

An Advanced Concept for Urban Living Labs

Deliverable 4.5



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 857160

EXPAND II is funded by a grant of the EUROPEAN COMMISSION - DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR RESEARCH & INNOVATION

Open Innovation and Open Science. Sharing Excellence – Country Intelligence

Grant Agreement number: 857160 — EXPAND — H2020-WIDESPREAD-2018-2020/H2020-WIDESPREAD-2018-02

Project acronym: EXPAND II
Deliverable 4.5

Title: Advanced Concept for Urban Living Labs

Submission date: 15/12/2021

Key authors:

Clémence Martin-Beaumont (Future Cities Catapult, UK)
Liam Dargan (Future Cities Catapult, UK)
Francesco Marchet (Future Cities Catapult, UK)

Contributors:

Johannes Riegler (JPI Urban Europe, AT)
Jonas Bylund (JPI Urban Europe, AT)

How to cite this document:

Martin-Beaumont, Dargan & Marchet (2021), *An Advanced Concept for Urban Living Labs*, Future Cities Catapult, Expand II, H2020- H2020-WIDESPREAD-2018-2020/H2020-WIDESPREAD-2018-02, GA 857160.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Background & rationale	4
1.1 Background and rationale	4
1.2 Task goals.....	4
1.3 Methodology	5
Chapter 2 – Summary of initial research and key findings	9
2.1 – What is an urban living lab?	9
2.2 – Key findings: lessons learned, and challenges experienced by existing urban living labs.....	10
Chapter 3 – Recommendations for an advanced concept of urban living lab	16
3.1 Overview of the 15 recommendations.....	16
3.2 Recommendations around stakeholder engagement and buy-in.....	18
3.3 Recommendations around urban living labs delivery	23
3.4 Recommendations around evaluation, impact, and project sustainability	27
Chapter 4 – Next steps	33
Annex.....	35

Chapter 1 – Background & rationale

1.1 Background and rationale

EXPAND II intends to support the implementation of the JPI Urban Europe Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda 2.0 (SRIA 2.0)¹ and advance the R&I programme by:

1. supporting JPI Urban Europe's widening activities towards new countries, stakeholders and partners,
2. facilitating the transition from SRIA (2015) to [SRIA 2.0](#) in terms of enhancing formats, instruments, strategic partnerships, and programme management, and by
3. improving availability and accessibility of research results for cities, funders, policy and decision makers.

Transformations to sustainable and liveable urban futures depend on a broad commitment and co-creation among a diverse set of actors, therefore, the identified challenge to be tackled by EXPAND II is widening the community and building capacities in research, policy and society at large.

Given this context, the project targets Widening Countries in particular with the aim to establish national dialogues and processes, mobilise national R&I communities dealing with sustainable urban development, intensify strategic relationships of urban stakeholders on transnational level and assess national programmes and instruments for transnational R&I cooperation.

The project includes tasks dedicated to providing data and cases to easily follow the progress achieved in JPI Urban Europe and its projects and strengthen the programme as a hub for international cooperation. These activities are tuned to further expand the programme towards Widening Countries and other interested parties.

This report is a result of Task 4.4 activities which focused on developing an advanced concept of urban living lab for JPI Urban Europe calls in order to deepen and intensify science-policy-business-society cooperation and better support scaling up and mainstreaming of results.

1.2 Task goals

Task 4.4 focuses on further developing the concept of urban living labs (ULL) by suggesting recommendations to deepen and intensify science-policy-business-society cooperation and better support scaling up and mainstreaming of results.

Urban Living Labs have proven to be innovative and flexible approaches to address societal challenges and foster innovation in creating the space and context for co-creation and experimentation. Since the first pilot calls of JPI Urban Europe, comprehensive experience and knowledge was created by developing guidelines for such urban living labs as well as by implementing urban living labs in many JPI Urban Europe projects.

However, the implementation of results and experiences from the relatively small piloting scale into the wider local and administrative context and network appears to be challenging in

¹Bylund, J., Riegler, J. & Noll, M. (2019), *Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda 2.0*, JPI Urban Europe

some cases. Therefore, to improve the impact, sustainability, and scalability of urban living labs, Task 4.4 focuses on analysing the non-technical challenges faced in the implementation of labs and the interventions and lessons learned by those teams in order to gain valuable advice to better support JPI Urban Europe projects and labs in the future.

1.3 Methodology

In order to further develop the concept of urban living labs and shape recommendations building upon insights from past urban living labs interventions, a qualitative approach has been taken. Thus, this report, as the output of the Task 4.4, was informed and contributed to by various partners and stakeholders across Expand II, JPI Urban Europe and urban living labs.

The task was undertaken in two phases. During the first phase, we gained insights about urban living labs from stakeholders through interviews and through a literature review. This phase ran across 2020.

Interviews with urban living labs stakeholders

Ten representatives across eight urban living labs participated in qualitative interviews. The profiles of interviewees ranged from project coordinators, urban living lab partners to city representatives from countries including Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Slovenia and United Kingdom. The interviews covered six JPI Urban Europe open calls. The projects / labs represented in interviews are presented in the table below.

JPI Urban Europe joint calls and selected projects from each of these covered in initial interviews	
1	ENSUF call - <i>BRIGHT FUTURE / FloodCitiSense / GLIMER / LOOPER / Smart Pedestrian Net</i>
2	SUGI/FWE Nexus call - <i>Creating Interfaces / Fuse / GLOCULL / WASTE FEW ULL</i>
3	Pilot Call 1 - <i>Interethnic Coexistence in European Cities / SubUrbanLab</i>
4	Pilot Call 2 - <i>Incubators of Public Spaces</i>
5	Making Cities Work - <i>PlaceCity / SYNCITY</i>
6	ENSCC - <i>SmarterLabs</i>

Table 1.1 – JPI Urban Europe Calls that were represented in the interviews conducted with urban living lab partners and city representatives between January and April 2020

The semi-structured interviews took place remotely through video-conferencing software all lasting approximately 45-60 mins. An interview guide was used to structure the interviews (Annex 1).

The research aimed to explore how urban living labs, funded through JPI Urban Europe calls which are often limited to a time and budget, could develop and evolve to eventually remain

established in the local ecosystem and community beyond the limited project time-frame. The following topics were covered in this initial research activity:

- Key learnings, what worked well and what didn't work out? What results / processes were adapted in different projects?
- Project legacy, where the findings translated into other urban contexts? Did the local authority adapt or scale up the project outcome / approach? How did they do that? Please expand on this.
- Project sustainability, did the urban living lab survive beyond the three-year funding period, if yes how did they do it (e.g. became an urban practice) and if the urban living lab didn't continue, why not and what could be done differently to increase the longevity of urban living labs?

With respect to the capacity of urban living lab interventions to have impact, sustain, and scale, these interviews served to provide valuable and practical perspectives on the day-to-day and non-technical challenges faced along the different project stages, on the best practices employed, and on the lessons learned.

Literature review

As a second activity in this initial research phase, a review of domain publications and reports was conducted in order to cross-validate and complete the insights gathered through the stakeholder interviews. These publications issued by European research teams, European Living Labs initiatives and JPI Urban Europe brought complementary reflections on the overall methodology attached to urban living labs or open-innovation projects, and on the feasibility to implement such initiatives in real-life settings, with various profiles of stakeholders and in ever-evolving urban contexts. The bibliography can be found in this report Annex (Annex 2).

The findings of this first research phase are summarised in Chapter 2 of this report.

This initial work of gathering and analysing insights from past urban living lab initiatives informed the second phase conducted to complete this task. The second phase consisted in shaping recommendations targeted at future urban living labs, JPI Urban Europe and funding agencies to support local cooperation, scaling and mainstreaming of results. This phase ran across 2021.

