 04 — Dissonance Perception. While Phase 04.1 and Phase 04.2 focus respectively on international perception and community-based perception of disvalue, Phase 04.3 is conceived as a researcher-led synthesis phase, aimed at bringing these two datasets into direct comparison. Unlike the previous phases, Phase 04.3 does not activate any form of dialogue, participation, or consultation with external actors. It is explicitly designed as an internal analytical phase, in which researchers operate independently in order to verify, cross-read, and critically interpret the data already collected. The purpose of this phase is not to generate new perceptions, but to evaluate the degree of convergence, divergence, overlap, or contradiction between international narratives and local/community perceptions. In doing so, Phase 04.3 functions as a methodological checkpoint that strengthens the robustness, transparency, and interpretative reliability of the overall process.

Guiding / Core Question for Phase 04.3

Phase 04.3 represents a critical moment of analytical consolidation and autonomous verification within Phase 04 — Dissonance Perception.

- How do international perceptions and local/community perceptions of dissonance and disvalue relate to one another?

This core question is articulated through a set of analytical sub-questions:

- Which elements of dissonance and disvalue appear consistently across international and local datasets?
- Which dimensions are emphasized internationally but marginal or absent at the local level, and vice versa?
- Are there forms of dissonance that are amplified, neutralized, aestheticized, or silenced in international representations when compared to community perceptions?
- Do discrepancies between the two datasets reveal structural asymmetries, narrative simplifications, or mechanisms of symbolic displacement?
- How do these convergences and divergences affect the overall understanding of the site and its dissonant condition?

Tools and Methodological Approach

Within the overall structure of the Community Process Diagram, Phase 04.3 represents the moment in which the research process deliberately steps back from direct interaction and consolidates the perceptual materials collected in the previous sub-phases through analytical validation. The function of this phase is not to reconcile perceptions, to prioritize interpretations, or to stabilize meanings, but to structure perceptual plurality and asymmetry before the activation of on-site and embodied tools in the subsequent phases of the process. From a methodological standpoint, Phase 04.3 operates as a researcher-led analytical space in which perceptual data are subjected to explicit methodological control. It is not a participatory phase, nor does it provide a setting for collective interpretation or dialogue with stakeholders. It does not seek to arbitrate between competing perceptions or to establish authoritative readings of dissonance. For this reason, Phase 04.3 does not involve institutions, associations, or people. Engagement is intentionally limited to the research team and, where appropriate, to selected experts whose role is confined to the validation of analytical frameworks rather than

Community Process Diagram CPD

the production of new empirical data. The primary tools activated in this sub-phase are Mind Mapping (MA-04) and Extremes and Mainstreams (MA-05). These tools are employed exclusively within the autonomous research line and function as instruments of synthesis and clarification. Mind Mapping supports the organization and comparison of perceptual themes across different scales and actor categories, enabling the research team to visualize overlaps, gaps, and recurring patterns without imposing coherence. Extremes and Mainstreams complements this process by allowing the identification of dominant, marginal, and polarized perceptions, while explicitly avoiding their collapse into consensus or hierarchy. Where necessary, Semi-structured Interviews (IN-02) may be selectively reactivated with experts. In this configuration, interviews do not serve an exploratory function, nor do they aim to generate new interpretations of the site. Instead, expert input is used to assess whether the perceptual patterns identified through analytical synthesis correspond to dynamics observed in comparable contexts of dissonant heritage. Expert involvement thus performs a calibration and validation function, supporting methodological robustness without introducing prescriptive or normative judgments. A defining feature of Phase 04.3 is its role as a methodological bridge between mediated perception analysis and subsequent on-site engagement. By consolidating perceptual data while preserving fragmentation, divergence, and asymmetry, this phase ensures that the transition toward embodied and spatial investigation does not occur on the basis of unresolved ambiguities or prematurely stabilized interpretations. In this sense, Phase 04.3 prepares the conditions for on-site engagement without anticipating its outcomes or constraining its interpretative openness.

Overall, the tools activated in Phase 04.3 support a moment of methodological deceleration and critical verification. They allow the research process to consolidate perceptual findings, assess their internal coherence, and strengthen the interpretative robustness of the CPD before moving toward on-site engagement and embodied interaction in Phase 05. To enhance analytical transparency and replicability, the comparative analysis carried out in this phase may be supported by coded comparative grids, such as matrices aligning key themes with different audiences or perceptual scales. These grids function as internal analytical devices that

make explicit how convergences, divergences, and omissions are identified across datasets, without introducing new data or external validation.

At this point, a group of experts will be involved in order to ensure the proper validation of the information collected. This group will be selected from the already established *Expert Database*, which has been developed throughout the different stages of the research and whose results are largely contained in the *Dissonant Heritage GeoApp* and in the *Co.Co.War Atlas: Mapping Dissonant Heritage*.

This process is particularly important, as it ensures a reliable validation of the information through the involvement of key experts who have been carefully identified in the previous phases.

Risks associated with Phase 04.3 interactions

Phase 04.3 entails risks of analytical overreach and methodological closure. The structuring power of analytical tools may inadvertently impose coherence or hierarchy where fragmentation is analytically more accurate. Extremes and Mainstreams (MA-05) may unintentionally reinforce binary distinctions, obscuring more nuanced or fluid positions. Expert validation may privilege certain interpretative frameworks over others, especially when experts share disciplinary backgrounds or normative assumptions. There is also a risk that analytical consolidation creates a false sense of readiness for on-site engagement, underestimating residual sensitivities or unresolved tensions. For these reasons, the outputs of Phase 04.3 are treated as provisional analytical artefacts, explicitly intended to inform the cautious design of Phase 05 rather than to conclude the investigation of perception.

Outcome #04.3 — Comparative Perception Validation Report

The outcome of Phase 04.3 is a Comparative Perception Validation Report, conceived as an autonomous and downloadable document produced through the exclusive analytical work of the research team. This report provides a structured and transparent synthesis of the cross-analysis between international perception data and local/community perception data collected in the previous phases.

The document articulates a comparative overview of how dissonance and disvalue are represented, interpreted, emphasized, or marginalized at different perceptual scales. It explicitly documents areas of convergence, where international narratives and community perceptions overlap or reinforce one another, as well as areas of divergence, where meanings, values, or critical issues appear distorted, simplified, aestheticized, or omitted when moving from the local to the international context, or vice versa. The report includes an analytical interpretation of the reasons underlying these discrepancies, addressing factors such as geographical and cultural distance, mediation through institutional or heritage discourses, selective processes of representation, and the translation of conflictual or traumatic dimensions into neutralized or valorizing narratives. Rather than resolving inconsistencies or hierarchizing perceptions, the document treats divergence, contradiction, and non-alignment as analytical findings that are constitutive of dissonant heritage.

From a methodological perspective, the Comparative Perception Validation Report functions as a calibration and verification tool within the CPD. It consolidates the reliability of the perception analysis carried out in Phase 04 by making explicit how different imaginaries interact, clash, or disconnect. In doing so, it provides a critically validated interpretative framework that supports and informs subsequent phases, particularly those involving on-site perception, affective engagement, and spatial analysis, ensuring that later stages of the process are grounded in an explicitly cross-verified understanding of dissonance and disvalue. The Comparative Perception Validation Report may include:

Community Process Diagram CPD

- a comparative analytical synthesis of international and local/community perception data related to dissonance and disvalue;
- identification of convergences between international narratives and community-based perceptions, highlighting shared themes or overlapping interpretations;
- documentation of divergences, omissions, or contradictions between international imaginaries and local or mediated perceptions;
- analysis of asymmetries in framing, emphasis, tone, or narrative structure across different perceptual scales;
- interpretative reflections on processes of neutralization, aestheticization, simplification, or silencing of dissonance in international representations;
- thematic matrices or comparative tables aligning key narratives, values, and disvalues across datasets;
- visual or conceptual mappings illustrating overlaps, gaps, and mismatches between international and local perceptions;
- analytical notes addressing the role of distance, mediation, institutional discourse, or heritage paradigms in shaping perception;
- methodological reflections on the implications of perceptual discrepancies for subsequent on-site engagement and analysis;
- references to the outcomes of Phase 04.1 and Phase 04.2 as the primary sources of the comparative analysis.

PHASE 04 — Outcome

Structured Perceptual Landscape

The overall outcome of Phase 04 is the Structured Perceptual Landscape, a consolidated analytical framework resulting from the integration of international representations (Phase 04.1), mediated local perceptions (Phase 04.2), and researcher-led analytical synthesis (Phase 04.3). This outcome documents how dissonance and disvalue are perceived, narrated, and framed across different scales and positions, without reconciling, normalizing, or hierarchizing these perceptions. Rather than producing a unified interpretative narrative, the Structured Perceptual Landscape preserves plurality, asymmetry, and contradiction as constitutive features of dissonant heritage contexts. Its function is to render perceptual configurations legible and comparable, providing a critical reference for Phase 05 by

highlighting expectations, imaginaries, and narrative framings that may interact with embodied spatial experience, and for Phase 06 by enabling cross-reading between narrated or imagined perceptions and spatially grounded experiential data.

The genesis of the Structured Perceptual Landscape reflects the specific logic of Phase 04, which deliberately separates perception from embodied experience. International representations are examined as mediated cultural constructs shaped by distance, institutional framing, and disciplinary paradigms, while local perceptions are documented through mediated interaction with institutions, associations, and people, without activating on-site or sensory engagement. These heterogeneous materials are subsequently subjected to analytical consolidation by the research team, allowing perceptual plurality to be structured without being resolved. The outcome does not evaluate the accuracy, legitimacy, or ethical adequacy of perceptions; instead, it documents how meaning is produced, circulated, displaced, or silenced at different levels. The Structured Perceptual Landscape is conceived as an autonomous and downloadable document composed of a limited number of core analytical instruments, considered essential for its usability by other researchers, practitioners, or institutions. Among these, two instruments are regarded as fundamental.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Perceptual Matrix (Scale × Position × Framing)

The first core component of the Structured Perceptual Landscape is the Perceptual Matrix, a comparative analytical device designed to make heterogeneous perceptions readable without reducing them to a unified or reconciled interpretation. The matrix organizes perceptual material along three intersecting dimensions: scale, position, and framing. Scale refers to the level at which perception is produced and circulated, distinguishing international representations, mediated local accounts, and the analytical layer introduced by the research team. Position refers to the standpoint from which perception is articulated, distinguishing institutional actors, organized associations or community groups, and individual or informal perspectives, while recognizing that these positions are internally diverse and context-dependent. Framing refers to the interpretative register

through which dissonance and disvalue are made intelligible, including valorization-oriented narratives, aestheticizing framings, trauma-centered accounts, conflict-oriented interpretations, normalization strategies, denial, or ambiguous and contradictory positions. By combining these three dimensions, the Perceptual Matrix functions as a structured surface on which convergences, divergences, absences, and asymmetries can be systematically registered. Its analytical value lies in its capacity to expose gaps between international visibility and local relevance, to identify perceptions that circulate strongly at one scale but remain marginal or silenced at another, and to reveal how different actors frame the same elements of the site through incompatible or non-communicating interpretative lenses. The matrix does not quantify perception, assign weight, or establish hierarchies. Instead, it supports comparison and traceability by associating each entry with a source type and a clearly defined framing category through a transparent coding system. The analytical layer developed in Phase 04.3 may be added as a distinct column, allowing interpretative hypotheses to be made explicit without collapsing them into mediated perceptions. The Perceptual Matrix is conceived as a provisional and open analytical artefact, designed to be revised or expanded as the research process progresses.

Narrative Framing Spectrum

The second core component of the Structured Perceptual Landscape is the Narrative Framing Spectrum, an analytical instrument designed to map how dissonance and disvalue are narratively treated across different sources, actors, and scales. Rather than focusing on factual content or historical accuracy, the Spectrum treats framing as the key analytical variable, highlighting the representational strategies through which dissonance is emphasized, neutralized, aestheticized, polarized, or silenced. Its purpose is to make visible how narratives operate and how specific framings shape expectations, imaginaries, and interpretative horizons. The Narrative Framing Spectrum is structured as a continuum along which different framing strategies can be positioned, ranging from neutralization and aestheticization, through problematization and explicit engagement with conflict or trauma, to polarization and deliberate silencing. This ordered structure allows the research process to distinguish between narratives in which dissonance is absent because it is normalized or displaced and

narratives in which it is actively removed or suppressed. It also makes visible how apparently neutral or celebratory representations may play a significant role in shaping perception while avoiding confrontation with difficult pasts.

