URBAN EUROPE

Co-creation and capacity building in ERA-NET Cofund SMART URBAN FUTURES
Interview study

October 2021
Katarina Larsen, Royal Institute of Technology
Caroline Wrangsten, JPI Urban Europe

Content

"

Instead of telling a story about what Italy or Britain does.
It's better to talk about what happens in Cosenza, what happens in Glasgow.

The project results in the catalogue have been tagged with
the dilemmas they can correspond to the most.

Stakeholders in over 65 cities and 20 countries
have been involved in the projects.

LOOPER is a perfect example of how the involvement of citizens in research
can keep people invested in generating solutions
for communal problems.

The project's local hubs for learning created
new networks and fostered local innovative ecologies.

Both the FLOODLABEL method and system are generic enough
to be scaled up and used in many places
that suffer from flood risks.

Cities of Making has developed typologies, practices and policies
for public and private stakeholders to breathe new life
into their manufacturing communities.

What they all have in common is the thing that makes them smart:
social skills, an understanding of multiple fields,
and their knowledge of their local neighbourhood.

We learned how changing the role of universities
can enhance urban equality.

The interviews with project leaders showed a long-term commitment
to working with questions of local capacity building.

Actors, organizations and residents in the urban local setting
can be smart rather than 'smart cities' as such.

Legacy in ENSUF departs from co-creation processes
being integrated in the project design already when
planning and applying for funding.

"

Learn more about the ENSUF results via https://jpi-urbaneurope.eu/calls/ensuf-call/

1. Introduction

In the call for project applications for the ERA-NET Cofund Smart Urban Futures (ENSUF) call, the broader aim is outlined by describing that the ENSUF call initiates transnational joint proposals with the purpose of:

> *Developing our knowledge of the urban condition and sustainable development through creation and testing of new methods, tools, and technologies required to overcome current economic, social, and environmental challenges.*
> (Source: ENSUF call text)

In this interview study we revisit some of the projects to hear more about hands-on experiences from the project leaders. Projects took initiative and suggested ways to design research and interactive processes to incorporate co-creation between different types of actors. Actors in the ENSUF projects included citizens, municipalities, residents in urban areas and private firms. The interviews with projects in ENSUF were carried out during March-April 2021 with the following four projects:

1. **SoHoLab – The regeneration of large-scale social housing estates through living labs**
2. **Smart UrbI – Smart urban intermediaries – trans-European research, learning & action**
3. **BRIGHT FUTURE – Bright future for black towns: reinventing European industrial towns and challenging dominant post-industrial discourses**
4. **CAPA.CITY – Building capacity to transform existing residential subdivisions into smart and robust urban ecosystems**

The focus was on experiences from co-creation processes and capacity building.
These themes were also accompanied by a discussion on the concept of Urban Living Labs (ULL) and other structures, methods, or processes for facilitating citizen dialogues and interaction with citizens as part of the approach of projects. The following points were used to briefly introduce the interviewees to these themes:

- **Capacity building**: Interviewees were asked to give examples of project outcomes that help build capacity for actors involved, and other (unexpected or less visible) outcomes of the project

- **Co-creation processes**: Interviewees were asked about how they incorporated different capabilities by especially local actors

- **Experiences from Urban Living Labs:** Interviewees were asked methodologies of urban living labs and more ways to incorporate citizens in the process

These concepts are overlapping since many of the co-creation processes address urban challenges and draw on different ways to engage with locally based knowledge through citizen interaction and dialogues. Some of the projects used concepts of Urban living labs (ULL) while others used processes and tools specifically designed for the project task. For instance, projects used visual tools (photo narratives), interactive games for on-site dialogues about urban dilemmas, and methods including artefacts to facilitate interaction between citizens in urban areas.