A collaborative approach and iterative process was used for designing the recommendations. Initially, we drafted a set of recommendations organised around seven themed areas:

- Diversity of stakeholders
- Effective and meaningful citizen engagement
- Buy-in & implementation
- Up-skilling and changing ways of working
- Project timeframe
- Measuring the impacts
- Up-scaling strategy

These recommendations were then presented to living lab partners and experts during a collaborative workshop to gather their feedback and refine the recommendations.

Complementary interviews with workshop attendees were finally organised to detail some of the recommendations.

Collaborative workshop

A two-hour interactive session was organised remotely in May 2021 with eight urban living labs and European project representatives, Living Lab experts and JPI Urban Europe. A first draft of the recommendations for an advanced concept or urban living lab were shared with the participants, and three main questions were posed around each recommendation area:

- Do you have any feedback about these recommendations?
- What could be the impacts of these recommendations?
- Is there anything missing / additions to make?

Feedback from participants and open discussions led to gather highly valuable insights to refine the initial recommendations.

JPI Urban Europe joint calls and selected projects from each of these covered in the collaborative workshop	
1	ENSCC - <i>SmarterLabs</i>
2	SUGI/FWE Nexus call - <i>Creating Interfaces / Fuse / GLOCULL / WASTE FEW ULL</i>
3	Making Cities Work - <i>PlaceCity / SYNCITY</i>
Other projects and organisations covered in the collaborative workshop	
4	Johanneberg Science Park - <i>SCORE project</i>
5	ENoLL – International Project Management and Capacity Building team member
6	Energy Systems Catapult - Living Lab team
7	Connected Places Catapult – Living Lab team
8	JPI Urban Europe – Management Board strategic team

Table 1.2 - JPI Urban Europe Calls, European projects and organisations that were represented in the collaborative workshop that took place in May 2021

Additional interviews with urban living lab stakeholders

Finally, four workshop attendees were contacted again for follow-up interviews to specify and detail some of the recommendations. These interviews took place remotely through video-conferencing software all lasting approximately 45-60 mins. They were conducted as open discussions focusing on different themes depending on the interviewee’s profile and domain of expertise.

We gathered insights on the implementation feasibility, potential impacts and risks of the following topics:

- ensuring the involvement of a diversity of stakeholders
- make local community participation more accessible
- understanding structures, dynamics and hierarchies within organisations and places
- increasing buy-in & implementation
- ensuring qualitative impact measurement
- scaling up and replicating results

JPI Urban Europe joint calls and selected projects from each of these covered in the additional interviews	
1	Making Cities Work - <i>PlaceCity / SYNCITY</i>
2	ENSCC - <i>SmarterLabs</i>
Other projects and organisations covered in the collaborative workshop	
3	Johanneberg Science Park - <i>SCORE project</i>
4	ENoLL – International Project Management and Communication team member

Table 1.3 - JPI Urban Europe Calls, European projects and organisations that were represented in the additional interviews conducted in September and August 2021

This iterative process eventually enabled us to prioritize and shape 15 recommendations to be developed and implemented by JPI Urban Europe and funding agencies through urban living labs to support successful cooperation, scaling up and mainstreaming of projects' results.

The final recommendations are covered and detailed in the Chapter 3 of this report. The last chapter, Chapter 4, include our perspective on the potential next steps for JPI Urban Europe and funding agencies to develop and implement the recommendations.

Chapter 2 – Summary of initial research and key findings

2.1 – What is an urban living lab?

An urban living lab is an experimental approach to research and innovation based on methodology and conceptual principles that aims to tackle complex urban issues by involving a wide range of stakeholders and offering opportunities to test and develop ideas and solutions in everyday settings.

“New collaborations are emerging in the form of urban living labs – sites devised to design, test and learn from social and technical innovation in real time.” – The Emerging Landscape of Urban Living Labs: Characteristics, Practices and Examples (2017)²

Thanks to the insights gathered in the initial research phase through discussions with lab partners and literature reviews, we have identified the following characteristics to define urban living labs:

- Geographical setting – Urban living labs are located in a specific urban context or area where they intend to address local challenges by involving local stakeholders.
- Multi-stakeholder approach – Urban living labs follow the Quadruple Helix Model³ approach which emphasises the transdisciplinary involvement of four different profiles of stakeholders; civil society, academia, industry, government, in order to achieve equal representation and inclusivity when researching a challenge and developing solutions. This enable to genuinely integrate complementary expertise and perspectives in the development of the initiative,

“In an urban living lab, stakeholders are deeply and actively involved from the early stages of the project, and the research is by its design open for surprises and learning that originates from the stakeholders involved.” – Call text (2021)⁴

- Co-creation & participation – The participatory and co-creation methods and tools used in urban living lab activities are key to encourage the active involvement of all actors (generative rather than evaluative). This approach enables everyone to speak, compare viewpoints and therefore aim for co-ownership of ideas and projects.
- Experimentation and learning – Urban living labs test new solutions, approaches and concepts in local everyday settings. Thus, new ideas are made visible to local communities and stakeholders who might have an interest in the solution or challenge addressed.

² *The Emerging Landscape of Urban Living Labs: Characteristics, Practices and Examples* (2017). GUST project 2014-2017, JPI Urban Europe.

³ Carayannis & Campbell (2009). ‘Mode 3’ and ‘Quadruple Helix’, *Towards a 21st century fractal innovation ecosystem*, International Journal of Technology Management.

⁴ Call text (2021). *Joint call for proposals for research and innovation projects on urban transformation capacities*, Annex D (p65). JPI Urban Europe available at: https://jpi-urbaneurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Joint-Call-for-Proposals_ENUTC_1.5.pdf

“Living labs can be understood both as a methodology and as a space for user participation in innovation processes.” – Scholl, et al (2017).⁵

The outputs of urban living labs are diverse but do not always necessarily result in a finalised product. For example, the varying can include: Increased understanding of a selected challenge and of the related various needs of the local community, evidence of the relevance of a new local service/process or new uses of the urban space, new patterns of local collaboration or a new local network of innovators and capacity building for tackling local challenges.

“It's difficult to see how that legacy can continue. It (urban living lab) is not something that leads to a product that can self-provide.” – interview with an urban living lab partner

Therefore, the purpose of urban living labs is to answer challenges, create value and offer the conditions for developing various projects and experimentation initiatives to set out a broader vision for cities, regions or communities.

2.2 – Key findings: lessons learned, and challenges experienced by existing urban living labs

Start of collaboration for launching a new urban living lab

- Most partners in urban living lab projects have been chosen because of existing contacts and relations between the project's academic partners and the city administration. Partners within each Urban Living Lab project already knew some, if not all, of the other partners from previous projects, networking events or professional connections.
- Conferences, matchmaking and networking events were often mentioned as starting point for projects because of the initial contacts made at these events with future project partners.

“The starting point for the project was a matchmaking event from JPI Urban Europe. It is there that the main partners met and then started reaching out to other partners they had worked with before.” – an urban living lab partner

- We did not come across many examples where a municipality or public administration could be considered as being one of the main initiators of the urban living lab. Often the local administrations were approached and convinced to participate by other partners.

⁵ Scholl, et al. (2017). *Guidelines for Urban Labs*, URB@Exp project 2014-2017, JPI Urban Europe.