Operationally, the Spectrum is constructed by clustering narratives, excerpts, images, or representational materials according to their dominant framing logic and positioning these clusters along the continuum based on explicit and shared analytical criteria. Keywords, recurring metaphors, visual tropes, and narrative structures are used to justify placement, ensuring transparency and replicability. The resulting Spectrum does not rank narratives or assess their legitimacy; instead, it offers a synthetic visualization of the range, distribution, and dominance of framing strategies within the perceptual field. Taken together, the Perceptual Matrix and the Narrative Framing Spectrum constitute the core of the Structured Perceptual Landscape. They enable the research process, and any subsequent user of the Toolkit, to compare heterogeneous perceptions without forced synthesis, to identify dominant and marginal framings, and to anticipate points of friction between narrated or imagined expectations and embodied spatial encounter. The Structured Perceptual Landscape does not stabilize meaning, resolve conflict, or reconcile narratives. It functions instead as a critical analytical reference designed to inform subsequent phases of the Community Process Diagram and to support cross-reading with spatial and experiential data, while preserving plurality, ambiguity, and contradiction as analytically meaningful conditions of dissonant heritage contexts.

Community Process Diagram CPD



View of Former House of the Fascist Party, Predappio, Italy, June, 2025

PHASE

05


On-site Spatial Investigation of Dissonance


Phase 05 represents the moment in which the research process engages directly and physically with the site as a spatial and architectural environment. After the documentation and analytical consolidation of mediated perceptions in Phase 04, this phase introduces embodied, sensory, and spatial experience as a central dimension of investigation. The objective of Phase 05 is not to confirm or disprove previously identified perceptions, nor to translate them into design solutions or communicative narratives, but to explore how dissonance and trauma are encountered, negotiated, and materially mediated through the built environment. In Phase 05, architecture is approached not as a neutral container of social meanings, but as an active medium that shapes movement, orientation, visibility, bodily response, and emotional intensity. Spatial sequences, thresholds, enclosures, material conditions, atmospheres, and sensory cues are understood as elements that participate in the production, amplification, or mitigation of dissonance. The investigation therefore focuses on how architectural form and materiality condition experience, rather than on symbolic interpretation or historical explanation alone. A defining methodological principle of this phase is the controlled transition from mediated perception to embodied encounter. On-site engagement is introduced only after perceptual framings, sensitivities,

Community Process Diagram CPD

and risks have been identified and critically assessed in the preceding phases. This sequencing reflects the recognition that spatial experience is never neutral: it is shaped by prior narratives, memories, expectations, and emotional dispositions. Phase 05 does not seek to erase or suspend these pre-existing frames, but to observe how they interact with the physical presence of the site, sometimes reinforcing them, sometimes destabilizing them, and sometimes producing unexpected forms of spatial response. For this reason, Phase 05 is characterized by a high level of methodological calibration. On-site engagement is not conceived as open-ended participation, spontaneous exploration, or unrestricted access. Instead, tools are selected and applied according to differentiated levels of exposure, sensitivity, and relational positioning. Autonomous investigation by the research team precedes any involvement of external actors and functions as a preparatory reading of spatial conditions and potential zones of intensity. Subsequent engagement with people and organized groups is structured through carefully designed tools that privilege movement, observation, and situated interaction over narrative production or discursive confrontation.

Throughout Phase 05, experience is treated as an analytical object rather than as evidence to be validated or instrumentalized. Bodily reactions, hesitations, avoidance, attraction, and altered patterns of movement are observed as meaningful spatial responses, not as indicators of acceptance or rejection. Silence, discomfort, or withdrawal are not interpreted as failure of engagement, but as possible manifestations of dissonance mediated by architectural space. In this sense, Phase 05 does not aim to extract testimony or to elicit interpretation, but to register how architecture conditions encounter at a pre-discursive level. The outcomes of Phase 05 do not consist in evaluations of architectural quality, conservation status, or design potential, nor do they produce recommendations for immediate intervention. Instead, the phase generates a situated understanding of how dissonance is materially and spatially embedded, revealing thresholds, intensities, and fragilities that cannot be accessed through mediated perception alone. These findings remain provisional and analytically framed, and they are subjected to further consolidation and critical processing in subsequent phases. By introducing embodied and spatial investigation only at this stage of the Community Process Diagram, Phase 05 ensures that on-site engagement is grounded in prior ethical awareness, perceptual knowledge, and risk assessment. In this way, the phase functions not as a culmination of the process, but as a carefully positioned moment of encounter in which architecture becomes a site of negotiation between memory, perception, and material presence, without prematurely resolving the tensions that define dissonant heritage.





Phase 05 - On-Site Spatial Investigation of Dissonance, CPD Diagram.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 05 On-site Spatial Investigation of Dissonance

Phase 05 constitutes a decisive and methodologically sensitive stage within the Community Process Diagram, as it marks the transition from the analysis of perceptions to direct, situated engagement with the site and with the actors who relate to it. After the completion of Phases 01 to 04—focused on contextual framing, stakeholder identification, risk assessment, and perceptual analysis—Phase 05 represents the first moment in which the research process engages explicitly with the physical environment as a space of interaction, experience, and interpretation. This phase is not conceived as a generic participatory moment, nor as an arena for dialogue or negotiation. Instead, it is structured as a progressive and internally differentiated sequence, designed to explore how dissonance is experienced and articulated on-site, while preserving analytical distance, ethical responsibility, and methodological control. The complexity and sensitivity of dissonant heritage require that interaction, interpretation, and confrontation are not collapsed into a single moment. For this reason, Phase 05 is articulated into three consecutive sub-phases, each characterized by a distinct role within the research process.

Phase 05.1 is dedicated to on-site interaction and situated data collection, conducted separately with institutions, associations, and people. Phase 05.2 introduces a moment of analytical consolidation and spatial synthesis, carried out autonomously by the research team, without further interaction. Phase 05.3 finally activates a mediated form of confrontation and co-interpretation, in which different perceptual positions are brought into relation through shared analytical artefacts rather than through direct debate. Taken together, these sub-phases allow the research process to move from experience to interpretation, and from interpretation to comparison, without forcing consensus or resolution. Phase 05 does not aim to neutralize dissonance, but to document how it is experienced, spatialized, and negotiated on-site, and to prepare a critically validated basis for the final synthesis and restitution phase.

Phase 05.1 — On-site Interaction and Situated Data Collection

Phase 05.1 represents the first moment of direct, embodied engagement with the site within the CPD. In this sub-phase, institutions, associations, and people are involved through on-site activities conducted separately for each category of actor. This differentiation is intentional and reflects the need to reduce power asymmetries, social pressure, and symbolic exposure, allowing perceptions to emerge in relation to space rather than through confrontation. The methodological assumption underlying Phase 05.1 is that dissonance often manifests itself through spatial practices, movement patterns, bodily reactions, and emotional responses that are difficult to articulate in abstract or discursive settings. On-site interaction therefore becomes a key device for accessing dimensions of disvalue that remain implicit or latent in mediated forms of inquiry.

Guiding / Core Questions for Phase 05.1

How does dissonance emerge through direct, embodied interaction with the site?

This guiding question frames Phase 05.1 as an exploration of perception grounded in physical presence rather than verbal representation. It opens reflection on how movement, hesitation, avoidance, and attraction reveal forms of discomfort, attachment, or conflict that may not be explicitly stated. It also raises questions about which specific spaces, paths, thresholds, or architectural elements activate emotional responses linked to trauma, memory, or contested meanings. Further attention is given to how different actors—institutions, associations, and people—relate differently to the same spatial conditions, and to which perceptions remain unspoken but become visible through spatial choice and embodied practice. Finally, the question invites comparison between on-site experiences and the mediated perceptions identified in earlier phases, highlighting confirmations, contradictions, and new insights.

This core question is articulated through a set of analytical sub-questions:

- How does direct physical presence on the site influence the perception of dissonance?

- Which forms of discomfort, attachment, or conflict emerge through movement, hesitation, avoidance, or attraction?
- Which specific spaces, paths, thresholds, or architectural elements activate emotional responses?
- Do certain areas of the site trigger stronger reactions related to trauma, memory, or contested meanings?
- How do different actors (institutions, associations, people) relate differently to the same spatial conditions?
- Are there spatial practices that reveal unspoken or implicit perceptions of dissonance?
- Which perceptions become visible through embodied interaction but remain unarticulated verbally?
- How do patterns of use, avoidance, or lingering reflect underlying tensions or attachments?
- Are there differences between individual and collective on-site behaviours?
- How do on-site experiences confirm, complicate, or contradict mediated perceptions identified in earlier phases?
- Do embodied interactions reveal new dimensions of dissonance not previously identified?
- How does spatial experience reshape or reframe narratives and imaginaries associated with the site?

Community Process Diagram CPD

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase 05.1 represents the core on-site phase of the Community Process Diagram and constitutes the moment in which the research process engages directly, physically, and continuously with the architectural space of the site. All activities activated in this sub-phase are developed in situ and are grounded in direct interaction with the built environment at an architectural scale. The primary purpose of Phase 05.1 is to investigate how dissonance and trauma are encountered, embodied, and negotiated through physical space, understood not as a neutral setting for social interaction, but as an active agent that structures perception, movement, behaviour, and emotional response through form, materiality, spatial sequence, and atmosphere. This sub-phase does not function as a moment of architectural evaluation, heritage interpretation, commemorative

practice, or design experimentation. It does not aim to assess architectural quality or conservation status, nor to propose solutions or future scenarios. Instead, it operates as a phase of spatial sensitivity, focused on understanding how dissonance and trauma are materially and sensorially embedded in architectural elements such as thresholds, enclosures, voids, transitions, materials, light conditions, acoustics, and micro-atmospheres. The emphasis is placed on the experiential dimension of architecture as it is physically encountered, rather than on its symbolic or discursive interpretation.

From a methodological perspective, Phase O5.1 is structured around three distinct but interconnected lines of engagement, all of which are developed on site and through direct interaction with architectural space: an autonomous investigation conducted by the research team, an individual and low-exposure engagement with people, and a collective and mediated engagement with associations and organized communities. This articulation reflects the recognition that different actors relate to architectural space from structurally different positions and that on-site exposure must therefore be calibrated through differentiated tools and modes of interaction. The tools selected for this phase are all designed to operate through bodily presence, movement, and perception within the built environment, and participation follows a graduated logic of exposure and sensitivity. The first line of engagement consists of an autonomous on-site investigation carried out exclusively by the research team and preceding any direct involvement of external actors. This autonomous phase functions as a methodological safeguard and as a preparatory reading of the architectural space. The foundational tools activated here are OB-01 In-person / On-site Observation and OB-02 Multi-sensory Observation. Through OB-01, the research team observes how the physical configuration of the site conditions access, circulation, visibility, avoidance, and presence, with particular attention to spatial sequences, changes in scale, enclosure and openness, material decay, light conditions, acoustics, and atmospheric qualities. OB-02 complements this approach by explicitly engaging the body as an analytical instrument, acknowledging that trauma and dissonance are often registered through sensory intensities, tension, or withdrawal before they are articulated verbally. This autonomous on-site reading allows the research team to identify architectural thresholds, spatial intensities, and zones of potential sensitivity before activating any form of participant engagement. A second line of engagement involves people, understood as non-organized

Community Process Diagram CPD

individuals, and is deliberately designed as individual, low-exposure, and reversible, while remaining fully grounded in on-site interaction with architectural space. In this line, OB-01 and OB-02 are activated again, not as tools for observing people as subjects, but as tools for observing how people physically move through, react to, and negotiate architectural space. Attention is paid to pacing, hesitation, detours, pauses, and avoidance as spatial behaviours emerging in direct relation to the built environment, without requiring verbal explanation or narrative production. In addition, CL-02 Transect Walks are activated exclusively with people in a reduced, one-to-one format. These transect walks are conceived as situated movements through selected portions of the site, in which bodily orientation, spatial negotiation, and physical response constitute the primary data. They are intentionally short, fragmented, and interruptible, ensuring that engagement remains controlled while preserving the primacy of architectural scale and material presence. The third line of engagement concerns associations and organized community groups and is structured through tools that address collective relationships with architectural space. CL-01 Day-to-day Interactions with Place is used to observe existing, everyday forms of spatial engagement with the site, focusing on how architectural space is integrated into routine practices without introducing new forms of exposure. CL-03 Community Tours / Memory Maps are employed to explore how architecture operates as a carrier of collective memory, anchoring shared narratives to specific architectural elements, routes, voids, or surfaces encountered on site. In this configuration, memory is articulated in direct relation to physical space rather than through abstract testimony, and the collective dimension allows emotional weight to be distributed across the group. GR-04 Site-based Practices may also be activated when practices of care, use, or informal interaction with the built environment are already present; in such cases, these practices are observed rather than organized or initiated by the research team. Across all three lines of engagement, Phase 05.1 maintains a consistent focus on on-site interaction with architectural space and deliberately avoids analytical abstraction, mapping exercises, or creative and discursive tools. The tools activated in this phase are unified by their reliance on bodily presence, movement, and sensory perception at the

scale of the built environment, ensuring that dissonance is encountered as a spatial and material condition before it is interpreted or represented in subsequent phases.