> *Projects used visual tools (photo narratives),*
> *interactive games for on-site dialogues about urban dilemmas,*
> *and methods including artefacts to facilitate interaction*
> *between citizens in urban areas.*

The concept of capacity building has been described in more JPI Urban Europe calls than ENSUF, especially in the Urban Transformation Capacities call text[1]. It here refers to the difference that projects maje on in a broad sense (for instance in processes among both public and private actors). Capacity building is here also explained in terms of access to experiences, collaboration within society in general, as well as the development of new structures and procedures using visions and scenarios.

> *Capacity building is here also explained in terms of access to experiences,*
> *collaboration within society in general,*
> *as well as the development of new structures*
> *and procedures using visions and scenarios.*

---

[1] Urban Transformation Capacities call text highlight the difference projects made, the capacities they helped build that will linger and remain although the project now ends.

"In this call we define urban transformation capacities as the process of building capacities such as skills, insights, tools, organisational and personal capabilities, working methods and processes, access to experiences and verifiable knowledge. Developing and building upon processes and strategies to enhance urban transformation capacities includes collaboration within society in general. More specifically developing strategies to enhance urban transformation capacities also includes:
• increasing capacities in public service innovation and public innovation governance;
• increasing capacities in private sector innovation for sustainable urbanisation;
• new approaches to governance, law and urban justice;
• building of new structures and procedures e.g. for envisioning and scenario development;
• carrying out, evaluating and scaling up urban experiments;
• collaboration of the public sector, private sector, academia and civil society;
• integrating policies across sectors; and learning, monitoring and reflecting on change processes. "

https://jpi-urbaneurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Joint-Call-for-Proposals_ENUTC_1.2.pdf

2. Capacity building and legacy in the ENSUF projects

What can we learn about capacity building, from the interviews with the ENSUF R&I projects? It seems evident that capacity building here is indeed about strategies that introduce new structures and ways of working in dialogue with other actors. This is particularly useful when approaching areas where development for different reasons seems blocked. What new ways can there be to approach and cooperate in such cases? The projects have developed ways of working and carrying out co-creation, rather than best-practises per se.

"Projects developed ways to facilitate dialogues more successfully with residents where they explored how residents envision the future of their neighbourhood

To get a good understanding of what issues that citizens think should be a priority to address, interviewees especially point to the importance of practical exercises and being on-site. They also emphasize the need for new or adjusted tools (dialogue toolkits, see Figure 2) to guide processes and facilitate dialogues to jointly identify future solutions to urban challenges. For instance, projects developed ways to facilitate dialogues more successfully with local residents, where they explored how residents envision the future of their neighborhood, but also what their needs are today. Focus was on not discriminating new problems during the process and to ensure justice between new and old ideas.

This perspective helped build capacity to generate new ideas for the stakeholders involved, but also an increased understanding for how to work with manifold viewpoints and perspectives at once. The improved processes included facilitation skills (some stakeholders are more vocal than others) but also time aspects- stakeholders who, for different reasons, can only join the process on one specific day or hour, were equally welcomed on their terms. Projects carried out these efforts with the aim to impact policymakers, and produced reports adapted to local and regional local authorities, policymakers and also for local stakeholders.

Story: CAPA.CITY and Dialogue Toolkits mini games

Here is a link to a Belgian project that we are running right now (and which builds upon the CAPA.CITY project): https://omgeving.vlaanderen.be/leertraject-verkavelingswijken
It is a project commissioned by the region of Flanders in which we supervise a learning trajectory on the transformation of 6 residential subdivisions in Flanders: we supervise both the learning trajectory and the 6 municipalities involved in the transformation. We already use the mini games developed, in a student exercise and will also use them the coming year to support the development of a mobility plan in one municipality.

- Interview with Oswald Devisch, CAPA.CITY (2021)

Figure 1: Story: CAPA.CITY mini games to be used in the development of a municipal mobility plan.

Projects also tried to build capacity by generating funding for follow-up projects. These efforts were made towards both regional and national funding agencies, in an attempt to carry on the work and advance some aspects of the research and activities started by the ENSUF-projects. In figure 2, you find six examples of how ENSUF projects made an impact in their respective environs.