Level of urban living lab experience across the projects

- When there is no previous experience or familiarity with running an urban living lab, there is no clear understanding of the concept in the beginning of the project, and the process to familiarise the stakeholders can be extensive.
- A common thread throughout the different projects is that the partners we talked to are familiar with the concept of urban living lab – though sometimes lacking experience with running one. Whereas public administration stakeholders who participate are often not familiar with the general approach. This can create a certain imbalance where partners act as experts and city stakeholders are not able to take on more leading or influential roles.
- The aspect of the urban living lab approach that is often most unfamiliar to local public administrations is the participatory approach of co-creation with local communities. Whilst it resembles some of the democratic processes followed by municipalities, the more active role that is required from local people in the creation and development of products, services or experiments is novel.

"I am not familiar with the concept of urban living lab. We do however do a lot of community leadership, and community panels." – a city representative

Barriers - Before and during the urban living lab projects

- Similarly to other EU commissioned projects, the JPI Urban EU application process can be time consuming and requests details on impact and outcome. At the early point of application, this can be very abstract and based on assumption.
- The foundations of an urban living lab are built in the initial early phase of the project and are fundamental to achieve both a successful outcome as well as a long-lasting impact. This does require a significant amount of time and effort, taking up a minimum of 6-12 months on average. It is common for this initial phase to either take longer than expected or fall short in reaching the original scope because of the limited time spent on it.
- In international urban living lab projects that involve more than one country, it is common to encounter communication barriers between the (non-local) partners and public administration stakeholders. There are situations where only local partners manage to communicate with city stakeholders. This makes it challenging to facilitate a knowledge exchange – like a direct sharing of learnings – between administrations coming from different countries or between local administrations and other partners.

"The language was a challenge; we couldn't talk directly to the local partners for example in Romania." – an urban living lab partner

- Approvals and permission needed for initiatives that involve interventions in public space can be challenging for urban living lab projects, sometimes involving substantial effort to establish communication and collaboration between different city departments.

"One of the biggest challenges is getting approval to activate public spaces. This can be discouraging for everyone involved." – an urban living lab partner

- In order to involve more vulnerable people* in the co-creation process, a lot of specific effort needs to go into finding the right channels and motivation to involve them. These groups are however considered to be crucial to the success of a complete participatory approach associated with an urban living lab.

**Examples of vulnerable people who are part of the local community can be people who find themselves either in (socio)economically difficult situations, feel they are part of a minority group, find themselves discriminated against by other members of the community or are somehow less involved in general community participation.*

Examples of successful achievements for urban living labs

- Across the interviews conducted, we noticed that the way urban living labs measured success was often linked to establishing new approaches, lessons learned and levels of engagement, not through tangible results or outcomes of projects.
- Five out of eight urban living lab projects received positive feedback from local communities, as they enjoyed the collaborative process.
- Urban Living Lab projects bring people from different backgrounds together and open-up their ways of thinking from new approaches to opportunity areas.

"The close collaboration between the urban living lab in Oslo and Vienna was very successful, they were able to learn from each other and tackle local issues in their neighbourhood." – an urban living lab partner

- Success can be measured in how the community of an urban living lab is constantly growing - throughout their project - as it can indicate that they are open to welcome and involve new partners to tackle relevant issues.
- Multi-disciplinary teams are important to cover various areas of urban living lab projects.

"We are not just one or two disciplines focusing on one area, we have a lot of expertise." – an urban living lab partner

- Having a good collaboration between local municipality, university and local community is the only way to guarantee a broadly supported urban living lab.
- Successful partnership is a result of the project.

"We are already applying for new projects together." – an urban living lab partner

Issues stopping urban living labs from widening its impact and continuing after the funding is over

- **Sharing knowledge:** After an urban living lab project has ended, the people that have been involved tend to carry their experience and learnings with them in the form of knowledge. If those people move to different jobs, there is a risk those learnings get lost for the organisation they have worked for. The resulting lack of knowledge, experience and learnings related to urban living labs could make it less likely for cities to host future urban living lab initiatives or for local partners to participate in those.
- **Fear of failure:** There is a fear of experimentation and perceived failure within municipalities. They must demonstrate good value for public money making it challenging to justify failed pilots or interventions despite the learnings holding valuable insights. This means post-failure steps are difficult or even scrapped, despite the need for learnings to be implemented and the intervention adjusted in an iterative way.

"The city has thought of doing more participatory projects, but funding has been an issue... also the University is a key driver for urban living lab projects...The local authority officer was activated and encouraged by the project, but she lacks the technical capabilities to continue. The city also doesn't provide funding for this project."

– an urban living lab partner

- Other barriers that stop urban living labs from continuing or scaling up after the projects have ended are:
 - The average duration of urban living lab projects is seen as short for the ambition of having an impact that lasts or could lead to projects that build upon achieved results.
 - Changes in the government and their strategy make it more difficult for these types of projects to keep up the relationship with the city stakeholders.
 - It is very challenging to keep stakeholders and communities engaged over a longer period, without having clear benefits or incentives in place.
 - Language and culture differences can create communication barriers.
 - Getting approval and finding the right people (within and outside local authorities) that support the project can be very time consuming. Differences or delays in funding can have a negative effect on the project, creating an imbalance of work and responsibilities.
 - When there is a lack of trust from the community or local authorities in the urban living lab activities, there is a greater risk of losing key stakeholders that represent those parties.

Examples of opportunities for widening its impact and sharing learnings:

- There are often no tangible results visible and only publications or policy recommendations. However, that doesn't mean there is no impact, and new relationships are also a clear outcome of urban living lab projects.
- Urban Living Labs are long-term projects that often rely on the next stage of funding to continue to develop in the same way, but they are also many opportunities to integrate these projects and approaches within the local processes and initiatives.

"We are convinced that the urban living lab approach can be integrated into numerous urban development processes and civic participation projects." – an urban living lab partner

- For local municipalities, experiences with running an urban living lab can result in guidelines and a better understanding on how to run similar approaches in the future.

Lessons stakeholders adapted into other projects

- Lessons around multi-stakeholders' engagement and collaborative approaches:
 - Cross-disciplinary engagement and collaboration was mentioned various times as one element that was adapted and used in other projects, especially interactions between different stakeholder groups and new ways of working.
 - Urban Living Lab projects highlighted and openly spoke about issues that were kept quiet in local communities. Close collaborations opened-up alternatives ways of tackling specific issues and support mechanisms within the community.
 - Multi-stakeholder engagement and relationship building can be very challenging when it comes to keep track of all partners activities or manage changes in the teams with for instance people leaving the project along the way. This can constitute a risk for the project, that needs to be anticipated when possible.
 - It was challenging to connect the scientific activities that happen during the ULL with the fieldwork and research that happen during the community engagement. This is a result of different ways of working and processing outcomes.

"For academics, its often about publications. And urban living lab are often led by universities... however, the real impact of a urban living lab is when their work is adopted by the public or other organisations" – WASTE FEW urban living lab partner

- Lessons related to the projects structure and sustainability:
 - It is common that the initial phase of the projects either takes longer than expected or falls short in reaching the original scope because of the limited time spent on it.

- Things change during a project, and it requires a flexible attitude with a preparedness to improvise. Some actors might be familiar with this approach, but others can find it new and confusing, and need to evolve in their mindset and ways of working.
- Urban living labs should avoid product and service dependency on external partners as this can often risk the project sustainability.

Chapter 3 – Recommendations for an advanced concept of urban living lab

3.1 Overview of the 15 recommendations

Following our research and insight synthesis, we have created a selection of recommendations for the future of urban living labs. A first draft of these recommendations was shared with stakeholders from JPI Urban Europe and urban living labs for feedback and further insight, which guided our iterations and formed the final recommendations below.