Risks associated with Phase 05.1 interactions

Phase 05.1 entails high levels of spatial, emotional, and ethical risk, as it involves direct and continuous on-site engagement with architectural spaces often associated with violence, exclusion, loss, or unresolved conflict. Physical exposure to such environments may reactivate trauma or embodied distress, particularly when participants encounter architectural thresholds, confined spaces, material decay, or atmospheres charged with symbolic or emotional intensity. Even when carefully calibrated, movement-based and observation-based tools may unintentionally guide participants into zones of heightened sensitivity. From a methodological perspective, there is a risk of architectural determinism, whereby spatial features are over-interpreted as direct causes of dissonance or trauma rather than as mediating conditions. Observation-based tools may also risk misreading avoidance, hesitation, silence, or altered movement patterns as disengagement or lack of interest, rather than as meaningful spatial responses to dissonance. In addition, the presence of the researcher within the space may influence behaviour, subtly shaping how architectural space is navigated or performed. Collective engagements with associations and organized community groups introduce further risks. Group-based tools may amplify dominant spatial narratives, marginalize less articulated or dissenting perceptions, or normalize particular ways of relating to the built environment. Even when memory and everyday practices are anchored to architectural space, there remains a risk that collective framing obscures internal diversity or unresolved tensions within the group. At a process level, on-site engagement may generate expectations of intervention, transformation, or future action, particularly when participants perceive the research presence as a precursor to decision-making or design. For these reasons, Phase 05.1 requires continuous reflexive monitoring, explicit informed consent, and the clear communication of participants' right to withdraw at any moment. Facilitation consistently emphasizes the exploratory, analytical, and non-prescriptive nature of the phase, reinforcing the distinction between encountering architectural dissonance and acting upon it.

Outcome #05.1 — On-site Perception and Spatial Experience Dataset

The outcomes of Phase 05.1 consist of a corpus of situated and experiential materials that document how dissonance is encountered and negotiated on-site. These materials include annotated maps, spatial narratives linked to specific locations, observational notes, photographic documentation, and graphic representations produced during interaction. Taken together, they constitute a body of raw data that captures the embodied, spatial, and affective dimensions of dissonance. These outcomes are not intended to function as communicable results at this stage, but as foundational empirical material that preserves the complexity and heterogeneity of on-site experience, preparing the ground for analytical consolidation in the subsequent phase.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 05.2 — Analytical Consolidation and Spatial Synthesis

Phase 05.2 represents a deliberately autonomous and internal phase of analytical consolidation, carried out exclusively by the research team. No interaction with institutions, associations, or people takes place during this sub-phase. Its primary function is to transform the raw and heterogeneous materials generated in Phase 05.1 into structured, interpretable, and ethically calibrated data results. This phase introduces a necessary moment of analytical deceleration within the CPD. By separating interaction from confrontation, Phase 05.2 ensures that materials are critically assessed, synthesized, and contextualized before being exposed to collective interpretation. This separation is essential to prevent the circulation of unprocessed testimonies, to reduce the risk of misinterpretation, and to preserve the anonymity and safety of participants.

Guiding / Core Questions for Phase 05.2

How can the experiential and spatial data collected on-site be structured into coherent analytical frameworks?

This guiding question frames Phase 05.2 as a process of interpretation without attribution. It opens reflection on which spatial patterns, emotional

intensities, and recurring themes emerge when data from different actors are aggregated and compared. It also raises questions about where convergences and divergences become visible across the site, how these relate to previously identified risks and sensitivities, and which zones appear particularly charged, avoided, or contested. Attention is given to how synthesis can make complexity legible without oversimplifying or neutralizing dissonance, and to how analytical representations can preserve ambiguity, contradiction, and uncertainty as meaningful results. This core question is articulated through a set of analytical sub-questions:

- Which spatial patterns of use, avoidance, or concentration emerge when on-site data are aggregated?
- Where do emotional intensities appear to cluster spatially across different datasets?
- Which themes or perceptions recur across different actors and interaction moments?
- Where do convergences between different experiences become visible across the site?
- Where do divergences or contradictions between experiences emerge most clearly?
- How do these spatial patterns relate to the risks and sensitivities identified and validated in Phase 03?
- Which zones appear particularly charged, contested, or symbolically dense?
- Are there areas of the site that are consistently avoided, marginalized, or overlooked?
- How can experiential data be synthesized without attributing perceptions to specific individuals or groups?
- Which analytical representations help make complexity legible without simplifying dissonance?
- How can ambiguity, uncertainty, and contradiction be preserved as analytical findings rather than resolved?
- What limits or biases emerge in the process of translating experiential data into synthetic representations?

Community Process Diagram CPD

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase O5.2 represents the analytical consolidation of the spatial and experiential data collected during the on-site engagement of Phase O5.1. Its purpose is to translate embodied, sensory, and movement-based interactions with architecture into structured analytical representations that preserve the complexity, ambiguity, and fragmentation of lived experience. At this stage, the built environment remains the central object of inquiry, but it is approached through abstraction, synthesis, and critical distancing rather than direct exposure. In Phase O5.2, architectural interpretation is intentionally suspended. The sub-phase does not address questions of quality, conservation, or design potential, nor does it seek to produce definitive spatial diagnoses or to stabilize meanings associated with specific architectural elements. Instead, Phase O5.2 functions as a phase of analytical translation, in which the multiplicity of spatial perceptions gathered on-site is reorganized into provisional frameworks that can be compared, questioned, and confronted. For this reason, Phase O5.2 does not involve direct engagement with institutions, associations, or people. All analytical work is conducted by the research team within the autonomous research line, with occasional expert consultation, in order to prevent premature exposure or reinterpretation of experiential data. This methodological distancing is crucial to avoid transforming lived spatial experiences into authoritative or prescriptive representations. The core analytical tools activated in Phase O5.2 include Mind Mapping (MA-O4) and Memory Reconstruction (MA-O6), which are complemented by additional analytical mapping and comparative tools. Mind Mapping is used to organize embodied reactions, sensory observations, and spatial narratives in relation to architectural elements such as routes, thresholds, voids, material conditions, and changes in scale. This tool allows the research team to visualize how different forms of dissonance cluster around specific spatial configurations without imposing linear causality or hierarchical interpretation. In Phase O5.2, mapping tools are employed exclusively as analytical and interpretative devices. They do not function as instruments of observation, documentation, or verification of spatial reality, nor are they intended to represent the site in an exhaustive or authoritative manner. Instead, mapping operates as a mode of analytical translation, through which embodied, sensory, and movement-based

experiences collected during Phase 05.1 are reorganized into provisional spatial frameworks. All mapping activities in this phase are conducted by the research team within the autonomous analytical line. They do not involve direct engagement with institutions, associations, or people, and they do not activate new forms of exposure to the site. The purpose of mapping is not to locate dissonance as a fixed property of space, but to explore how different forms of dissonance cluster, overlap, or diverge in relation to architectural elements, spatial sequences, thresholds, and temporal layers. Importantly, mapping in Phase 05.2 is explicitly non-projectual and non-prescriptive. Maps, diagrams, and spatial syntheses are treated as working artefacts that make visible analytical hypotheses rather than spatial truths. Their role is to support comparison, critical reflection, and subsequent mediated confrontation in Phase 05.3, while preserving the provisional and reversible character of interpretation. Any apparent coherence produced through mapping is therefore understood as an analytical construct, subject to revision, contestation, and recalibration in later Phases of the CPD.

Memory Reconstruction (MA-06) supports the integration of present-day spatial experiences into broader temporal frameworks. By linking on-site perceptions to historical phases of construction, destruction, reuse, neglect, or symbolic transformation, this tool helps reveal how trauma and dissonance are layered within the architecture over time. Importantly, memory reconstruction in this phase is not based on testimony, but on the analytical alignment of experiential data with historical knowledge. Spatial synthesis is further developed through Behaviour Mapping (MA-01) and Physical Traces Mapping (MA-02), interpreted analytically rather than descriptively. Behaviour Mapping allows the identification of recurring spatial patterns such as routes of avoidance, zones of hesitation, and areas of concentrated presence, while Physical Traces Mapping focuses on material indicators embedded in the architecture, such as informal markings, decay patterns, modifications, or signs of care and neglect. In this phase, these tools are not used to document what happens on-site, but to interpret how architectural space conditions behaviour, memory, and perception. Within the mapping activities of Phase 05.2, particular analytical attention is given to architectural thresholds and boundary conditions. Entrances, staircases, changes in light, variations in enclosure, shifts in visibility, and material discontinuities are examined as critical moments where dissonance and trauma intensify or become perceptible. By foregrounding thresholds

rather than fixed zones, this analytical focus avoids spatial determinism and acknowledges the sequential and experiential nature of architectural space. Earlier outputs from Participatory Mapping (MA-03), produced in previous phases, may be revisited and layered with on-site data in order to identify discrepancies between imagined, narrated, and experienced space. Extremes and Mainstreams (MA-05) are used comparatively to distinguish dominant spatial experiences from marginal or isolated ones, preventing the overemphasis of spectacular architectural features or singular narratives. The outputs of Phase 05.2 include interpretative maps, diagrams, heatmaps, and analytical syntheses that articulate the relationship between dissonance, trauma, and the built environment. These outputs are explicitly framed as intermediate working artefacts rather than definitive representations and are prepared to support mediated confrontation and further critical assessment in Phase 05.3.

Community

Process Diagram

CPD

Risks associated with Phase 05.2 interactions

Phase 05.2 entails significant epistemological and methodological risks. The translation of embodied and emotional experiences into analytical representations may produce a false sense of objectivity or stability, masking uncertainty, contradiction, or ambivalence. Mapping tools may inadvertently reify dissonance by fixing it spatially, suggesting permanence where experience is fluid and situational. Threshold Mapping, while analytically powerful, carries the risk of over-symbolizing transitional spaces and transforming them into deterministic markers of trauma. Memory Reconstruction may introduce temporal coherence that exceeds the actual continuity of lived experience. There is also a risk that analytical outputs are misinterpreted as conclusions rather than as provisional frameworks. For these reasons, all outputs of Phase 05.2 are treated as intermediate and are explicitly prepared for mediated confrontation rather than validation or dissemination.

Outcome #05.2 — Synthetic Spatial Interpretation and Emotional Mapping Report

The outcomes of Phase 05.2 consist of a set of synthetic and interpretative documents that translate raw experiential data into structured spatial representations. These include interpretative maps, heatmaps, emotional

maps, and comparative spatial diagrams that articulate patterns of convergence, divergence, and tension across the site. These documents function as mediating artefacts rather than as definitive results. Their purpose is to support. The Synthetic Spatial Interpretation and Emotional Mapping Report may include:

- a set of interpretative spatial maps synthesizing experiential data collected during Phase O5.1;
- heatmaps visualizing areas of intensity, avoidance, concentration, or emotional charge across the site;
- emotional maps highlighting spatial distributions of discomfort, attachment, tension, or ambivalence;
- comparative spatial diagrams identifying convergences and divergences between different actors' on-site experiences;
- thematic clusters linking spatial patterns to recurring narratives, emotions, or practices;
- identification of zones that appear particularly sensitive, contested, or symbolically dense in relation to dissonance;
- analytical notes connecting spatial patterns to the risks and sensitivities validated in Phase O3;
- documentation of ambiguities, contradictions, or uncertainties preserved as analytical findings;
- methodological reflections on the limits and interpretative nature of spatial synthesis;

Phase O5.3 — Cross-Group Confrontation and Co-Interpretation

Phase O5.3 introduces a controlled and mediated form of confrontation between different perceptual positions. Rather than organizing direct debates or unstructured encounters, this sub-phase is structured around the collective interpretation of synthesized materials produced during Phase O5.2. The emphasis is placed on shared analytical artefacts as intermediaries between actors. This approach reflects the assumption that confrontation in dissonant contexts is more productive when it occurs through objects of interpretation rather than through positional exchange. Maps, diagrams, and spatial syntheses allow participants to engage with difference while maintaining distance from personal exposure and symbolic escalation.