1. **Conceptual development was used as templates for other cities areas.**
   Researchers involved in ENSUF-projects were also using the conceptual frames to analyze other city areas after the project period ended.

2. **Practical tools to facilitate dialogues with citizens on pathways for change were created**: Some projects used "mini-narratives" and games to identify locations (dangerous bike path for school children, scope for neighbor interaction etc.) in need of solutions, and to create alternative pathways for change.

3. **How to influence local policymakers: "**Bottom-up concepts" was a term used by inhabitants to describe local experiences and were translated to local policy by the projects. Projects translated and related local experiences to local policy goals, and local planning documents and strategic action for city areas.

4. **Global policy objectives** input: Projects contribution to SDGs were identified. Focus in this call was naturally on SDG 11: "Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable".

5. **Projects practiced Cross-city learning – based on similar local conditions to discuss different strategies to problem solving in national contexts**: learning from similar character of cities and different national contexts. For example, comparing role of state actors in some countries contrasted with roles of third sector (non-profit) actors in other countries to care for social development in residential areas.

6. **Generating (local and regional) funding for follow-up projects**. With project leaders having long-term engagement in the themes studied – both before and after ENSUF – the call created leverage through international project teams and exchange within ENSUF.

Figure 2: Example of ways that ENSUF projects worked to ensure legacy and impact of their results and learnings.

When it comes to project outputs, capacity building for involved stakeholders has been frequently mentioned also in more JPI Urban Europe calls. In ENSUF, the interactive process with users was far from a side activity, rather, it was part of the methodology from the start.

In comparison to other finalized calls, the interactive design and co-creation processes were, in ENSUF, a cornerstone (or point of departure) rather than a project output. Logically then,

several consortium members in ENSUF-projects already had a long-term commitment to the thematic area they targeted, as well as previous experience from working on-site in dialogue with residents. So, the initial level of capacity to work with co-creation methods was high. Interviewees therefore showed examples of new tools and methods that build on and advancing already existing knowledges and experiences. These tools can now help guide the process of interaction with different target groups forward.

This report occasionally draw reference to the ENSCC call (ERA-NET Cofund Smart Cities and Communities), which is the latest ERA-NET Cofund finalized in JPI Urban Europe prior to ENSUF. Lessons learned in the ENSCC call[2] were adopted in templates and transferred to upcoming calls, meaning that current and upcoming calls directly attributable to the experience of producing a certain mechanism of co-funding. This may be a relevant aspect to consider for further discussion also for ENSUF:

- Are there any lessons learned about how to create leverage in practice (locally and at the policy level) from the project results from the call as a whole?

- Can post-project exchange and co-creation be supported through some small seed-funds so the participants can share experiences and lessons learned at the call level?

In some ENSUF-projects the project teams work closely with residents in areas that may not have a strong trust in governmental institutions. These areas may also hold negative experiences of external projects. Have experienced initiatives getting started (and then closed) in their local urban areas.

> *Citizens felt left behind and forgotten by regional authorities.*
> *Therefore, the project's main objective is to develop place-specific urban strategies*
> *for industrial towns in Europe by respecting their strengths.*

---

[2] https://jpi-urbaneurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/ENSCC-Synthesis-Report-20200407-1.pdf

> ### Story: BRIGHT FUTURE worked with local traditions and knowledge passed on from generations- to realise social innovation
>
> The project was drawing on citizen dialogues and translated this into strategic action agendas that were suited for policy action. In the topics addressed by the projects "a participatory approach is the only viable way":
>
> Challenges were that citizens *"felt left behind and forgotten by regional authorities".* Therefore, the project's main objective is to develop place-specific urban strategies for industrial towns in Europe by respecting their strengths, needs and expectations. *"We are interested in assets and strengths of particular case studies. They will lead to new social and organisational innovations enabling small towns to adapt, to be resilient, and to be sustainable."*
>
> Examples of areas of social innovation in BRIGHT FUTURE
> »   Mentoring schemes
> »   Cultural volunteering, as a tradition passed on from generations – transferred from the culture of mines and factories to new generations
> »   Young people's work in retirement homes, contributing to community services, such as transportation of elderly
>
> - Interview with David Bole, BRIGHT FUTURE (2021)