The 15 recommendations below have been clustered into three categories:

- Stakeholder engagement and buy-in
- Urban Living Labs delivery
- Evaluation, impact, and project sustainability

For each recommendation we have highlighted the stakeholder group that we believe will find the recommendation most useful or will have the most power to implement it: JPI Urban Europe or urban living labs. However, all recommendations will likely be useful or interesting for both parties.

Each recommendation is structured by:

- Headline recommendation
- Challenges that informed this recommendation
- Ways to address the challenges (more specific recommendations)
- Examples of good practice
- Actions for JPI Urban Europe (things JPI UE can do to support the recommendation)

Our recommendations cover a wide spectrum across the whole journey of an urban living lab project and therefore are naturally quite high level. With this in mind, we believe that these recommendations should not be treated as absolute or final. The recommendations should be prioritised followed by further, deeper, collaborative research by relevant stakeholders before they are implemented. This will help to further understand the potential (positive and negative) consequences of such change, the barriers to implementation and the stakeholders required to support (such as national funding agencies, municipality teams etc.).

Recommendation	Main audience	
	JPI UE	urban living labs
1 Stakeholder engagement and buy-in		
1.1 Conduct genuine and continuous stakeholder analysis to support with involving a diversity of participants throughout the lifetime of a project		✓
1.2 Get decision-makers on-board early and build confidence to achieve better buy-in		✓
1.3 Be aware of stakeholders' different backgrounds and abilities to lower barriers to participation		✓
1.4 Manage the expectations of different stakeholders by being clear about the project journey		✓
1.5 Communicate in a simple and accessible way and be strategic in how you communicate to different audiences		✓
2 Urban Living Labs delivery		
2.1 Extend the length of projects and break them down into key phases, emphasizing important stages and activities	✓	
2.2 Better communicate what an urban living lab is to new people, emphasizing the underlying methods and mindset	✓	✓
2.3 Provide training for the participatory approach to allow a better balance in skills and responsibilities between different types of stakeholders	✓	
2.4 Maintain flexibility to adapt to local governance, conjuncture, strategies, and contextual changes		✓
3 Evaluation and project sustainability		
3.1 Prioritise evaluation and impact measurement as key activities throughout the project		✓
3.2 Link the impact measurement strategy to the local urban context and ecosystem		✓
3.3 Set a 'learning strategy' from the beginning and establish a methodology for capturing knowledge and insights throughout the project		✓
3.4 Explore alternative funding streams early to ensure the ongoing sustainability of an urban living lab and its initiatives		✓
3.5 Establish and agree on a clear strategy for scaling the urban living lab initiatives		✓
3.6 Facilitate the formalisation and dissemination of lessons learned across JPI's urban living labs community	✓	

3.2 Recommendations around stakeholder engagement and buy-in

Urban Living labs are, above all, about people, fruitful encounters, and inspiring collaborations. But this human side of urban living labs also comes with many challenges related to actors’ buy-in, representation, on-going engagement, motivations, and collaborative work. Thus, these five initial recommendations focus on the topic of stakeholder engagement and buy-in and are mainly targeted at urban living labs to implement along their project journey. JPI Urban Europe is here encouraged to support urban living labs by sharing methodologies, advice and foster the sharing of best practices.

<p>Stakeholder engagement and buy-in / Recommendation 1.1</p> <p>Conduct genuine and continuous stakeholder analysis to support with involving a diversity of participants throughout the lifetime of a project</p>	<p>JPI UE</p> <hr/> <p>urban living labs ✓</p>
--	--

Challenges that inform this recommendation

- Many urban living lab teams rely on close networks and existing relationships, restricting potential ideas and impact, and reducing opportunities for other stakeholders.
- Despite their relevance and potential influence, some stakeholders remain less interested in being part of an urban living lab if they don’t share the same motivations, urgency, or have pre-existing negative relationships or experiences.
- Existing power structures are often reproduced inside Living Labs, resulting in unequal opportunities and unheard voices.

Ways to address the challenges

- Conduct ongoing stakeholder mapping and analysis throughout the lifetime of a project (not just at the start).
- Broaden your network and increase the variety of stakeholders involved by asking *all* existing stakeholders to recommend others who they think should be involved.
- Increase chances of success by collaborating closely with people/stakeholders who have direct experience of the project challenge and location.
- Involve vulnerable or ‘hard to engage’ communities by finding the most relevant and direct routes to access, recruit and keep them engaged. For example:
 - Go to where they are, at a time that works for them.
 - Connect with local ambassadors and trusted organisations.
 - Present communication materials in the most accessible format (e.g. Printed, in a different language etc.).
 - Understand what motivates them to be involved and create an incentive structure related to these drivers (NB: it does not necessarily have to be a monetary incentive)
 - Show the value of their input through clear feedback and updates.
- As part of your stakeholder mapping, make sure to understand existing hierarchies, relationships and the potential influence that different stakeholders might have (especially regarding

implementation and scaling up) in order to avoid reproducing existing governance structures and conflicts that might hinder the project.

Examples of good practice

- When mapping stakeholders always cover the quadruple helix (community, academia, government, and industry) and identify for each stakeholder their barriers, benefits, needs, importance, influence and expected role for participating in the project.
- Update the stakeholder analysis whenever external conditions change, in order to avoid the exclusion of any stakeholder group.
- Aim for mitigation strategies to remove hierarchies and give a 'level playing field' for all stakeholders involved in a discussion.
- Encourage the emergence of any conflicting goals between Lab participants and possible external stakeholder groups not actively engaged and manage these conflicting goals by multi-criteria decision-making techniques.
- Keep a solid and updated CRM of the stakeholder community that can be passed over and ensure the project's sustainability.

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- Encourage stakeholders mapping and analysis activities via training and the sharing of frameworks, toolkits, and templates.
- Encourage (enforce or incentivise) the integration of new stakeholders in calls.

Stakeholder engagement and buy-in / Recommendation 1.2

Get decision-makers on-board early and build confidence to achieve better buy-in

JPI UE
urban living labs ✓

Challenges that inform this recommendation

- Fragmented institutional arrangements between and within institutions (“silo compartments”) may prevent clear distribution of responsibilities among the actors involved in the urban living lab activities, hindering cooperation between them.
- When not aware or deeply involved in urban living labs, institutions are less likely to commit to implementing the project outcomes.
- Receiving the permission needed for the use of public spaces can be time consuming, difficult and requirements can vary across different countries and cities. It requires collaboration between often siloed municipality departments, plus other local stakeholders such as local communities and business owners who may also need to give consent.

Ways to address the challenges

- Involve influential stakeholders (such as local municipalities and governments) as soon as possible and ensure that they are clearly aware of the urban living lab's purpose, processes, and potential impacts.

- Invite influential stakeholders to allocate time and funding to the project to increase buy-in and improve the chances of success and sustainability.
- Be aware of the different departments (and their overlaps, responsibilities, relationships and power) within local public institutions. Map them and bring them together in the project and help to break down the silos.

This recommendation relates to the recommendations 2.2 and 3.2 about the communication and dissemination of what is an urban living lab, and about the linking of the impact measurement strategy to the local urban.

Examples of good practice

- Ask city departments (not individual people) to sign a letter of support for the project, and for a longer term (e.g. 2 to 3 years). This will remove barriers to buy-in and support.
- Find ways to help the different municipality departments to communicate better internally, and encourage them to create a dedicated Living Lab team to prevent knowledge loss when people leave.
- Develop future visions with stakeholders and crucial decision-makers, highlighting the potential structural changes that might be needed to support effective collaborative working, management and processes.
- Local actors may be empowered when teamed up with supra-urban actors. For example, teaming up municipalities with provinces, or local NGOs with their national counterpart (scale jumping).