Guiding / Core Questions for Phase 05.3

How do different actors engage with and interpret the synthesized representations of dissonance?

This guiding question frames Phase 05.3 as an investigation of interpretative dynamics rather than consensus-building. It invites reflection on which spatial patterns or analytical framings resonate with participants' experience, which provoke discomfort or resistance, and how disagreement is articulated when mediated through shared representations. It also raises questions about how co-interpretation reveals blind spots, new insights, or persistent tensions, and under which conditions confrontation remains reflective rather than polarizing. This core question is articulated through a set of analytical sub-questions:

- How do different actors interpret the synthesized spatial and analytical representations produced in Phase 05.2?
- Which patterns or mappings are recognized, questioned, or contested by participants?
- Which representations resonate with participants' experience, and which generate discomfort or resistance?
- How are disagreements articulated when discussion is mediated through shared analytical artefacts?
- Do participants identify blind spots, omissions, or misinterpretations in the synthesized materials?
- How does co-interpretation modify, enrich, or complicate the initial analytical frameworks?
- Are new tensions, convergences, or contradictions revealed through collective interpretation?
- Under which conditions does confrontation remain reflective rather than polarizing?
- How do power relations, positionality, or group dynamics influence interpretative exchanges?
- Which aspects of dissonance remain unresolved or non-negotiable after co-interpretation?
- How can the outcomes of co-interpretation be documented without forcing consensus?

Community Process Diagram CPD

- In what ways does co-interpretation prepare the ground for final synthesis and restitution?

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase 05.3 represents the moment in which the research process reopens dialogue after the analytical consolidation of on-site experience carried out in the previous sub-phases. At this stage, spatial interpretations and analytical representations developed in Phase 05.2 are not treated as conclusions, but as provisional materials to be confronted within a controlled and carefully mediated setting. The purpose of Phase 05.3 is not to validate interpretations, arbitrate meanings, or negotiate outcomes, but to verify their analytical robustness while allowing the collection of additional, reflexive data emerging from structured confrontation. Central to this phase is the architectural space itself, which remains the primary object of discussion, interpretation, and critical questioning. From a methodological standpoint, Phase 05.3 is conceived as a selective and non-generalized dialogical phase. It does not function as restitution, dissemination, or participatory decision-making, nor does it aim to produce consensus, reconciliation, or shared narratives. Instead, it operates as a mediated confrontation focused on how spatial representations of dissonance and trauma are received, questioned, resisted, or reframed by actors who possess the capacity to engage critically and reflexively with architectural material. For this reason, Phase 05.3 involves exclusively associations, organized communities, and experts. Institutions, people, and autonomous research actions are explicitly excluded in order to prevent the reactivation of power asymmetries, unmanaged exposure, or expectations of decision-making. Engagement with associations and organized community groups is primarily structured through Group Meetings / Focus Groups (GR-01). In this configuration, small and carefully facilitated group settings are used to discuss analytical representations of architectural space, such as spatial sequences, thresholds, material conditions, or zones of tension identified during on-site investigation. These meetings are not intended to elicit personal testimony or emotional disclosure. Rather, they provide a setting in which collective interpretations of architectural space can be articulated, contested, or problematized, allowing the research process to observe how spatial dissonance is negotiated at a collective level. GR-01 thus functions both as a tool for verification and as a means of gathering additional qualitative data related to the collective reading of

Community Process Diagram CPD

architectural conditions. Where the degree of polarization, conflict, or divergence requires it, Multispeaker Debate (GR-05) is activated with associations, communities, and experts. This tool is employed in a highly moderated format and is explicitly oriented toward spatial issues rather than personal positions. Debate focuses on architectural elements, spatial configurations, thresholds, and material transformations, making visible points of convergence and divergence in how dissonance is spatially interpreted. The function of GR-05 is not to resolve disagreement, but to expose it analytically, enabling the research team to identify persistent tensions, irreconcilable readings, or areas where spatial representations provoke resistance or discomfort. In parallel, Semi-structured Interviews (IN-02) are introduced as a complementary tool, used selectively with experts and, where appropriate, with representatives of associations or organized communities. In Phase 05.3, interviews do not serve an exploratory or narrative function. Instead, they are oriented toward critical assessment and verification. Interviewees are invited to reflect on the spatial interpretations produced so far, to assess their coherence, limits, and blind spots, and to articulate how these representations resonate—or fail to resonate—with their experience of similar architectural contexts marked by dissonance and trauma.

Through IN-02, Phase 05.3 allows the research process to gather additional, reflexive data that support calibration rather than confirmation. A defining characteristic of Phase 05.3 lies in its dual function. On the one hand, it operates as a verification phase, testing the analytical solidity, legibility, and ethical implications of spatial interpretations developed earlier. On the other hand, it remains a data-generating phase, albeit in a controlled and reflexive manner. The interactions activated through GR-01, GR-05, and IN-02 may surface new spatial sensitivities, unresolved tensions, or interpretative discrepancies that were not fully visible during on-site engagement. These inputs are not treated as definitive findings, but as further analytical material contributing to the understanding of how architectural dissonance is collectively and critically engaged. By restricting engagement to associations, communities, and experts, and by focusing exclusively on architectural space as the object of confrontation, Phase 05.3 ensures that the process remains analytically rigorous and ethically contained. It consolidates the transition from embodied

experience to critical reflection, preparing the ground for the final orientation and closure phases without transforming dialogue into negotiation or analysis into prescription.

Risks associated with Phase 05.3 interactions

Phase 05.3 entails risks related to confrontation, symbolic escalation, and misinterpretation. Spatial representations of architectural dissonance may be perceived as accusatory, reductive, or authoritative, particularly when they highlight thresholds, material conditions, or spatial configurations associated with trauma. In group-based settings, dynamics activated through focus groups or moderated debates may reproduce existing power asymmetries, potentially silencing less confident or less recognized voices within associations or community groups. There is also a significant risk of expectation misalignment. Participants may interpret this sub-phase as a step toward decision-making, intervention, or transformation of the site, especially given the dialogical and confrontational nature of the tools employed. Such expectations may generate frustration, resistance, or strategic positioning if not carefully managed. In addition, expert-led interviews or debates may unintentionally reinforce epistemic authority, framing certain spatial interpretations as more legitimate or definitive than intended. For these reasons, facilitation in Phase 05.3 consistently emphasizes the provisional, analytical, and non-prescriptive status of all representations and discussions. The distinction between critically engaging with spatial dissonance and acting upon it is made explicit, and the role of dialogue is framed as a means of verification and reflexive data collection rather than validation or endorsement.

Outcome #05.3 — Co-Interpretation and Mediated Confrontation Record

The outcomes of Phase 05.3 consist of documented processes of co-interpretation, including annotated visual materials, interpretative commentaries, and structured records of discussion. These documents capture how different actors engage with synthesized representations of dissonance, making visible areas of convergence, persistent disagreement, and unresolved tension. Rather than producing consensus or closure, these outcomes document the dynamics of interpretation itself, providing a critically grounded basis for the final synthesis and restitution phase of the CPD.

Community Process Diagram CPD

The Co-Interpretation and Mediated Confrontation

Record may include:

- documentation of group meetings, workshops, or facilitated encounters conducted during Phase 05.3;
- annotated versions of maps, diagrams, or visual materials discussed during collective interpretation sessions;
- summaries of interpretative exchanges highlighting points of convergence, divergence, and tension among actors;
- records of questions, critiques, or reinterpretations raised by participants in response to synthesized materials;
- identification of blind spots, contested interpretations, or newly emerging issues revealed through co-interpretation;
- documentation of how power relations, positionality, or group dynamics influenced interpretative processes;
- notes on conditions that enabled reflective confrontation and mitigated polarization or escalation;
- evidence of how co-interpretation modified, enriched, or complicated the analytical frameworks developed in Phase 05.2;
- methodological reflections on the role of mediated confrontation within dissonant heritage contexts;
- references to the tools, facilitation strategies, and materials used to support co-interpretation.

PHASE 05 — Overall Outcomes of the Phase

Situated Spatial and Experiential Analysis

The overall outcome of Phase 05 consists of a Situated Spatial and Experiential Analysis, produced through the aggregation of autonomous on-site observations, differentiated engagement with people and associations, and the documentation of embodied responses to architectural space. This outcome represents the first moment in the Community Process Diagram in which dissonance is encountered directly through physical presence, movement, and sensory exposure. Rather than translating experience into evaluation, diagnosis, or prescription, the Situated Spatial and Experiential Analysis collates insights into how dissonance is materially and spatially

mediated through architectural thresholds, sequences, atmospheres, changes of scale, patterns of movement, and sensory intensities.

The genesis of this outcome reflects the specific logic of Phase 05, which introduces on-site engagement only after perceptual framings and risks have been identified and critically assessed in the previous phases. Architectural space is treated here not as a neutral container of meaning, but as an active medium that conditions how dissonance is encountered, intensified, avoided, or negotiated at a bodily and experiential level. For this reason, Phase 05 privileges situated observation, movement-based interaction, and sensory registration over narrative production or interpretative explanation. The outcome does not aim to verify mediated perceptions, nor to correct them. Instead, it documents how architectural space confirms, destabilizes, or complicates existing imaginaries once they are confronted with material presence. The Situated Spatial and Experiential Analysis enters into direct dialogue with the Structured Perceptual Landscape developed in Phase 04, allowing convergences, divergences, and dissonances between perception and experience to be critically assessed. Expectations, narrative framings, and imaginaries identified in Phase 04 are not treated as hypotheses to be tested, but as conditions that shape embodied encounter. At the same time, the outcome provides a core input for Phase 06, where experiential and spatial materials are analytically transformed into representational and comparative frameworks, without collapsing experience into stabilized meanings or operational recommendations.

The Situated Spatial and Experiential Analysis is conceived as an autonomous and downloadable document composed of a limited number of core analytical instruments, considered essential for its usability by other researchers, practitioners, or institutions. Among these, three instruments are regarded as fundamental.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Spatial Threshold and Sequence Analysis

The first core component of the Situated Spatial and Experiential Analysis is the Spatial Threshold and Sequence Analysis, an analytical instrument designed to document how dissonance is encountered through architectural progression rather than at isolated points. This analysis focuses on thresholds, transitions, and sequences of spaces, understood as moments in which bodily orientation, emotional response, and perceptual intensity shift in relation to changes of scale, enclosure, materiality, light, sound, or visibility. Thresholds may include entrances, passages, stairs, changes in ground level, constrictions and expansions, points of exposure or concealment, and moments of visual or acoustic rupture. The Spatial Threshold and Sequence Analysis does not map space as a static configuration, nor does it attribute symbolic meaning to architectural elements in isolation. Instead, it reconstructs experiential sequences, documenting how dissonance emerges through movement and temporal progression. This allows the identification of architectural conditions that amplify tension, provoke hesitation or avoidance, generate attraction, or concentrate emotional charge. The analysis is explicitly non-evaluative: it does not judge architectural quality or design intention, but registers how spatial configurations mediate experience at different scales, from the bodily to the architectural.

Experiential Intensity and Sensory Mapping

The second core component is the Experiential Intensity and Sensory Mapping, an analytical device designed to visualize how dissonance is registered through bodily sensation and affective response across architectural space. This instrument focuses on gradients of intensity rather than on discrete spatial zones, acknowledging that experiential response often fluctuates rather than stabilizes. Sensory dimensions such as sound, light, temperature, texture, smell, enclosure, and exposure are considered in relation to emotional reactions such as discomfort, attraction, tension, calm, or disorientation. Experiential Intensity and Sensory Mapping does not seek to objectify emotion or to quantify affect. Instead, it provides a structured way to compare and layer experiential responses collected through autonomous observation, individual transect walks, and differentiated on-site engagement. By visualizing areas of heightened

intensity, sensory overload, or emotional resonance, the mapping reveals how architectural space participates in the production of dissonance beyond narrative or symbolic framing. The resulting maps are explicitly provisional and interpretative, intended to preserve ambiguity and variability rather than to define fixed zones of meaning.