Figure 3: Story: BRIGHT FUTURE worked with local traditions, history, culture and knowledge passed on from generations- to realise social innovation in times of new societal challenges

The ENSUF-projects working with residents from marginalized groups in certain socio-economic groups also actively engage in a discussion of how established concepts will have to be adjusted and adapted to be meaningful for their context. One example is the concept of Urban living labs (Towards a definition of socially oriented Urban Living Labs, 2020[3]) by the SoHo lab team in Italy working with resident dialogues in social housing estates in the San Siro area in Milano. This "local concept literacy" (knowing how and when the concept is of value to the local context) is another type of capability developed during the project period. The increased knowledge contributes to preparing for action by better understanding what is of value for the local community, and thereby increasing the readiness for implementing actions that will be of use to the citizens living in the area. The creation of living labs themselves can be understood both as a method, and an output.

The ENSUF projects delivered not only policy advice but facilitated a discussion about alternative decisions and their supposed impact. These activities were carried out while grounded in the target groups' and end users' viewpoints and needs [4].

> **99** *Legacy in ENSUF departs from co-creation processes being integrated in the project design already when planning and applying for funding.*

---

[3] Towards a definition of socially oriented Urban Living Labs. By: *Nele Aernouts, Elena Maranghi and Michael Ryckewaert (Editors)* https://jpi-urbaneurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/soholab_report2.pdf

[4] In ESCC this is described as "Policy advice and the improvement of decision-making capabilities via policy briefs, ICT tools and learning platforms were another way of delivering results to target groups."

What about legacy? Legacy is (in ENSCC) discussed in terms of how certain thematic areas (such as energy management in ENSCC) are tested, which experiences are gained, as well as how they play out on district level. Legacy in ENSUF departs from co-creation processes being integrated in the project design already when planning and applying for funding.

Based on the interviews carried out (see appendix for list of interviewees) five lessons are highlighted to discuss impact and capacity building at several different levels. See section three.

3. Five general lessons about how to create impact and capacity building from ENSUF-project interviews

Lesson 1. Catalyse both on local capacity and your international teams
Lesson 2. Learn on location: be on site and in the urban lab
Lesson 3. Co-creation between actors builds legacy
Lesson 4. The legacy of ENSUF projects can benefit from continued attention and support
Lesson 5. Conceptual developments during practical exercises

Lesson 1) Catalyse both on local capacity and your international teams

The interviews with project leaders showed a long-term commitment to working with questions of local capacity building. For instance, they made efforts to create processes where residents could substantially influence not only problem formulations but also priorities made in the long-term development of their neighbourhood.

Interestingly, several interviewees pointed to the importance of long-term relations at the local level, as well as creating leverage for international exchange (which was one of the aims with ENSUF). Stakeholders in these projects and different local areas learned from both similarities and differences across national borders. On project level, some of the case study sites within one project were facing similar challenges and would thereby contribute to cross-site knowledge exchange within the project. On a national level, it was noted how different solutions were used in different national contexts. This in turn created scope for general discussions within the international consortium, which gave rise to cross-national learning.

One interviewee highlighted that the international project team went through a process of learning and capacity building by drawing on international comparison of local cases studied. They discussed how local challenges could be tackled in a variety of different ways in different countries. For example, they were learning about how certain shared problems in marginalized housing areas were met by either strategy by municipal actors or by local private non-profit sectors by comparing cases in the UK and the Nordic context. A common trait of the ENSUF-project teams was that they had been working with these questions for a long time and emphasized the importance of being familiar with the local conditions and developing good contacts with citizens to better grasp how capacity for change could be facilitated in the local context.

The interviews with project leaders showed a long-term commitment to working with questions of local capacity building.