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- Facilitate the collection of best practices and ‘labs stories’, sharing across the JPI urban living lab community to inspire project teams on how to gain buy-in from their local network.
- Prepare urban living lab projects for the challenges related to gaining consent and data privacy at the application stage.

Stakeholder engagement and buy-in / Recommendation 1.3	JPI UE
Be aware of stakeholders’ different backgrounds and abilities to lower barriers to participation	urban living labs ✓

Challenges that inform this recommendation

- Many urban living labs tend to be seen as quite exclusive. For example, engagement with stakeholders can often be rushed or planned quite late, leading to a reliance on existing contacts and relationships.
- Engaging with people who are less comfortable with technology can be difficult, but it is essential to involve them in order to make the project inclusive and democratic.

Ways to address the challenges

- Living Labs are built intrinsically on the principle of a collaborative process and shared responsibilities. Thus, it is crucial to open

participation to a representative diversity of stakeholders as soon as possible to create engagement and ownership.

- Design and provide a variety of collaborative activities which align with people’s interests and capacities and offer attractive and meaningful opportunities to participate.
- Choose to run activities online or in a physical setting depending on each activity’s objectives, while making sure that it does not leave some stakeholders on the side.

Examples of good practice

- Include peoples’ knowledge, background, abilities, and influence as part of stakeholder mapping activities to enable better targeted activities.
- Adapt tools, support materials, and activity formats (duration, groups size, level of interaction, choice of venue, schedule of meeting, language, technological support...) to reduce capacities and digital divide and make the most of the format chosen (in person or remote meeting).
- In most cases, when activity outputs are well designed, made relevant to peoples’ interests and are clearly shared in advance, they should be enough of an incentive for people to join.

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- Facilitate the collection of best practices, methodologies and ‘lab stories’ and share these across the JPI urban living labs community to enable progress in participatory approaches.

Stakeholder engagement and buy-in / Recommendation 1.4		JPI UE
Manage the expectations of different stakeholders by being clear about the project journey		urban living labs ✓
<i>Challenges that inform this recommendation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is often difficult to keep local communities involved over a long period of time. • When unclear about the process and project goals, some stakeholders might struggle to see the benefit and ultimate value in participating. 	
<i>Ways to address the challenges</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboratively create a clear understanding of the project goals and expected impacts at different levels (e.g. at an individual level, city level, policy level etc.). • Be transparent and keep stakeholders up to date about the overall process and activities. • Make the different stakeholders’ interests and expectations explicit to all in order to facilitate the accommodation of both substantive and process-oriented interests in the design of the experiment. • Make it clear to participants what the value is for them, why they need to be engaged and how they’ll benefit. 	

Examples of good practice

- Well designed and accessible communication materials can be used to explain the process of the urban living labs and to manage expectations.
- Continuous stakeholder mapping and analysis helps to understand the different stakeholder desires, benefits, or barriers in participating, informing what sort of activities and incentives will likely motivate them.
- Clarify the stakeholders’ roles and levels of involvement at different stages of the project (e.g. Informed, consulted, involved, accountable, responsible).
- Accept that some groups or people might not stay involved for the whole lifetime of the urban living lab or experimentation and anticipate potential impacts and actions to take accordingly.
- Emphasize to participants that their involvement is a voluntary commitment and that they can ‘opt out’ at any point. Empowering them to make this decision and feel they remain in control can actually mean they stay involved for longer.

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- Facilitate the collection of best practices, methodologies and ‘lab stories’ and share these across the JPI urban living labs community to support urban living lab teams in sustaining their community of stakeholders.

Stakeholder engagement and buy-in / Recommendation 1.5 Communicate in a simple and accessible way and be strategic in how you communicate to different audiences	JPI UE
	urban living labs ✓

Challenges that inform this recommendation

- Often in European urban living labs, language and culture differences can create communication barriers.
- Stakeholders can get overwhelmed if there is too much information communicated at one time.

Ways to address the challenges

- The style, format and clarity of communication materials are highly important when it comes to keeping people engaged.
- Establish different target audiences according to the stakeholder groups and roles and use these as a guidance to create communication materials of appropriate detail and frequency.
- Tell people only what they need to know at different stages of the project (less is more!).

Examples of good practice

- Ensure language and content used in communication is simple to understand and approachable, and always explain acronyms and technical terms to avoid people feeling excluded.
- Customise communication messages, formats, and materials to the different target audiences.

- Some urban living labs choose to nominate one communicator (point of contact) for each type of partner. (This for instance can enable a closer relationship with some local communities through, for example, communicating with them in the most suitable language.) The team of communicators can gather in regular meetings and align on how to customize and filter the information for their own target audience.
- Work with copywriters, content designers and graphic designers to ensure project is clearly communicated.
- Test communication asset mock-ups with potential users to understand areas that they find challenging or irrelevant. Iterate designs and messages based on feedback.

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- JPI Urban Europe could create and share a *Glossary of urban living labs common terms* in multiple languages.
- Facilitate content sharing and the collection of best practices across the JPI urban living labs community to inspire teams in communicating and promoting their project efficiently.

3.3 Recommendations around urban living labs delivery

Developing and implementing an urban living lab requires time, a set of specific skills and mindset, and can be very challenging in an ever-changing urban environment since these kinds of projects rely heavily on real-life experimentation and on local organisations which have their own agenda, strategy, and constraints. Therefore, the following four recommendations are related to the project implementation and teams’ up-skilling. They are targeted at both JPI Urban Europe and urban living labs.

Urban living labs delivery / Recommendation 2.1		JPI UE	✓
Extend the length of projects and break them down into key phases, emphasizing important stages and activities		urban living labs	
<i>Challenges that inform this recommendation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average duration of a JPI Urban Europe funded urban living lab project (four years) is seen by some as being too short to fulfil goals, ambitions and create long lasting impacts. • The fundamental stage of building up the foundations of an urban living lab requires a significant amount of time (6-12 months on average). It is common that this phase either takes longer than expected or falls short in reaching the original scope because of the limited time spent on it. • Getting approval and finding the right people to support projects can be time consuming. Differences or delays in funding can have a negative effect on projects, creating an imbalance of work and responsibilities. 		

Ways to address the challenges

- Establish a new phased structure for urban living labs, breaking them down into three key stages: pre-study, implementation and scaling-up. This will encourage important activities to take place (e.g. business models, feasibility studies, iterations, long-term data collection, local governance integration).
- Clarify the expectations for each phase of the projects and include key activities in project agreements. Highlight for instance in the pre-study stage the importance of ‘challenge definition’ to ensure that urban living labs remain focused on solving local challenges.
- Create further opportunities for long-lasting impact through continuation calls, earmarking follow-up funding to support with developing the urban living lab outcomes further.

Examples good practice

- Applications, funding, and performance indicators can be allocated to each phase, with project partners expected to fulfil certain criteria before being able to move on to the next phase.

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- Work with national funding agencies to understand how a phased approach to funding urban living labs might work, researching best practices, potential consequences, and potential barriers to implementation.
- Provide guides/training around key activities such as ‘challenge definition’.

Urban living labs delivery / Recommendation 2.2

Better communicate what an urban living lab is to new people, emphasizing the underlying methods and mindset

JPI UE ✓

urban living labs ✓

Challenges that inform this recommendation

- Some projects use the ‘Living Lab’ label without fully understanding and implementing the particular approaches and methods that make Living Labs unique (such as the quadruple helix and participatory approach).
- Some groups of participants can feel disappointed when the co-design approach, decision-making processes and experimentation principles have not been well understood or communicated.
- Some organisations are unlikely to share the learnings that they see as ‘failures’ as they fear exposing themselves to potential criticism, especially when using public funding.