Scale and Movement Pattern Analysis

The third core component is the Scale and Movement Pattern Analysis, which documents how different scales of architectural space interact with bodily movement and social practice. This instrument focuses on how scale conditions orientation, pacing, gathering, avoidance, and circulation, and how these patterns differ between autonomous researcher observation, individual engagement with people, and collective interaction with associations. Movement is treated as an analytical indicator of spatial negotiation rather than as behavioral data to be optimized or corrected. The Scale and Movement Pattern Analysis makes visible recurring routes, pauses, detours, and zones of congestion or emptiness, without interpreting them as functional problems or design failures. Instead, these patterns are read as situated responses to architectural form and atmosphere, revealing how dissonance is spatially distributed and experienced at different bodily and collective scales. By comparing movement patterns across different forms of engagement, the analysis highlights how architecture mediates dissonance differently depending on positionality, familiarity, and social configuration. Taken together, the Spatial Threshold and Sequence Analysis, the Experiential Intensity and Sensory Mapping, and the Scale and Movement Pattern Analysis constitute the core of the Situated Spatial and Experiential Analysis. They enable the research process, and any subsequent user of the Toolkit, to understand how dissonance is materially and spatially mediated through architecture, how experiential responses concentrate or dissipate across scales, and how bodily encounter complicates or destabilizes mediated perception. The Situated Spatial and Experiential Analysis does not stabilize meaning, resolve conflict, or anticipate intervention. It functions instead as a critical analytical reference designed to inform subsequent representational and comparative work in Phase O6, while preserving the situated, embodied, and scale-dependent nature of experience as an irreducible dimension of dissonant heritage contexts.

PHASE


06


Final Synthesis and Orientation

Conceived as the final analytical stage of the Community Process Diagram, Phase 06 functions as a moment of consolidation, critical interpretation, and mediated return of the knowledge produced throughout the research process. Following the on-site spatial investigation conducted in Phase 05, direct engagement with the site or with communities is deliberately suspended. Experiential and participatory activities are not extended further; instead, a reflective step back from the field is introduced, allowing heterogeneous materials—perceptual, spatial, sensory, and relational—to be transformed into structured analytical frameworks and communicable representations. Rather than aiming to resolve dissonance, stabilize meanings, or produce definitive narratives, this phase is oriented toward articulating how dissonance has been constructed, perceived, encountered, and mediated across the different stages of the process. From this perspective, Phase 06 operates as a space of synthesis without closure, in which complexity, contradiction, and fragmentation are preserved rather than reduced. The knowledge produced is not framed as an authoritative account of the site, but as a situated interpretation that explicitly acknowledges its conditions of production, its limits, and its internal tensions. Central to this phase is the controlled translation of experience into representation. Spatial encounters, bodily reactions, perceptual asymmetries, and identified sensitivities are not transferred directly into communicative outputs or operational recommendations. Instead, they are subjected to analytical processing through researcher-led tools that support comparison, abstraction, and critical distancing. Such a transformation is grounded in the awareness that representation is never neutral: maps, diagrams,

Community Process Diagram CPD

texts, visualizations, and narratives inevitably select, frame, and hierarchize elements of reality. For this reason, representation itself is treated here as a methodological act that must remain explicit, reflective, and accountable. Within this framework, outcomes are conceived primarily as analytical and interpretative artefacts. These may include structured reports, comparative diagrams, perceptual and spatial mappings, methodological syntheses, and curated visual or textual materials. Their function is not to communicate solutions, but to render visible the conditions under which dissonance operates and the ways in which architecture, memory, perception, and power intersect within the investigated context. When materials are prepared for dissemination or public circulation, this occurs through mediated and carefully framed formats that avoid direct exposure, personalization, or the reactivation of sensitive dynamics identified in earlier phases. Beyond consolidating results, Phase 06 also performs a reflexive role with respect to the research process itself. By bringing together outcomes across phases, it allows the research team to critically assess methodological choices, the selection or exclusion of tools, and the effects of sequencing and calibration. In this sense, the phase does not simply conclude the process, but renders it legible, transferable, and comparable, enabling adaptation to other contexts of dissonant heritage. By positioning consolidation and representation as a distinct and autonomous phase, the Community Process Diagram avoids collapsing engagement, experience, and communication into a single moment. The return of knowledge—whether addressed to professional audiences, institutions, or broader publics—is therefore mediated analytically rather than enacted as direct restitution. Through this positioning, Phase 06 preserves the ethical and methodological safeguards established throughout the process and affirms that working with dissonant heritage requires not only engagement and encounter, but also interpretation, responsibility, and restraint.





Phase 06 - Orientation, Restitution and Responsible Closure, CPD Diagram.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 06 Final Synthesis, and Orientation

Phase 06 constitutes the concluding phase of the Community Process Diagram and represents the moment in which the research process is rendered explicit, legible, and communicable. It does not correspond to a closure of the dissonance under investigation, nor to a resolution of conflict. Instead, it functions as a phase of consolidation and orientation, in which the knowledge produced throughout the CPD is brought into relation, critically structured, and made available for reflection and future use. By the time Phase 06 is activated, the research process has already generated a complex body of materials, including contextual analyses, stakeholder frameworks, validated risk assessments, perceptual studies at different scales, and on-site experiential data. Phase 06 does not add new data and does not activate further forms of interaction. Its role is to synthesize, reconstitute, and orient, ensuring that the multiplicity of perspectives and tensions identified throughout the process is preserved rather than reduced.

Phase 06 is articulated into three complementary and sequential sub-phases, each corresponding to a distinct analytical and communicative function. Phase 06.1 is dedicated to final analytical synthesis and operates as a cumulative reading of the entire CPD, bringing together perceptual, spatial, and interpretative layers without hierarchizing them. Phase 06.2 focuses on restitution and differentiated communication, addressing how the knowledge produced through the process can be responsibly shared with different audiences and through different formats. Phase 06.3 is devoted to orientation and frames the implications of the research process in terms of conditions, constraints, and zones of attention, without translating them into prescriptions or recommendations.

Together, these three sub-phases allow the CPD to conclude as a reflective methodological framework. Analytical synthesis, restitution, and orientation are treated as distinct but interdependent moments, ensuring

that the final phase does not collapse interpretation, communication, and future projection into a single operation. Taken together, the outcomes of Phase O6 constitute a transferable and operative knowledge base. They are conceived to be used beyond the CPD itself, supporting the activation of the Community Toolkit and informing subsequent phases of the project. By translating complex analytical processes into structured, readable, and ethically calibrated materials, these outcomes enable future actors to engage with the site in an informed manner, while maintaining awareness of dissonance, risk, and unresolved tension. In this way, Phase O6 ensures continuity between the research process and future actions, without collapsing understanding into prescription.

Phase O6.1 — Final Analytical Synthesis

Phase O6.1 is dedicated to the analytical synthesis of the entire research process. At this stage, the research team revisits all previous phases of the CPD in a cumulative and relational manner, with the aim of clarifying how different forms of knowledge interact and how dissonance is structured across perceptual, spatial, and social dimensions.

Rather than summarizing each phase sequentially, Phase O6.1 operates through comparison and cross-reading. International imaginaries, local and community-based perceptions, validated risks, and on-site experiential data are read together in order to identify patterns, contradictions, and unresolved tensions. This synthesis is interpretative rather than narrative and is oriented toward understanding the configuration of dissonance rather than its causes or solutions. In this sense, Phase O6 does not represent an endpoint isolated from subsequent actions, but rather a transitional phase between understanding and application. The outcomes produced in this phase are conceived not as conclusive results, but as structured knowledge resources intended to inform and support subsequent phases of the project and the operational use of the Community Toolkit. Phase O6 therefore functions as a hinge between the analytical process developed through the CPD and future practices of conservation, communication, design, or policy-making, without predetermining their content or direction.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Guiding / Core Questions for Phase 06.1

What is the overall configuration of dissonance that emerges when all phases of the CPD are read together?

This core question frames Phase 06.1 as a moment of interpretative alignment rather than synthesis through reduction. It invites the research team to reflect on how international representations, community perceptions, and on-site experiences intersect, overlap, or contradict one another. It also opens further questions concerning the persistence of certain tensions across different scales, the emergence of conflicts only in specific contexts, and the ways in which dissonance is distributed spatially, socially, and symbolically. Particular attention is given to aspects that remain ambiguous or unresolved, and to the reasons why such ambiguities persist despite extensive investigation. The aim is not to reconcile these elements, but to articulate their relationships within a coherent analytical framework. This core question is articulated through a set of analytical sub-questions:

- How do international representations, community perceptions, and on-site experiences intersect when read together?
- Where do these different perceptual layers converge, reinforce one another, or overlap?
- Where do contradictions, divergences, or disconnections between perceptual layers become most evident?
- Which tensions persist across different scales of perception (international, mediated, on-site)?
- Which conflicts or dissonant dynamics emerge only in specific contexts or forms of engagement?
- How is dissonance distributed spatially across the site?
- How is dissonance distributed socially among different actors and groups?
- How is dissonance articulated symbolically through narratives, images, and representations?
- Which aspects of dissonance remain ambiguous, unresolved, or resistant to interpretation?
- Why do certain ambiguities or tensions persist despite extensive

investigation?

- How do omissions, silences, or narrative gaps contribute to the overall configuration of dissonance?
- How can these heterogeneous elements be articulated within a coherent analytical framework without resolving or hierarchizing them?

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase O6.1 marks the moment in which the Community Process Diagram deliberately shifts from engagement to orientation. Following the intense and embodied spatial exposure of Phase O5, the research process withdraws from direct interaction with the built environment in order to consolidate an explicit awareness of limits, sensitivities, and conditions of attention. Architecture remains central to the process, but it is no longer approached through bodily movement, sensory immersion, or on-site experience. Instead, it becomes the object of reflective positioning, in which spatial knowledge produced in earlier phases is critically reframed in terms of responsibility, caution, and potential harm. This sub-phase does not aim to define actions, priorities, or interventions. It does not translate findings into recommendations, guidelines, design strategies, or concrete scenarios of architectural transformation. Nor does it seek to anticipate future projects, reuse hypotheses, or operational trajectories. Phase O6.1 operates on a different methodological register: its task is to make explicit what should be approached with caution, what should not be done lightly, and which forms of spatial engagement, transformation, or representation may risk reproducing conflict, trivializing trauma, or reinforcing dissonance. Rather than projecting solutions, this phase articulates constraints and conditions, emphasizing the ethical weight embedded in architectural decisions within dissonant contexts. The principal tool activated in Phase O6.1 is CR-01 Future Visioning, employed in a deliberately constrained, critical, and inverted manner. In this phase, Future Visioning is not used to define realistic, feasible, or desirable design scenarios, nor to outline concrete project proposals or planning options. Instead, it functions as a reflective and cautionary device aimed at identifying problematic or risk-laden futures. Associations and, where appropriate, institutional actors are invited to reflect on hypothetical spatial situations—such as changes of use, forms of visibility, regimes of access, or symbolic re-framing—not in order to develop them,

Community Process Diagram CPD

but to critically assess how such transformations could intensify existing conflicts, reactivate trauma, or instrumentalize architectural features. The exercise is carefully facilitated to remain grounded in the material and spatial characteristics of the site, while explicitly avoiding any translation into project briefs, scenarios of intervention, or actionable proposals. The methodological value of CR-01 in this configuration lies precisely in its negative and non-projective orientation. By framing future-oriented reflection around avoidance, restraint, and potential harm rather than desire, feasibility, or ambition, the tool allows participants to articulate tacit boundaries, unspoken fears, and zones of concern without committing to decisions or endorsing particular trajectories. In this sense, Future Visioning operates as an exercise in ethical awareness and responsibility, rather than as a precursor to design or planning. Alongside CR-01, CL-01 Day-to-day Interactions with Place is reintroduced in Phase 06.1 with a deliberately low-intensity and non-intrusive profile. In this sub-phase, CL-01 does not function as a data-generating tool and does not involve elicitation, prompting, or structured engagement. Instead, it supports a reflective observation of how the site gradually re-enters—or fails to re-enter—ordinary spatial routines after the conclusion of the on-site phases. Attention is paid to whether everyday practices resume, remain altered, or continue to avoid specific architectural elements, routes, or spaces previously identified as sensitive. These observations do not aim to document behaviour exhaustively, but to provide indirect indications of lingering spatial tension, unresolved sensitivity, or stabilization following embodied engagement. A defining characteristic of Phase 06.1 is that both tools operate without reopening experiential engagement or generating new interpretative claims. CR-01 and CL-01 are used to reflect on the consequences of action and inaction, visibility and invisibility, activation and restraint, rather than to expand the analytical corpus or to outline future interventions. Their combined use supports the construction of an orientation framework that consolidates spatial sensitivities, critical thresholds, and conditions of attention emerging from the process as a whole. This framework does not prescribe future action; instead, it documents the potential consequences of acting without care and makes explicit the ethical implications associated with architectural decision-making in contexts marked by dissonance and trauma.

