

JPI URBAN EUROPE CONFERENCE:  
PROJECTS DAY (May 31)

Stakeholder seminar: enhancing impact and accelerating transitions



Open session to identify topics for future support activities

### Short summary of conclusions

JPI UE is at the moment especially seen as an academic project funder; the role of the programme could be strengthened by **clearly linking funding to long term ambitions**, by supporting **continuity and follow up in projects** (follow up projects, actions as well as longer term impact monitoring), by crafting **links between projects and networks** and by **supporting knowledge transfer** and mobility between projects and networks.

It would be good if project results would be made available, searchable and if possible evaluated with respect to their usability and relevance. It was recommended to start a taskforce to develop innovative knowledge dissemination schemes and activities (e.g. policy briefs, short movies, incorporating intermediaries in projects (consultants to cities).

Regarding a possible 'hub' function of JPI UE, **problem owners** (i.c. Cities) **should have a more prominent role**. Also, JPI UE should **link to already existing networks and communities** and the JPI UE **activities should have a clear added value** to already existing instruments and initiatives.

### Overview of group input

"JPI Urban Europe as the hub for cities"?

- Reward cities for joining projects, for instance by mentioning them at the JPI UE website
  - explanation: the programme views on the emergence of projects should reflect reality: in reality, initiatives for projects are often taken by researchers seeking support which cities – and cities volunteer to support projects;
- Organise a match-making system for researchers seeking cities and cities expressing their research questions; this can be done in sessions, but also via internet ('marketplace')
- Recognise differences: collaboration and sharing information is very good, but we have to take into account that there are important differences between cities and even neighbourhoods within cities;
  - explanation: cities differ in size, in economic prosperity and in a whole range of other indicators; also cities and neighbourhoods differ in development stage: such areas will have different challenges and priorities; we should embrace this diversity;
- JPI UE should reach out to cities, organisations and people that are *not* part of projects as well as to project participants;

- explanation: some (larger) cities frequently participate in JPI UE projects, but not all (small) cities are able to do so; for them it might also be difficult to get access to knowledge and experiences
- If JPI UE has the ambition to be a hub, it should have quite close relations with already existing networks, communities etc.; it must be clear what the added value of JPI UE is compared with the already existing initiatives;
- invite other networks, funding agencies etc. to the JPI UE events (and reversely, show JPI UE in other events);
- JPI UE could act as the distributed memory for project *results*, experiences etc., however, there are already several databases and – structures, so JPI U should provide added value:
  - ‘valuation’ categorisation/ranking of project results (we could evaluate results like we evaluate proposals),
  - a smart filtering/search functionality
  - a database of approaches, solutions , their stage in implementation and success/failure factors;
  - by giving an indication of the impact of a project (measurement unit needed here!)
  - no ‘administrative’ evaluation (checking number of output, financial reporting), but a real, content driven evaluation needed!
  - stimulate dialogue and (in depth) discussions and sharing of experiences, knowledge between target groups (i.e. cities, citizens, companies).

*“What kind of actor is JPI UE?”*

- At the moment, JPI UE is especially seen as a project funder, maybe not so much (yet) as an organisation with added value; the added value of JPI UE can be increased by:
  - organising follow-up activities for successful projects, for instance follow up projects (like innovation projects), small travel budget grants
  - having a longer term programmatic approach with recurring topics in the various instruments (traditional calls, innovative actions, communication activities etc.)
- ... and JPI UE is especially seen as an academic project funder; researchers often take the initiative for projects; there would be a need for a better ‘power’ balance between researchers, cities, private enterprises etc., in defining projects (note: this now gets shape in the innovation call process)
- Possible improvements in JPI UE instruments:
  - allow different types of projects and mid-term ‘tuning’ of projects in the more traditional R&D calls;
  - develop different calls for different project stages (like in GER): 2-yr definition phase and then multi-year development & implementation phase
  - better include SME and larger companies in project formulation and execution; when participants have to pay (‘co-funding’), they perhaps feel more inclined to use the results of their investments...

### *Other remarks*

- JPI UE should showcase good examples, including pilots from cities that really added value for the cities;
- we need a taskforce to develop innovative knowledge dissemination schemes and activities;
  - examples of such schemes and activities include policy briefs, short movies, incorporating intermediaries in projects (consultants to cities);
- A most prominent issue: how to contribute to continuity? I.e.:
  - how can we make sure that successful projects get a follow up?
  - how can we keep project participants interested even after projects have formally concluded?
- Possible solutions (regarding continuity):
  - specific funding / calls for follow-up activities;
  - a call programme with recurring topics (so, also the science base is preserved);
  - more attention for project results that are applicable;
  - more attention for clear communication, so that others can use the results as well;
  - in specific cases: a role for intermediaries ('consultants') that are able to spread and apply knowledge in multiple situations/cases;
  - in specific cases: try to develop business models, so that project results can live on their own;
  - introduction of 'research vouchers' or 'innovation vouchers' to give problem owners better access to available knowledge and expertise