Ways to address the challenges

- Emphasize the collaborative and ‘learning-by-doing’ mindset and the participatory methodologies when explaining Living Labs.
- JPI’s interventions, communication materials and tools can help to ‘normalise’ a culture of experimentation, where ‘failure’ is always a learning process to take forward and iterate.

This recommendation relates to recommendations 1.3 and 3.3 about managing expectations and capturing lessons learned.

<i>Examples good practice</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make sure everyone is aware of what it means to participate and communicate about the collaborative approach and decision-making processes.
<i>Actions for JPI Urban Europe</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote the Living Lab methods and mindset by organising, for example, urban living lab tours and visits, training sessions and/or a webinar series. • Create a network of urban living lab ambassadors who could share their stories and own experiences • Create attractive and engaging communication materials to share what an urban living lab is and to make available for use by projects owners to use locally (e.g. videos, podcasts, games, ice breakers, conferences...). • Build a library of use cases to showcase a variety of urban living labs stories, highlighting the value of the methodology and mindset.

Urban living labs delivery / Recommendation 2.3	JPI UE ✓
Provide training for the participatory approach to allow a better balance in skills and responsibilities between different types of stakeholders	urban living labs

<i>Challenges that inform this recommendation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are only few city administrations considered as being one of the main initiators of urban living labs. Many local public administrations are less familiar with the participatory approach. Even if it resembles some of the democratic processes they follow, the more active role given to local communities in the creation and development of solutions and experiments is novel. • The difference of culture and skills around the participatory approach can create a certain imbalance where some partners act as experts and city stakeholders are less able to take on more leading or influential roles.
<i>Ways to address the challenges</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JPI to provide training programmes and materials around the participatory approach. • JPI to strengthen the urban living lab community opportunities for capacity building.
<i>Examples of good practice</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In situations where some negative voices are more powerful than others, find ways to facilitate conversations that force everyone to remain involved and positive. • Create situations where you remove roles/hierarchies and place everyone on an equal playing field. • Work with trained facilitators to manage potential conflicts.
<i>Actions for JPI Urban Europe</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise at first the targeted audience for these trainings such as municipalities and urban public administration. • Nominate 'participatory' champions (people with greater experience in participatory / co-creation methods) to facilitate capacity building

within the JPI urban living labs community to foster progress in participatory approaches.

Urban living labs delivery / Recommendation 2.4	JPI UE
Maintain flexibility to adapt to local governance, conjuncture, strategies, and contextual changes	urban living labs ✓

Challenges that inform this recommendation

- A lack of coordination with the social, economic, cultural and political conjuncture can hinder the deployment of experiments and reduce the chances of the later adoption and integration of the innovation pursued.
- Urban assemblage can be locked-in to certain technical, infrastructural, legal or financial aspects (e.g. long-term contracts, legal lock-ins) and may become a barrier to the practical implementation of urban living labs outcomes.
- A change in political representation in the local area (city, region...) can affect, slow down or even threaten urban living lab projects (as, for example, the project could lose its key sponsor).

Ways to address the challenges

- Be ready to adapt to changing conditions in the outside social and political agenda.
- Be aware of and analyse the local conjuncture (broader socio-economic, cultural, and political aspects), existing governance structures, practices and procedures to manage the urban living lab activities and co-design innovations with the local context and constraints in mind.
- Increase the sustainability of the urban living lab projects by discovering alternative funding streams, ideally from the early stages of a project, in order to not fully rely on public funding and the local ‘hosts’.

Examples of good practice

- Establish links with the existing public debate, with the local community priorities, and with what stakeholders consider to be feasible.
- Be open to adjusting the project objectives and methodologies to shift strategy in the case of contextual changes.
- Be aware of national, European and international strategies/policy changes that could have an influence on local strategies and priorities.

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- Facilitate the sharing of best practices across the JPI urban living labs community to enable project teams to learn from one another.
- Communicate how International and European policy has influenced the funding call (and work with national funding agencies to do the same in regard to national strategies).

3.4 Recommendations around evaluation, impact, and project sustainability

All the recommendations in this report aim to increase the impact of urban living lab projects and improve their chances sustainability. However, the following recommendations aim to support the processes of impact measurement and knowledge sharing, which we heard are often challenging or undervalued areas of an urban living lab journey. These last six recommendations are mainly targeted at urban living labs, with strong support also required from JPI Urban Europe.

Evaluation, impact, and project sustainability / Recommendation 3.1		JPI UE
Prioritise evaluation and impact measurement as key activities throughout the project		urban living labs ✓
<i>Challenges that inform this recommendation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is often a lack of budget and resourced time allocated for measuring impacts throughout a project. • Long term impact is rarely captured due to project funding ending and teams moving onto new priorities. • Forecasting a projects potential impact is a challenging activity that requires multiple stakeholders to share their perspectives and expectations. 	
<i>Ways to address the challenge</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicate a significant part of the project budget to the evaluation of impacts (at least 10%). • From the beginning, define and agree with the relevant stakeholders on the long-term vision and goal for sustaining the project after the initial JPI funding (if that is the ambition). • Always try to connect activities to this wider goal in order to keep everyone engaged and increase the potential for scaling-up in the end. • Make sure to define objectives that are tangible and agree on the evaluation process to collect data and learnings before, during and after each intervention. • Always plan to run an initial baseline study before starting any experiment as a reference point for evaluating the impacts of the intervention. • Engage with industry/external experts to validate findings and impacts and ensure their relevance by aligning with Standards. 	
<i>Examples of good practice</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit the number of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) in regard to the challenge addressed in order to keep priorities focussed and clear. • While more resource intensive, qualitative impact assessment on an individual level (understanding changes in mentalities, opinions, stories, relationships etc.) is one of the most interesting ways to see how an urban living lab has changed a place. 	
<i>Actions for JPI Urban Europe</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work closely with urban living labs partners to define a few common KPIs. These could be used to measure across all urban living labs to support the projects team methodology and facilitate learning sharing and comparison. 	

- Recommend investigation methods and tools to measure and understand project impacts.
- Consider extending funding to allow some urban living labs to measure impact on longer term basis.

Evaluation, impact, and project sustainability / Recommendation 3.2		JPI UE
Link the impact measurement strategy to the local urban context and ecosystem		urban living labs ✓
<i>Challenges that inform this recommendation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups and impacts outside the Living Lab context tend to be overlooked, resulting in projects being disconnected from their wider context and less likely to gain buy-in from the local city administration and chances for sustaining. 	
<i>Ways to address the challenge</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage systemic thinking in the urban living lab activities (e.g. consequence scanning) to explicitly consider the projects indirect and cross-scale effects in the broader urban context. This pragmatic approach will enable better integration of the project in its local context. • Communicate clearly how the urban living lab project will contribute to the wider city strategy and goals in order to improve buy-in from the local public administration. 	
<i>Examples of good practice</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systemic design activities such as consequence scanning or externalities' mapping enable reflection on multiple scales relevant to the Living Lab, on the various actors that might be included/excluded at each scale and on the related impacts within different time frames. 	
<i>Actions for JPI Urban Europe</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate best practices / methodologies sharing and continuous inspiration within JPI urban living labs community of practice. 	

Evaluation, impact, and project sustainability / Recommendation 3.3		JPI UE
Set a 'learning strategy' from the beginning and establish a methodology for capturing knowledge and insights throughout the project		urban living labs ✓
<i>Challenges that inform this recommendation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living Labs, which are built upon open innovation principles and involving multiple stakeholders, are meant to allow the actors involved to 'learn by doing' and develop new ways of collaborating and working together. However, these learnings goals are not always made explicit among all project stakeholders at the beginning and some actors show less interest in learning from the process and progressing their 'ways of working'. 	