Lesson 2) Learn on location: be on site and in the urban lab

There is an interplay between on-site learning and the reflective work that the project team also contributed with, by discussing the concept of urban living lab (ULL). This became evident for the project team working with a marginalized local housing district. They explored what is required to work with these types of concepts in this specific urban setting, characterized by socioeconomic marginalized groups. Being on site was described as a necessity for "tuning in" on what questions residents considered most relevant and urgent.

On-site work was also key for establishing trust by residents in areas with a high level of first or second-generation immigrants from a wide range of countries. It was also important for facilitating communication between the research teams, the local residents, and other groups of actors. Interestingly, this was somewhat of a tradition by the university involved already. The university had a facility on site (a house in the neighbourhood) where dialogues are the core activity. This type of action is considered one part of the so-called third mission (interaction with society) for universities, in addition to the key missions (teaching and research).

Lesson 3) Co-creation between actors builds legacy

The role of researchers in co-creation processes took different shapes in different projects. One such researcher's role was to be a *"structuring agent of the co-creative process"*, by means of creating and hosting a set of "mini-games" to involve residents (Interview with Oswald Devisch 23 March 2021). These mini-games had been developed to address specific questions, of a more general nature ("Who/What can help us to bring change?) or targeting specific locations that were important to the local community.

One game worked to geographically pinpoint problematic spots, like dangerous bike crossings for children on their way to school. Another one was targeting community gardening and equipment sharing among residents. The research team would then structure the process to generate a detailed problem description, and then outline different ways to identify solutions. The teams identified problems on site and used physical objects and tools to illustrate solutions (gardening equipment to illustrate solutions to communal gardening etc.) The dialogues took place on site, and was facilitated by teams with design-skills, who used practical artifacts for residents to come up with solutions to specific questions (how a safer bike route can be found for school children etc.). [The games](#) were used as a tool to deliberate change processes and implement solutions.

Another role of the research teams was to be the *mediating door-opener* so that new (and sometimes unexpected actors) can get involved. The role to act as mediator proved important to facilitate involvement of both public and private actors. This in turn is important for the legacy of the project, namely, to ensure that the project results and insights were implemented and maintained.

One door-opener was to enable involvement of a larger private company to be part of the process of crafting solutions.

In addition to before-mentioned "local anchoring", the importance of commitment to the project goals and the process at a high political level was emphasized by several interviewees. One door-opener was to enable involvement of a larger private company to be part of the process of crafting solutions, as was the case of the CAPA.CITY project. In this case it was a larger pharma-company that is an important employer in the region. The company turned out to play an important role once involved, since they had an interest in reducing their employees' reliance on cars for commuting to work – which in turn affects the streets and infrastructure planning around the company building.

Lesson 4) The legacy of ENSUF projects can benefit from continued attention and support

It did not start with the project, and it did not end with it.

Some project participants emphasized especially two points relating to the end and final phases of the projects. Firstly, that the project teams had a long-term commitment to the project themes (quote above). Secondly, the interviews with project leaders also showed that the involvement of post-doc and PhDs in the project, in some cases, created room for an extended project period. It also had the implication that the project leader had a significant workload and responsibility (towards the end of the project) with dissemination and synthesizing the results, since the PhDs and Post-doc researchers were moving on to new projects and funding in other research environments.

After the Smart Urban Intermediaries project, the Dutch funding agency NWO funded a one-year project, in which the project went back to urban intermediaries the projects spoke to (already 10 years ago) to see how their (work) life developed, what they ran into, and how they deal with challenges. A first product of that follow-up research was an essay, in Dutch available here: Mensen die een verschil maken VanHulstMatelski 2021.pdf (tilburguniversity.edu) For more information, contact Smart Urban Intermediaries.

The project leaders and teams had a long-term commitment to the themes of ENSUF-projects (addressing social exclusion, building community dialogues to create capacity for action) and the interviewed showed in several cases that they had successfully generated follow-up projects (see bullet-point list in the next section). However, some concerns were also raised about cross-project learning in ENSUF and how results could be implemented after the project phase ended. The project leaders interviewed also emphasized the fact that the final phases of projects were generating valuable new insights for policy implementation.