Risks associated with Phase O6.1 interactions

The primary risk of Phase O6.1 lies in the potential confusion between orientation and instruction. Institutional actors may read the orientation framework as an implicit set of recommendations, constraints, or future courses of action, attributing to it a normative or operational force it does not possess. The use of Future Visioning, even in its critical and non-projective form, may reopen latent disagreements if discussions drift toward attribution of responsibility or blame. There is also a risk that the observation of day-to-day interactions is perceived as an evaluation of behaviour rather than as contextual monitoring of spatial sensitivity. For these reasons, facilitation consistently emphasizes that Phase O6.1 produces awareness rather than decisions, and that its outputs are analytical, non-binding, and explicitly non-exhaustive.

Outcomes #O6.1 - Final Dissonance Synthesis Report

The Final Dissonance Synthesis Report represents the most comprehensive analytical outcome of the CPD and constitutes the point at which the entire research trajectory is read and interpreted as a coherent whole. This document does not merely summarize the results of the previous phases, but performs an integrative and relational synthesis that brings together international representations, community-based perceptions, validated risks, and on-site experiential data.

The report articulates the overall configuration of dissonance emerging from the CPD by identifying how different perceptual, spatial, and social layers intersect, overlap, or contradict one another. Particular attention is devoted to the persistence of tensions across scales, to the emergence of conflicts only within specific contexts of engagement, and to the ways in which dissonance is distributed spatially across the site and socially among different actors. Rather than resolving contradictions or privileging one perspective over others, the synthesis explicitly treats ambiguity, contradiction, and non-alignment as constitutive elements of dissonant heritage. A central function of this outcome is to make visible relationships that remain implicit when phases are read in isolation. By cross-reading mediated imaginaries, narrated disvalue, and embodied experience, the report clarifies how omissions, silences, or narrative displacements operate alongside explicit

representations of conflict or trauma. It also reflects critically on why certain ambiguities persist despite extensive investigation, highlighting structural, cultural, or methodological factors that shape the production of meaning. From a methodological perspective, the Final Dissonance Synthesis Report provides a transparent account of how knowledge has been constructed throughout the CPD. It documents interpretative choices, analytical limits, and unresolved questions, thereby functioning as a reflexive reference for both the research team and external readers. As such, it constitutes the analytical backbone of the CPD and a key resource for comparability across case studies developed within the same framework. The Final Dissonance Synthesis Report may include:

- an integrated analytical synthesis of findings emerging from all phases of the CPD;
- a cross-scale interpretation of dissonance, bringing together international representations, community perceptions, and on-site experiences;
- identification of persistent tensions, contradictions, and convergences across perceptual, spatial, and social dimensions;
- spatial and conceptual mappings illustrating how dissonance is distributed across the site and among different actors;
- analysis of unresolved or ambiguous aspects of dissonance and reflections on why they persist;
- documentation of narrative gaps, silences, or omissions identified throughout the process;
- interpretative frameworks articulating relationships between different forms of dissonance without hierarchization;
- methodological reflections on the limits, uncertainties, and scope of the synthesis process;
- references to all previous CPD outcomes as the analytical basis of the synthesis;
- visual diagrams or summary schemes supporting readability and comparability of results.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Phase 06.2 — Restitution and Differentiated Communication

Phase 06.2 addresses the question of restitution and communication of the knowledge produced through the CPD. Restitution is not conceived as a single or uniform act, but as a differentiated process that takes into account the diversity of potential audiences, levels of exposure, and ethical considerations associated with dissonant heritage. This sub-phase acknowledges that transparency does not imply total visibility. Some materials generated during the process are suitable for broad dissemination, while others require mediation, contextualization, or restricted circulation. Phase 06.2 therefore focuses on selecting, adapting, and framing materials in ways that preserve complexity while minimizing the risk of simplification or reactivation of conflict.

Guiding / Core Questions for Phase 06.2

How can the results of the CPD be restituted in a way that preserves complexity without exacerbating conflict?

This question frames restitution as a methodological challenge rather than a neutral transmission of information. It opens reflection on which materials can be made public and which require mediation or contextualization, on how communication should differ when addressing institutions, communities, experts, or broader publics, and on which formats are most suitable for conveying spatial, emotional, and perceptual dimensions of dissonance. It also raises questions about the risks of oversimplification, instrumentalization, or misinterpretation, and about how uncertainty, plurality, and contradiction can be communicated without being neutralized. This core question is articulated through a set of analytical sub-questions:

- How can the outcomes of the CPD be communicated without simplifying or neutralizing dissonance?
- Which results are appropriate for public dissemination, and which require mediation or restricted circulation?
- How should restitution differ when addressing institutions, associations, communities, people, experts, or broader publics?
- Which formats are most suitable for communicating spatial, emotional, and perceptual dimensions of dissonance?

- How can uncertainty, ambiguity, and contradiction be communicated responsibly?
- What risks of misinterpretation, instrumentalization, or conflict reactivation are associated with different forms of restitution?
- How can restitution preserve analytical complexity while remaining accessible?
- How can visual and spatial materials be contextualized to avoid misleading readings?
- What role does the CPD itself play as an explanatory framework in restitution processes?
- How can restitution support reflection rather than debate or polarization?
- How can differentiated communication protect participants and sensitive materials?
- How can restitution contribute to transparency without exposing vulnerable actors or narratives?

Community

Process Diagram

CPD

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase 06.2 addresses one of the most delicate moments of the Community Process Diagram: the regulation of restitution and communication after the completion of analytical and on-site phases. Rather than asking how results should be disseminated or made visible, this sub-phase poses a more fundamental and prior question: what can be shared, with whom, and under which conditions, in light of the spatial, emotional, and ethical sensitivities identified throughout the process. Phase 06.2 is therefore not oriented toward disclosure or synthesis, but toward the careful calibration of exposure. This phase does not aim to disseminate findings, to present a comprehensive account of the research, or to outline future scenarios of action or transformation. It is not conceived as a public-facing activity, nor as a moment of recognition, closure, or validation for participants. Instead, Phase 06.2 functions as a regulatory and mediating space in which the circulation of data and interpretations is critically assessed in order to anticipate potential harm, misinterpretation, or overexposure. The emphasis is placed on restraint, selectivity, and contextualization, rather than on transparency understood as full disclosure. The primary tool activated in this phase is GR-02 Community Gatherings, explicitly reconfigured for a non-public and non-projectual purpose. In Phase 06.2, gatherings are not conceived as open events, forums, or participatory

assemblies, nor as spaces for dialogue oriented toward consensus or decision-making. They are instead carefully framed encounters involving a limited and clearly identified set of interlocutors. Participation is invitation-based, and the materials shared are partial, mediated, and explicitly contextualized. Rather than presenting results or conclusions, these gatherings focus on discussing conditions of attention, unresolved sensitivities, and the limits of interpretation associated with the data produced. Spatial representations, when introduced, are abstracted and selective, deliberately avoiding detailed visualization of highly sensitive architectural areas or configurations. In this configuration, GR-02 functions as a testing device, allowing the research process to verify whether the framing of caution, restraint, and incompleteness is intelligible, acceptable, and ethically sound for different actor categories. CR-02 Arts-based Engagements complement this process by acting as translation and mediation devices. In Phase 06.2, arts-based tools are not activated for creative expression, participatory interpretation, or imaginative projection. They are explicitly detached from any design-oriented or future-oriented purpose. Instead, they are used to transform complex spatial, emotional, and analytical insights into indirect, symbolic, or abstract forms that reduce cognitive and emotional overload. Through non-verbal or minimally representational languages, CR-02 allows difficult content to be approached without reproducing the intensity of on-site exposure or reactivating traumatic associations. The use of arts-based engagements in this phase is carefully limited to associations, mediators, and professionals, and explicitly excludes vulnerable individuals or actors for whom such exposure could be ethically problematic.

A defining feature of Phase 06.2 is its non-projectual nature. Neither GR-02 nor CR-02 is used to imagine future transformations, to outline scenarios of reuse, or to prefigure interventions. Instead, both tools are oriented toward the controlled restitution of data and interpretations already produced, with the explicit aim of regulating how such materials may circulate. The outcome of Phase 06.2 is a differentiated restitution framework that maps audiences, formats, degrees of abstraction, and levels of access. This framework makes explicit that selective and partial communication is not a failure of transparency, but a necessary ethical response to dissonant heritage contexts, where uncontrolled dissemination may reproduce harm rather than understanding.

Risks associated with Phase 06.2 interactions

Phase 06.2 carries significant relational and political risks. Selective restitution may be perceived as exclusion, withholding, or censorship, particularly by actors who expect visibility or recognition. Arts-based translations risk aestheticizing trauma if their symbolic nature is not clearly framed. Controlled gatherings may generate expectations of further engagement, action, or institutional response. There is also a risk that abstracted spatial representations lose nuance, leading to misinterpretation. A further risk lies in the potential misreading of this sub-phase as a preparatory step toward design, intervention, or decision-making, despite its explicitly non-projectual intent. To mitigate these risks, the limits and purpose of Phase 06.2 are explicitly stated, and all shared materials are framed as partial, provisional, and context-dependent.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Outcome #06.2 — Differentiated Restitution and Communication Package

The Differentiated Restitution and Communication Package translates the analytical outcomes of the CPD into a set of curated and context-sensitive materials designed for different audiences. This outcome responds to the recognition that dissonant heritage cannot be restituted through a single narrative or format without risking simplification, misinterpretation, or conflict reactivation. Rather than functioning as a unified public report, this package is structured as a differentiated system of documents and visual materials, each calibrated to a specific category of interlocutors, such as institutions, associations, communities, experts, or broader publics. The objective is not to disseminate all results indiscriminately, but to ensure that communication remains ethically responsible, analytically accurate, and appropriate to the level of exposure and responsibility of each audience. The package draws on the outcomes of all previous phases, particularly the Final Dissonance Synthesis Report, and rearticulates them through adapted formats. These may include explanatory texts, visual syntheses, maps, diagrams, or narrative summaries, always accompanied by contextual framing that clarifies analytical limits, uncertainty, and plurality of interpretation. Special care is given to the treatment of sensitive materials, ensuring that restitution does not expose vulnerable actors, re-personalize trauma, or transform analytical findings into prescriptive

statements. Methodologically, this outcome reinforces the role of restitution as an integral part of the research process rather than a final communicative act. By making explicit how and why different forms of restitution are produced, the package supports transparency and reflexivity, and allows the CPD to be understood not only as a tool for analysis, but also as a framework for responsible communication of complex and contested heritage. The Differentiated Restitution and Communication Package may include:

- tailored versions of CPD outcomes designed for different audiences (institutions, communities, experts, wider publics);
- curated visual and spatial materials adapted for responsible communication of dissonance;
- explanatory texts clarifying the methodological framework and limits of interpretation;
- guidance on levels of accessibility and exposure of sensitive materials;
- documentation strategies for communicating uncertainty, plurality, and contradiction;
- contextual notes accompanying maps, diagrams, or visual outputs to prevent misinterpretation;
- materials supporting institutional discussion, exhibitions, or educational activities;
- internal and external communication formats ensuring ethical and methodological consistency;
- reflections on risks associated with dissemination and strategies adopted to mitigate them;
- references linking restitution materials to the original CPD outcomes and analytical sources.

Phase 06.3 — Orientation Framework

Phase 06.3 represents the final moment of the CPD and is dedicated to orientation. This sub-phase is not intended to generate recommendations or guidelines, but to articulate the implications of the research process in terms of conditions, constraints, and zones of attention. The objective of Phase 06.3 is to project the knowledge produced through the CPD into the future without determining specific actions. It clarifies what has been learned about the site's dissonant condition and what this knowledge implies for any potential future intervention.

Guiding / Core Questions for Phase 06.3

What must be taken into account if future actions are to engage responsibly with the site?

What must be taken into account if future actions are to engage responsibly with the site?

This guiding question shifts the focus from interpretation to projection without prescription. It invites reflection on which sensitivities, risks, and unresolved tensions have emerged through the CPD, and how these elements should condition any future conservation, transformation, or communication process. It also addresses the consequences of ignoring perceptual, emotional, or spatial dimensions of dissonance, and the importance of maintaining awareness of uncertainty and conflict rather than attempting to resolve them prematurely.