-
- Even if there is a desire to learn from the process among a project team, lessons learned are often not explicitly monitored and formalised.
 - When people leave the project, or when an urban living lab project has ended, people carry their experience and learnings with them in the form of knowledge. Therefore, there is a risk that those learnings are lost from the project or organisation, affecting the potential sustainability of a project.
 - Some stakeholders can be hesitant to share thorough learnings, especially if such learnings have the potential to paint them in a bad light, especially when it comes to publicly funded experiments.

Ways to address the challenge

- In order to continuously improve the innovation and working process within the urban living lab and enable the project to be more sustainable, develop from the beginning a comprehensive learning strategy aimed at capturing and monitoring knowledge creation, lessons learned, participants' feedback and evolutions in the process or methodology.
- The learning strategy should be defined with a representative selection of stakeholders, making explicit from the start the different stakes and learning expectations for each actor.
- Include guidelines for capturing and formalising lessons learned as an ongoing process throughout the project within the learning strategy (roles, tools, formats, etc.).
- Work with stakeholders to 'normalise' experimentation and learning from mistakes by helping them to communicate the value of these sorts of approaches.

Examples of good practice

- Communication budget to produce content such as videos, articles, blogs etc. can help to support the learning strategy.
- Systematising sharing about individual experiences, thoughts and feedback through workshops, interviews, surveys etc. can help with understanding how communication and processes could be improved throughout an urban living lab project and in the future.

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- Suggest tools and templates to capture lessons learned in an efficient way all along the project's journey.
- *See also recommendation 3.6.*

Evaluation, impact, and project sustainability / Recommendation 3.4		JPI UE
Explore alternative funding streams early to ensure the ongoing sustainability of an urban living lab and its initiatives		urban living labs ✓
<i>Challenges that inform this recommendation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Living Labs rely heavily on research funding (such as that through JPI) or funding from municipalities. • Strategies for the sustainability of urban living labs beyond JPI UE funding are often not thought about soon enough, meaning that many end when the funding stops. 	
<i>Ways to address the challenge</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at diversifying the urban living lab’s activities, projects and funding streams to strengthen the chances of sustainability beyond the JPI Urban Europe funding timeline. • Explore and test potential business models to help your Living Lab and associated projects/activities to be self-sufficient (or less reliant on funding grants). 	
<i>Examples of good practice</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update business models throughout the course of the project (and beyond) to align to any contextual changes and updates in strategic priorities, locally, nationally, and internationally. 	
<i>Actions for JPI Urban Europe</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer support to project teams on business model shaping (training, frameworks, etc.). • Encourage project owners to share use cases around their Labs’ business models in order to support and inspire others within JPI urban living labs community. 	

Evaluation, impact, and project sustainability / Recommendation 3.5		JPI UE
Establish and agree on a clear strategy for scaling the urban living lab initiatives		urban living labs ✓
<i>Challenges that inform this recommendation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results and learnings from experimentation and testing through urban living labs often fail to transfer into wider contexts such as city administrations. Impact could be strengthened. 	
<i>Ways to address the challenge</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Find ways to make scaling and acceleration of impacts a conscious and central focus of the urban living lab development strategy and consequently of each partnered organisations’ strategy. • Clarify the purpose for widening the impacts and the expected results to establish an approach for scaling out, scaling up and/or scaling deep (Riddell and Moore, 2015)⁶, with the possibility to blend and change strategy at different stages of the process. 	

⁶ Riddell, D. & Moore, M.L. (2015). *Scaling Out, Scaling Up, Scaling Deep: Advancing Systemic Social Innovation and The Learning Processes to Support it*. J.W. McConnell Family Foundation and Tamarack Institute.

- Scaling out: a scaling approach focussed on replicating successful innovations in different contexts and communities.
- Scaling up: a scaling approach aiming to change institutions, policy and law to achieve greater impact.
- Scaling deep: a scaling approach related to the notion that sustainable change is achieved through changes in communities' culture, values and practices and in the way they interact.

Examples good practice

- Once project teams make scaling a deliberate choice, participating organisations and individuals are invited to employ various strategies depending on their own context (resources, network, capabilities, own opportunities...) to spread their innovation and address the systemic root causes of their challenge.

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- Encourage and support projects teams to establish a clear strategy for widening impact early in the process.

Evaluation, impact, and project sustainability / Recommendation 3.6

JPI UE



Facilitate the formalisation and dissemination of lessons learned across JPI's urban living labs community

urban living labs

Challenges that inform this recommendation

- The urban living labs potential for learning seems to be underexploited both at local and larger scales.
- Once projects end or funding stops, there is often a lack of resource and incentives for participating organisations to share learnings to a wider community.
- It can be difficult to measure and compare urban living labs as they tend to be very different and complex ecosystems.
- Project communities, even if hearing about learnings from others, tend to prefer to learn by themselves and experiment things in their own situation.

Ways to address the challenge

- From the interviews and workshops organised to shape this report and recommendations, there is a strong expectation from project owners for JPI Urban Europe to become a knowledge hub and play a proactive role in supporting learning processes at different scales, locally and trans-locally.
- JPI Urban Europe should encourage and advise on learnings transfer within the JPI urban living labs community but also locally to relevant actors outside the labs, including both positive and negative experiences with a focus on lessons learned and pivoting approaches.
- JPI Urban Europe could create simple and efficient methods, tools and templates to systematise downloading and sharing of knowledge and lessons learned at key moments of the urban living labs projects. This

will enable them to create a JPI UE library and to better reference and easily compare project use cases.

- Create engaging and attractive formats for knowledge / lessons learned transfer (e.g. videos, podcasts, in person events, peer-to-peer activities...) to communicate as clearly and simply as possible and make learning rewarding and comprehensive to all.

This recommendation relates to the recommendation 2.2 about the communication and dissemination of what is an urban living lab to new people.

Examples of good practice

- Project kick-off can be used as a time for bringing other projects in to share learnings.

Actions for JPI Urban Europe

- Launch a reflection on the objectives, functionalities and use cases for a JPI Urban Europe Knowledge Hub to be created.
- Start working on the production of templates and processes for urban living labs to systematically summarise and share their experience and lessons learned to the JPI urban living labs community.
- Organise peer-to-peer activities (in person or remotely) to facilitate knowledge transfer.

Chapter 4 – Next steps

In order to explore, detail and implement the recommendations presented in this report and bring this advanced concept of urban living lab to life, we would invite JPI Urban Europe, along with the funding agencies, to closely collaborate and form a steering group to define the next actions to undertake. We suggest the following actions as immediate next steps:

Prioritisation and further research

The fifteen recommendations in these reports have been organised and presented under three themes: *Stakeholder engagement and buy-in*, urban living labs *delivery*, and *Evaluation, impact, and project sustainability*. We invite JPI Urban Europe and the funding agencies to work on prioritising the recommendations depending on their strategic orientations, on-going projects and potential feedback received from urban living lab initiatives related to support needs and challenges they face. This prioritisation exercise should help to define focus areas and lead to a clear and staggered plan for developing and implementing the recommendations. Some further research and qualitative studies may be required to agree on this plan and further develop some of the recommendations.

Gathering inspirations

These recommendations might be translated in an enhanced support offer delivered by JPI Urban Europe and/or the funding agencies. In order to shape this offer, we would invite JPI Urban Europe and the funding agencies to conduct solutions and best practices scanning. This will enable them to get inspiration by gathering examples of things that are done well, either in the same open-innovation domain or in other domains.