Therefore, one conclusion is that there is a need for aftercare to ensure i) making the most of policy advice based on experiences of projects in the final phase and ii) to ensure experiences between project teams in ENSUF were utilized. One interviewee suggested that the call itself should benefit from having some seed-funds available after the end of the formal call period, for additional cross-project exchange. Even a very small incentive would be beneficial to exchange experiences from final phases beyond the publication of final reports, as is already expected by project teams in ENSUF.

Lesson 5) Conceptual developments during practical exercises

Some of the projects put the concepts "to work" by using developing conceptual frameworks in dialogues with citizens, to test the concepts. This initial phase of engaging in a dialogue with residents was also important for legitimacy and trust building reasons.

Another example of how projects challenged certain concepts, lies in the choice of project names. The project name "Smart Urban Intermediaries" emphasizes the importance of residents, by referring to them as smart intermediaries. In other words, the project emphasises that actors, organizations and residents in the urban local setting can be smart rather than 'smart cities' as such. This human dimension and focus on interactive dialogues and local knowledge emphasize the potential of engaging citizens to achieve real change in their neighbourhoods.

> *Actors, organizations, and residents in the urban local setting can be smart, rather than 'smart cities' as such.*

4. Summary: Projects' impact, legacy, co-creation insights, and capacity building in bullet points

From here follows concluding remarks about different types of capacity building and legacy of projects, categorised under the projects that were interviewed in this study.

SoHoLab – The regeneration of large-scale social housing estates through living labs

● Impact at different levels (including locally based knowledge) highlighted by the project team.

● Commitment to being on site to enable trust and learn from residents about what questions that are relevant.

● This was also summarized in the publication "Adapting the Urban Living Lab approach to marginal contexts and urban regeneration: the case of Mapping San Siro Lab" by: Francesca Cognetti and Elena Maranghi[5]. Making the argument of a need to adapt the concept because of i) the difficulties for especially fragile populations to access to certain languages or tools (among other factors because of a substantial digital divide); and ii) because of a widespread sense of distrust, generated by the perceived "absence" of competent institutions, which seem to be no longer able to promote effective policies in such contexts. As a result, the process of exclusion of these territories is currently worsening. This type of guideline can be described as an active involvement to influence policymakers (and researchers) working with these concepts, and developing capacities describe as "local concept literacy".

● SoHoLab engaged in a topical debate and informed the concept of "socially oriented urban living labs"

Smart UrbI – Smart urban intermediaries – trans-European research, learning & action

● Efficiently bridging hands-on resident dialogues with conceptual work and new methods to incorporate different types of local perspectives (residents views, experiences from change makers in non-profit organizations etc.).

● Further developing "co-enquiry" as a concept where reflection and peer-learning was used so researchers, practitioners and co-operation partners collaborate to develop and make sense of research findings. Participatory workshops were used as "local

---

[5] http://soholab.org/content/2-publications/7-soholab-guidelines-for-the-regeneration-of-large-scale-social-estates/soholab_guidelines.pdf

labs" to investigate smart urban intermediation (in neighbourhoods near Glasgow, Birmingham, Copenhagen, Amsterdam).

- Combining dialogue and deliberation to explore the challenges and opportunities of working in neighbourhoods with early workshops organized to establish common ground between the aims of the academic research and the interests of those involved in the project.

- The labs were highly interactive and made use of a range of participatory formats and facilitation techniques.

- The project team devoted time and resources to communicate policy lessons in reports[6] under headlines like "What did we do? What did we learn? Why does this matter?". This was done to encourage policymakers to learn from the project experiences and capabilities they created.

BRIGHT FUTURE – Bright future for black towns: reinventing European industrial towns and challenging dominant post-industrial discourses

- BRIGHT FUTURE develops place-specific urban strategies for industrial towns in Europe by their strengths, needs and expectations. The goal is to go beyond dominant economy-driven post-industrial strategies, which are more suited for large cities and to adopt new post-industrial narratives better suited to European urban realities.