This core question is articulated through a set of analytical sub-questions:

- What conditions emerge as essential for any future engagement with the site?
- Which sensitivities, risks, or unresolved issues must be acknowledged before any action is undertaken?
- Which aspects of dissonance require particular care, mediation, or avoidance?
- What are the potential consequences of ignoring perceptual, emotional, or spatial dimensions of dissonance?
- Which tensions appear non-negotiable or resistant to resolution?
- Where does uncertainty persist, and how should it be maintained rather than resolved?
- How can future actions remain informed by the complexity documented through the CPD?
- What ethical constraints should guide future conservation, transformation, or communication processes?
- How can awareness of dissonance shape responsible decision-making without prescribing outcomes?
- How can the outcomes of the CPD be used as orientation tools rather than guidelines?
- What limits should be explicitly acknowledged in future interventions?
- How does the Orientation Framework support continuity between the CPD and subsequent project phases?

Community Process Diagram CPD

Tools and Methodological Approach

Phase 06.3 deliberately activates tools that allow for a capillary and process-oriented form of verification. The selection of Semi-structured Interviews (IN-02) and Multispeaker Debate (GR-05) reflects the need to analyze the Community Process Diagram not in terms of its substantive findings, but in relation to its internal coherence, ethical positioning, and methodological effectiveness across all phases. In this sub-phase, tools are explicitly oriented toward the critical examination of the process itself. Experts are invited to assess how the different phases have been articulated, whether the sequence of engagement, withdrawal, and restitution has been respected, and whether the safeguards identified in earlier phases have been adequately implemented. Attention is paid to identifying moments of potential overexposure, premature closure, analytical bias, or unresolved tension between methodological ambition and ethical restraint. Through IN-02, expert interviews enable a detailed and reasoned evaluation of individual phases and transitions, allowing specific choices, omissions, or uncertainties to be examined in depth. GR-05 complements this individual assessment by providing a collective and comparative space in which different expert perspectives can confront one another, making divergences, blind spots, or structural weaknesses explicit rather than implicit. A defining feature of Phase 06.3 is its explicitly iterative logic. Verification is not conceived as a terminal endorsement of the process, but as a critical checkpoint. Should expert analysis reveal significant gaps, misalignments, or insufficiently explored dimensions, the CPD allows—and explicitly acknowledges—the possibility of returning to earlier phases in order to gather additional information, refine analytical steps, or recalibrate engagement strategies. In this sense, Phase 06.3 does not merely conclude the process, but ensures that its closure is reflective, reversible, and accountable. By framing verification as a moment of critical scrutiny rather than final validation, the tools activated in Phase 06.3 reinforce the CPD's commitment to methodological rigor and ethical responsibility. The outcome of this phase is not a confirmation of results, but a documented awareness of the strengths, limits, and conditions under which the process may be considered complete, without foreclosing the possibility of further inquiry if required.

Risks associated with Phase 06.3 interactions

The main risk in Phase 06.3 is the reintroduction of authority at the moment of closure. Expert reflections may be perceived as endorsement or final judgment, lending unintended legitimacy to certain interpretations. There is also a risk that formal closure produces an illusion of resolution, obscuring the ongoing nature of dissonance and trauma. Multispeaker debates may reproduce disciplinary hierarchies, marginalizing less dominant perspectives. To counter these risks, expert input is framed as reflective guidance rather than validation, and the CPD concludes with an explicit refusal of finality, preserving the possibility of revision or return to earlier phases if critical issues remain unresolved.

Outcome #06.3 — Orientation and Risk Awareness Framework

The Orientation and Risk Awareness Framework represents the final outcome of the CPD and functions as a forward-looking reference rather than a set of recommendations or guidelines. Its purpose is to articulate the implications of the research process in terms of conditions, constraints, and zones of attention that must be acknowledged in any future engagement with the site. This framework consolidates the sensitivities, risks, and unresolved issues identified and validated throughout the CPD, connecting them to perceptual, spatial, and social dimensions of dissonance. It clarifies which aspects of the site require particular care, mediation, or avoidance, and highlights tensions that appear persistent, non-negotiable, or resistant to resolution. Importantly, it also makes explicit areas of uncertainty that should be preserved rather than resolved, recognizing uncertainty as an ethical and analytical outcome of the process. The Orientation and Risk Awareness Framework does not prescribe actions, interventions, or design solutions. Instead, it provides a structured reference that supports informed decision-making while preserving the autonomy of future actors. By identifying what cannot be ignored, what requires caution, and what remains open, this outcome establishes a shared baseline of awareness that conditions any subsequent phase of conservation, communication, design, or policy-making. Within the broader logic of the CPD, this outcome functions as a hinge between analytical understanding and future practice. It ensures

Community Process Diagram CPD

continuity between the research process and subsequent project phases, and allows the Community Toolkit to be used in an informed and context-sensitive manner. In doing so, it reinforces the ethical integrity of the CPD and affirms its role as a framework for navigating, rather than resolving, dissonant heritage. To support future users of the CPD, the Orientation Framework may be complemented by a simple decision-oriented reference, indicating when existing CPD outcomes provide sufficient orientation and when additional investigation or renewed engagement may be required. Such a reference does not prescribe actions, but helps situate the CPD within longer-term and iterative research or project trajectories. The Orientation and Risk Awareness Framework may include:

- a synthesis of key sensitivities, risks, and unresolved issues emerging from the CPD;
- identification of conditions and constraints relevant to any future engagement with the site;
- spatial and thematic indications of zones requiring particular care or mediation;
- articulation of ethical considerations shaping future conservation, transformation, or communication processes;
- reflections on non-negotiable tensions and areas of persistent uncertainty;
- orientation notes clarifying what should be acknowledged rather than resolved;
- references to validated risk assessments and perceptual analyses supporting the framework;
- conceptual diagrams outlining relationships between dissonance, risk, and engagement conditions;
- guidance on how CPD outcomes may inform subsequent project phases without prescribing actions;
- explicit statements on the limits of applicability and scope of the orientation framework.

PHASE 06 — Overall Outcome

Interpretative Framework

The overall outcome of Phase 06 is the Interpretative Framework, a structured and reflexive analytical outcome that consolidates and critically relates the materials produced throughout the previous phases of the Community Process Diagram. This outcome represents the final phase of the CPD and does not function as a resolution of dissonance, a reconciliation of narratives, or a translation of findings into operational or design-oriented prescriptions. Instead, it constitutes an interpretative device that renders the research trajectory legible, transferable, and critically usable, while preserving ambiguity, contradiction, and non-alignment as constitutive conditions of dissonant heritage contexts.

Community Process Diagram CPD

The genesis of the Interpretative Framework reflects the cumulative and relational logic of the CPD. It brings into dialogue the Structured Perceptual Landscape developed in Phase 04 and the Situated Spatial and Experiential Analysis produced in Phase 05, while remaining informed by the Contextualized Risk and Sensitivity Framework articulated in Phase 03. These heterogeneous materials are not merged into a unified synthesis, nor are they hierarchized according to disciplinary, spatial, or ethical criteria. Rather, they are interpreted through explicit analytical operations that clarify how different layers of meaning coexist, overlap, or resist integration across perceptual, experiential, spatial, and ethical dimensions. Within the overall logic of the CPD, the Interpretative Framework performs a double function. At an analytical level, it enables a cross-reading of perception and experience, making visible where narratives, imaginaries, and mediated framings converge with or diverge from embodied spatial encounter. At an epistemological level, it establishes limits to interpretation by identifying elements of dissonance that persist despite extensive investigation, participation, and experiential engagement. In doing so, it protects the research process from forced coherence, premature closure, or the expectation that all tensions can or should be resolved.

The Interpretative Framework is conceived as an autonomous and downloadable document composed of a limited number of core analytical instruments, considered essential for its usability by other researchers,

practitioners, and institutions. Among these, two instruments are regarded as fundamental.

Interpretative Layers Diagram

The first core component of the Interpretative Framework is the Interpretative Layers Diagram, an analytical device designed to visualize the coexistence of multiple interpretative dimensions without collapsing them into a single explanatory framework. The diagram organizes the materials produced in the previous phases into distinct but related layers, typically including perceptual and narrative framings, spatial and architectural configurations, embodied and experiential responses, and ethical or risk-related constraints. These layers are not arranged hierarchically, nor are they interpreted as successive stages of understanding. Instead, they are presented as parallel and interdependent fields that jointly shape how dissonance is produced, perceived, and negotiated.

The Interpretative Layers Diagram allows the research process to clarify where different layers reinforce one another, where they contradict or destabilize each other, and where they remain disconnected or only partially aligned. For example, a dominant narrative framing identified in Phase 04 may not correspond to the zones of experiential intensity documented in Phase 05, or an area of heightened spatial tension may coexist with relative narrative silence. By rendering these relationships explicit, the diagram prevents reductive interpretations that privilege either discourse or experience, and it foregrounds architecture and spatial scale as active mediators rather than as passive backgrounds.

This instrument does not aim to integrate layers into a comprehensive interpretation, nor to prioritize one layer as more authoritative. Its function is interpretative rather than synthetic: it supports critical judgment by making visible the structural complexity of dissonance and by preserving the autonomy of different analytical dimensions. The diagram is explicitly provisional and context-dependent, designed to support reflection and comparison rather than to stabilize meaning.

Community Process Diagram CPD

Persistence and Irreducibility Map


The second core component of the Interpretative Framework is the Persistence and Irreducibility Map, an analytical instrument designed to identify forms of dissonance that remain unresolved or only partially transformed at the conclusion of the CPD. This map focuses on what persists despite analytical inquiry, participatory engagement, perceptual documentation, and experiential investigation. Rather than treating persistence as a failure of the research process, the map explicitly frames irreducibility as an analytical and ethical finding.

The Persistence and Irreducibility Map distinguishes between different conditions of dissonance, such as tensions that persist across scales and phases, dissonances that are transformed but not resolved through engagement or spatial encounter, and latent dissonances that remain marginal or silent yet continue to shape perception and experience. These conditions are not quantified or ranked, nor are they translated into priorities for action. Instead, they are documented as limits to interpretation and intervention.

By making irreducibility explicit, this instrument plays a crucial role in orienting future practice without prescribing it. It clarifies which aspects of dissonance cannot be addressed through design, conservation, communication, or participation alone, and which tensions must be acknowledged as enduring features of the site and its history. In this sense, the Persistence and Irreducibility Map establishes an epistemological boundary for subsequent strategic reflection within the Co.Co.War Handbook, ensuring that strategies for intervention are formulated with awareness of what cannot be resolved, mitigated, or reconciled.

Taken together, the Interpretative Layers Diagram and the Persistence and Irreducibility Map constitute the core of the Interpretative Framework. They enable the research process, and any subsequent user of the Toolkit, to interpret relationships between perception, experience, space, and risk without collapsing them into a unified narrative or actionable solution. The Interpretative Framework does not conclude the investigation of dissonance, nor does it transform analysis into prescription. It functions

instead as a critical closing device of the CPD, preserving complexity, uncertainty, and limitation as integral components of responsible engagement with dissonant heritage.



Inner Space of Former House of the Fascist Party, Predappio, Italy, June 2025

/5.0

APPENDIX

Appendix A — Data Governance and Ethical Responsibility

The investigation of dissonant heritage inevitably involves the collection, processing, and interpretation of sensitive materials, including narratives related to trauma, conflict, exclusion, and contested memory. For this reason, data governance and ethical responsibility are not ancillary aspects of the Community Process Diagram (CPD), but foundational conditions for its responsible application. The CPD assumes that data generated throughout the process—whether textual, visual, spatial, or audio—may carry personal, emotional, social, or political implications. Even when data are collected in mediated or anonymized forms, their interpretation and circulation can have consequences for individuals, groups, and communities. Ethical responsibility therefore extends beyond compliance with formal regulations and includes reflexive awareness of how data are produced, stored, interpreted, and potentially disseminated. Within this framework, data governance should be understood as a continuous and integrated process accompanying all phases of the CPD. This includes attention to informed consent, anonymity, confidentiality, secure storage, controlled access, and responsible archiving. Particular care must be taken when dealing with materials generated during participatory or on-site phases, where embodied experience and emotional response may expose participants to vulnerability. The CPD explicitly avoids the uncontrolled circulation of raw data and emphasizes the progressive transformation of materials into structured outcomes, as a way to mitigate ethical risks.