Areas of research could cover for, for example, the following topics:

- successful peer-learning activities and schemes,
- innovative formats of trainings,
- knowledge hubs/platforms (architecture, uses and functionalities, maintenance,...)
- toolkits and frameworks (format, comms and dissemination channels, ...)
- community of practice management (relationship building and engagement patterns, sustaining principles, comms plan and tools, ...)

Development and implementation of the recommendations

As a meaningful and quite logical approach, the recommendations should be developed and implemented using the same participatory and innovative principles as advocated in all living labs initiatives. Therefore, co-creation methods and activities would constitute opportunities for involving a diversity of stakeholders to develop the recommendations and plans for practical implementation.

Additionally, as some of the recommendations might be quick and easy to implement, we would invite JPI Urban Europe and funding agencies to use an experimentation approach and invite urban living lab initiatives to test and apply the recommendations in their project and setting, evaluate their feasibility and quickly iterate to eventually find the best way for implementing and sustaining those recommendations. This will help to collaboratively refine

the recommendations, best practices attached, and better define viable ways for implementing those in different contexts.

Existing community of practice and future partnerships

As stated in the introductory chapters of this report, a qualitative approach has been used to develop the recommendations for an advanced concept of urban living lab. The desk research and qualitative interviews conducted enabled to uncover valuable insights to do so, however the sample of urban living labs partners and experts involved in the different activities remains quite limited. Thus, we would advise JPI Urban Europe and funding agencies to connect to the many domain experts and large community of practice which are already involved around urban living labs. An extended community of practice and partnerships could be established to share perspectives around this advanced concept of urban living lab and pursue the activities and actions mentioned in this chapter.

Annex

Annex 1

Interview Guide used in semi-structured interviews during the initial research phase

Interview guide for Expand II – Task 4.4

Key areas we want cover in these interviews:

- **Key learnings**, what worked well and what didn't work out? What results / processes were adapted in different projects.
- **Project legacy**, where the findings translated into other urban contexts? Did the local authority adapt or scaled up the project outcome / approach? How did they do that - please expand on this
- **Did the ULL survive beyond the three-year** funding period, if yes how did they do it (e.g. became an urban practice) and if the ULL didn't continue why not and what could be done differently to increase the longevity of ULL?

Intro [5 minutes]:

My name is [insert name], I work for Connected Places Catapult and I'm here today with my colleague(s) [insert name(s)] to find out more about your urban living lab Project [insert ULL project here]. Your insights will help with our research into ULLs and will be a published as a part of our project deliverable. The interview will take between 45-60 minutes.

This is what we want to do with you today:

- [Show you the consent form and ask you to sign it – Check if they have sent it and remind them to do so.]
- We would like to **record the (audio of the) call** so that our colleagues who cannot be here today take part in the research and understand what you said, but also to be able to go over the conversation later internally. Repeat that we will not publish the recording anywhere externally.
- We will be asking you (in an informal way) a number of questions, but don't worry about there being wrong or right answers! We are most interested in your personal experience and perspective on things.
- We will ask you about **your role and your role in the project**
- Then we will talk **about key stages of the project and learnings**
- And lastly, what happens after the project, **sustainability, and scaling**

Do you have any further question or doubt? If not, we'll dive right in...

I am going to start the recording.

About your role and the project - 10 - 15 minutes

1. Can you tell us a bit about your professional role and your role in the project/ urban living lab?
2. Could you take us back in history a little bit, and tell us a bit more about how your project came to be? How did it start?
 - a. Did you have any previous experience running urban living labs?
 - b. If so, how many others have you worked on, and what were they about?
 - c. If not, is/was it different than what you expected from it beforehand? Why?
3. Could you summarise the project briefly, what urban challenge did the open call/ project aim to tackle? How did they do that?
 - a. What other people were involved, who were the main stakeholders?
 - b. Did the other stakeholders have any previous experience with ULL's?

Key non- technical learnings - 15-20 minutes

1. Would you consider it to be/have been successful? Why or why not?
2. What worked well in the project? Please expand.
3. What didn't work out or changed during the project? Why?
4. Were you and your partners able to adapt any project results or learnings into other projects? How did you do that/expand.

Legacy - 15-20 minutes

1. Were the findings translated into other urban contexts?
2. Did the local authority adapt or scale the project outcome / approach?
If yes, how did they do that - please expand on this
3. Did the ULL survive beyond the three-year funding period, if yes how did they do it (e.g. became an urban practice)
...and if the ULL didn't continue **why not** and what could be **done differently** to increase the longevity of ULL?

Last question (if time)

Is there anything else you'd like to add that might be of interest to us?

Annex 2

Bibliography - Literature review

- Carayannis & Campbell (2009). *'Mode 3' and 'Quadruple Helix', Towards a 21st century fractal innovation ecosystem*, International Journal of Technology Management.
- Riddell, D. & Moore, M.L. (2015). *Scaling Out, Scaling Up, Scaling Deep: Advancing Systemic Social Innovation and The Learning Processes to Support it*. J.W. McConnell Family Foundation and Tamarack Institute.
Available at: https://mcconnellfoundation.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/ScalingOut_Nov27A_AV_BrandedBleed.pdf
- Steen, K., & van Bueren, E. (2017). *Urban Living Labs – A Living Lab Way of Working*. Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Metropolitan Solutions.
Available at: <https://www.ams-institute.org/news/urban-living-labs-living-lab-way-working/>
- Scholl, C., Ablasser, G., Eriksen, M.A., Baerten, N., Blok, J., Clark, E., Cörvers, R., Domian, W., Drage, T., Essebo, M., Graham, T., Hillgren, P.A., Hoeflehner, T., Janze, A., Kemp, R., Klingsbigl, G., Köhler, W.T., de Kraker, J., Landwehr, A., Leitner, G., Nilsson, P.A., Pelin, O., Rijkens-Klomp, N., Seravalli, A., Simons, J., Vandermosten, G., Wachtmeister, A., van Wanroij, T., Wlasak, P., and Zimmermann, F. (2017). *Guidelines for Urban Labs*, URB@Exp project 2014-2017, JPI Urban Europe.
Available at: <https://jpi-urbaneurope.eu/project/urbexp/>
- *The Emerging Landscape of Urban Living Labs: Characteristics, Practices and Examples* (2017). GUST project 2014-2017, JPI Urban Europe
Available at: <https://jpi-urbaneurope.eu/news/gust-project-results-in-urban-living-labs-handbook-and-massive-open-online-course/>
- Scholl, C., de Kraker, J., Hoeflehner, T., Eriksen, M.A., Wlasak, P., and Drage, T. (2018). *Transitioning Urban Experiments, reflections on Doing Action Research with Urban Labs*. URB@Exp project 2014-2017. GAiA.
Available at:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323804020_Transitioning_Urban_Experiments_Reflections_on_Doing_Action_Research_with_Urban_Labs
- Dijk, M., da Schio, N., Diethart, M., Hoeflehner, T., Wlasak, P., Castri, R., Cellina, F., Boussauw, K., Cassiers, T., Chemin, L., Cörvers, R., de Kraker, J., Kemp, R., and van Heur, B. (2019). *How to anticipate constraints on upscaling inclusive Living Lab experiments*, SmarterLabs project 2016 -2019, JPI Urban Europe.
Available at: https://static.uni-graz.at/fileadmin/projekte/smarterlabs/downloads/SmarterLabs_Guidelines_short.pdf
- Bylund, J., Riegler, J. and Caroline Wrangsten. (TBP) Anticipating 'the New Normal' Experimentation Through urban living labs 2.0: Lessons Learnt by JPI Urban Europe, JPI Urban Europe.