- A key outcome of the project is the creation of new social and organizational innovations that help small towns adapt and be resilient and sustainable. Streamlining these into planning and institutional practices is important. How can cities that are dependent on manufacturing thrive also in the future? A guide for stakeholders has been developed with recommendations for alternative urban development for industrial towns[7].

- BRIGHT FUTURE focuses on practical knowledge about the innovation, and inspiration from different cities to be replicated or transferred to more cities and situations.

- The project aimed at creating social innovations (not only analyse conditions for change). One point of departure was to draw on local traditions passed on from generations of mining cities and factories. These traditions helped develop capabilities such as mentoring schemes of youth organisations, cultural volunteering, and transport solutions that enabled youth to do work in elderly care.

---

[6] Report: Socially smart cities: Making a difference in urban neighborhoods, November 2019:

[7] *BRIGHT FUTURE* Recommendations for alternative urban development of industrial towns: Stakeholder-specific practical guide. February 2020. https://giam.zrc-sazu.si/sites/default/files/d5.2_stakeholder-specific_practical_guide.pdf

- The project team also developed capabilities to better engage in dialogue where migration created social tension and some residents felt left behind and forgotten by regional authorities". This increased the capacity to discuss viable solutions by drawing on peoples' experiences and at the same time recognize tensions within the community.

CAPA.CITY – Building capacity to transform existing residential subdivisions into smart and robust urban ecosystems

- Working with interactive methods with residents to develop ways to improve their local spaces, including residential areas but also impact on transportation and commuting at the municipal level.

- Participatory project design using approaches to test ideas in practice ("Telling, Making and Enacting") in the project where one of the cases (in Denmark) included a festival where some future scenarios were enacted in order to engage with citizens directly to hear their views and collect local stories on residential areas.

- Utilizing design methods and materials on site and developing "mini-games" as result of the CAPA.CITY project. These were used to improve safety for cycling (school children´s bike paths for example) and will also be used to support the development of a mobility plan in one municipality.

- Final results display that suburbanites are open to collective action, but that this action is typically temporary (such as the removal of fences when children are small, the sharing of storage space when the children are out of the house).

- CAPA.CITY has provided residents with a toolkit/game to create a network of useful contacts, tools needed for change, and an understanding of the processes for engagement with larger actors to discuss bigger structural changes that will last after project deadline.

5. Summary: Types of capabilities and legacy

To conclude we see, via these interviews with four ENSUF projects, a broad range of different capabilities and legacy developed and proposed by the project teams, including:

✔ Methods and concepts at work in interaction with residents and in user dialogues.

✔ Policy briefs and active dialogue with local, regional and national decision makers

✔ Co-creation and learning with both public and private actors (ENSUF-teams with roles as facilitator, providing structures for processes or door-opener for dialogues)

✔ Follow-up initiatives and regional-national funds after completion of ENSUF projects so the capabilities developed could be implemented in other regions.

6. Appendix A: ENSUF Interviews March-April 2021

Overview of interviews and statements with examples of follow-up projects
By Katarina Larsen

Interviewees

Projects leaders were interviewed, in the following ENSUF-projects:
SoHoLab, Smart Urban Intermediaries, Bright Future, and CAPA.CITY. + additional interview with Jonas Bylund in JPI Urban Europe on the Urban Living Lab concept in the ENSUF call.

SoHoLab (Italy case)
Francesca Cognetti De Martiis francesca.cognetti@polimi.it
Elena Maranghi elena.maranghi@gmail.com
Smart Urban Intermediaries
Oliver Escobar Oliver.Escobar@ed.ac.uk (Scotland)
Merlijn van Hulst M.J.vanHulst@tilburguniversity.edu (The Netherlands)

Bright Future
David Bole, david.bole@zrc-sazu.si (Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Sovenia)

CAPA.CITY
Oswald Devisch, oswald.devisch@uhasselt.be (Belgium)

JPI Urban Europe – discussion on Urban Living Lab in the ENSUF call
Jonas Bylund (15 April, 2021)