It is strongly recommended that each application of the CPD be accompanied by a dedicated data and ethics document, to be included as an appendix to the research. This document should clarify how data are managed across phases, how sensitive materials are protected, and under which conditions outcomes may be shared or published. Such a document does not impose a single standard, but ensures transparency,

Appendix

accountability, and alignment with local legal frameworks (e.g. data protection regulations) and institutional ethical requirements.

By foregrounding data governance as an explicit methodological concern, the CPD reinforces its commitment to ethical research practice and ensures that the investigation of dissonance does not reproduce harm, exposure, or exploitation, but contributes to a careful, responsible, and critically grounded understanding of difficult heritage.

Appendix B — Psychosocial Risk Awareness and Emergency Considerations

Engagement with dissonant heritage frequently intersects with unresolved trauma, emotional distress, and sensitive collective memories. While the CPD is designed to minimize risks through its phased structure and delayed engagement with people, it is nevertheless essential to acknowledge that unexpected emotional reactions may arise during the research process. Psychosocial risk awareness refers to the capacity of the research framework to recognize, anticipate, and respond responsibly to situations in which participants or researchers may experience distress. This does not imply that the CPD functions as a therapeutic or clinical tool. Rather, it acknowledges that research activities—particularly those involving memory, loss, violence, or exclusion—may reactivate emotional responses that require care and attention. The CPD addresses this issue primarily through Phase 03, where risks and sensitivities are identified and validated before direct engagement with people. However, awareness of psychosocial risk should extend across all phases, especially those involving interaction, participation, or public confrontation of dissonant narratives. Researchers and facilitators should remain attentive to signs of discomfort, distress, withdrawal, or escalation, and should be prepared to pause, reframe, or adapt activities when necessary.

It is therefore recommended that each application of the CPD include a basic psychosocial risk awareness note, outlining principles rather than procedures. This may include recognition of warning signs, clarity on the limits of the research role, and identification of local support resources that could be activated if needed. The aim is not to professionalize the research team as mental health practitioners, but to avoid situations of neglect, denial, or improvisation in the face of distress. Including such considerations as an appendix reinforces the CPD's ethical orientation and underscores the principle that responsible research on dissonant heritage must remain attentive not only to analytical rigor, but also to the well-being and dignity of those involved.

Appendix

Appendix C — Outcome Documentation and Reporting Framework

The CPD places particular emphasis on outcomes as progressive synthesis documents that accompany the research process and ensure transparency, traceability, and comparability. Outcomes are not conceived as generic deliverables, but as structured reports that document how knowledge has been produced at specific moments within the CPD.

To support coherence across different applications of the CPD, it is recommended that each outcome be introduced by a standardized initial section that clearly situates the document within the broader research process. This introductory section functions as a methodological header and provides essential contextual information that allows the outcome to be read, archived, and compared across cases. Such an introductory section may include, among other elements, the title and number of the outcome, the corresponding CPD phase, the date of production, the research team involved, a brief description of the scope and objectives of the document, and references to the tools and data sources used. It may also specify the status of the document (draft, intermediate, validated), its intended audience, and any restrictions on circulation due to ethical or sensitivity considerations.

This initial framing does not exhaust the content of the outcome, but establishes a shared structure that supports clarity and accountability. Additional sections may then be developed according to the specific nature of the outcome, including analytical content, visual materials, interpretative notes, and methodological reflections. By encouraging the use of a standardized introductory framework for outcomes, the CPD strengthens its capacity for cumulative documentation and cross-case comparison. It ensures that outcomes are not isolated products, but integrated components of a coherent research archive that can support future phases of the project, comparative research, and responsible use of the Community Toolkit.

Appendix D — Guidelines for Translation and Multilingual Communication

The investigation and communication of dissonant heritage frequently require engagement across linguistic, cultural, and geopolitical boundaries. Within the Community Process Diagram (CPD), translation and multilingual communication are not understood as neutral or purely technical operations, but as interpretative acts that can significantly influence meaning, perception, and reception.

Dissonance, trauma, and disvalue are often embedded in language-specific expressions, metaphors, silences, and cultural references that do not translate directly across linguistic contexts. For this reason, the CPD treats translation as an integral component of methodological responsibility, rather than as a post-hoc dissemination task. Decisions regarding language use, translation strategies, and multilingual communication should therefore be made consciously and reflectively, with explicit awareness of their analytical and ethical implications.

Multilingual communication may be required at different moments of the CPD, including desk-based research involving international sources, expert consultation across linguistic contexts, community engagement in multilingual settings, and restitution of outcomes to diverse audiences. In each of these contexts, translation involves choices that may amplify, soften, neutralize, or reframe dissonance. Particular care is needed when translating terms related to trauma, conflict, identity, or exclusion, as apparently equivalent expressions may carry different emotional or political weight in different languages. It is recommended that translation practices within the CPD be guided by principles of contextual sensitivity and transparency. Rather than seeking literal equivalence, translation should aim for interpretative fidelity, preserving ambiguity, uncertainty, and tension where these are analytically meaningful. When key concepts do not have direct equivalents, explanatory notes or parallel formulations may be preferable to forced translation. Similarly, maintaining original-language excerpts alongside translated versions can support reflexivity and allow readers to recognize potential shifts in meaning. Multilingual communication also raises questions of accessibility and power. Choices

Appendix

about which languages are used in engagement activities or restitution materials can include or exclude specific groups and shape whose voices are heard. The CPD encourages explicit reflection on these dynamics, particularly in contexts where dominant languages differ from those spoken by local communities or marginalized groups. Decisions about language use should therefore be documented and justified as part of the methodological process. It is advisable that each application of the CPD include a brief translation and language note, outlining which languages are used, which materials are translated, and which translation strategies are adopted. This note may also clarify who is responsible for translation, whether professional translators or cultural mediators are involved, and how consistency and quality are ensured across different phases and outputs. By addressing translation and multilingual communication as methodological issues, the CPD reinforces its commitment to analytical rigor, ethical awareness, and inclusivity. Rather than minimizing linguistic difference, this approach acknowledges translation as a site where dissonance itself may be revealed, negotiated, or transformed, and where careful methodological attention is essential to avoid unintended distortion or erasure.

/6.0

REFERENCES

- Alaszewski, A. 2006. Using Diaries for Social Research. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Ancarno, C., O. Davis, and D. Wyatt. 2016. "Forging Communities: The Caerau and Ely Rediscovering Heritage Project and the Dynamics of Co-Production." In *After Urban Regeneration: Communities, Policy and Place*, edited by D. O'Brien and P. Matthews, 113–129. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Brahm, E. 2003. "Latent Conflict Stage." *Beyond Intractability*.
- Bryman, A. 2016. *Social Research Methods*. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burton, J. 1990. *Conflict: Human Needs Theory*. New York: Springer.
- CARE. 2020. *The CARE Emergency Toolkit (CET): Conflict Sensitivity*. London.
- Charmaz, K., and L. M. McMullen. 2011. *Five Ways of Doing Qualitative Analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Chitty, G., ed. 2017. *Heritage, Conservation and Communities: Engagement, Participation and Capacity Building*. London: Routledge.
- Clark, K. 2019. *Playing with the Past: Exploring Values in Heritage Practice*. New York: Berghahn.
- Clark, K. 2010. "Values in Cultural Resource Management." In *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*, edited by G. S. Smith, P. M. Messenger, and H. A. Soderland, 89–99. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Cockayne, J., C. Mikulaschek, and C. Perry. 2010. *The United Nations Security Council and Civil War: First Insights from a New Dataset*. International Peace Institute.
- Coffey, A. 1999. *The Ethnographic Self: Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity*. London: SAGE.
- Cruikshank, B. 1999. *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Davies, C. A. 2008. *Reflexive Ethnography*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Department for International Development (DFID). 2004. *Disaster Risk Reduction: A Development Concern*. London.
- Ellard-Gray, A., N. K. Jeffrey, M. Choubak, and S. E. Crann. 2015. "Finding the Hidden Participant." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 14 (5): 1–10.
- First Aid and Resilience for Cultural Heritage in Times of Crisis (FAR). 2018. ICCROM. Rome.
- Flyvbjerg, B. 2006. "Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 12 (2): 219–245.

References

- Galtung, J. 1969. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research*.
- Galtung, J. 1996. *Peace by Peaceful Means*. London: Sage.
- Garduño Freeman, C. 2010. "Photosharing on Flickr." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (4—5): 352—368.
- Giaccardi, E., ed. 2012. *Heritage and Social Media*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gillham, B. 2000. *Case Study Research Methods*. London: Continuum.
- Graham, H., and J. Vergunst, eds. 2019. *Heritage as Community Research*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Harper, D. 2012. *Visual Sociology*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Herbert, S. 2017. *Conflict Analysis: Topic Guide*. Birmingham: GSDRC.
- Hinds, R., and B. Carter. 2015. *Indicators for Conflict, Stability, Security, Justice and Peacebuilding*. GSDRC.
- ICCROM. 2005. *Definition of Cultural Heritage*. Rome.
- International Alert. 2004. *Conflict-Sensitive Approaches to Development*.
- Jenkins, K., and D. B. Subedi. 2018. *Reconciliation in Conflict-Affected Communities*. New York: Springer.
- Jones, S. 2017. "Wrestling with the Social Value of Heritage." *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 4 (1): 21—37.
- Jones, S., and S. Leech. 2015. *Valuing the Historic Environment*. London: AHRC.
- Jones, S., et al. 2017. "3D Heritage Visualisation and Authenticity." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24 (4): 333—353.
- Jones, S., and T. Yarrow. 2022. *The Object of Conservation*. London: Routledge.
- Kisić, V., and G. Tomka. 2018. *Citizen Engagement & Education*. The Hague: Europa Nostra.
- Kozinets, R. V. 2010. *Netnography*. London: SAGE.
- Krueger, R. A., and M. A. Casey. 2015. *Focus Groups*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lähdesmäki, T., et al., eds. 2026. *Engaging Communities in Cultural Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Latham, A. 2003. "Research, Performance, and Human Geography." *Environment and Planning* 35: 1993—2017.
- Lavie, A. 2004. "Right of Remembrance." *Haaretz*.
- Lecocq, B. 2010. *Disputed Desert*. Leiden: Brill.
- Low, S. 2008. "Social Sustainability." In *The Heritage Reader*, 392—404. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Mac Ginty, R. 2013. "Indicators+: Everyday Peace Indicators." *Evaluation and Program Planning*: 56—63.
- Mason, J., and K. Davies. 2009. "Sensory Methodology." *Qualitative Research* 9 (5): 587—603.
- Matthews, P. 2015. "Neighbourhood Belonging and Social Media." *Housing Studies* 30 (1): 22—39.
- Neal, C. 2015. "Heritage and Participation." In *The Palgrave Handbook*, 347—365.
- Onciul, B., M. L. Stefano, and S. Hawke. 2017. *Engaging Heritage*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

- Palmer, J., C. Pocock, and L. Burton. 2017. "Waiting, Power and Time." *Qualitative Research* 18 (4): 416—432.
- Peters, R. F., et al., eds. 2020. *Heritage Conservation and Social Engagement*. London: UCL Press.
- Pink, S. 2007. *Doing Visual Ethnography*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Robson, E. 2025. *Assessing the Social Values of Heritage*. London: UCL Press.
- Robson, E., and S. Jones. 2025. *Social Values Assessment Report*. Stirling: University of Stirling.
- Seidman, I. 2006. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Silverman, D. 2014. *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. 5th ed. London: SAGE.
- Tandon, A., et al. 2018. *First Aid to Cultural Heritage in Times of Crisis*. Rome: ICCROM.
- Taylor, M. 2011. *Public Policy in the Community*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- UNESCO. 2018. *Warsaw Recommendation on Recovery and Reconstruction of Cultural Heritage*.
- UNISDR. 2020. *Terminology*.
- Vagnarelli, T. 2025. *Progettare e praticare la conservazione partecipata*. Roma: WriteUp.
- Watt, S., and J. Scott Jones. 2010. "Participant Observation." In *Ethnography in Social Science Practice*, 107—125. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Yin, R. 2014. *Case Study Research*. 5th ed. London: Sage.
- Zimmerman, D. H., and D. L. Wieder. 1977. "The Diary-Interview Method." *Urban Life* 5 (4): 479—498.

References



Visit to the Havuts Tar Monastery Complex, Armenia, July, 2025





ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
**UNIVERSITÀ
DI BOLOGNA**



**UNIVERSITÀ
POLITECNICA
DELLE MARCHE**



**Politecnico
di Torino**

Dipartimento
di Architettura e Design



