

URBACT II

(2007 - 2013)



Application Form

Final Application Form Thematic Networks - P II - 2012

Priority-Operation 2-1

Attractive and Cohesive Cities

Exchange and learning

USER Phase II

Changes and conflicts in using public spaces

Submitted version

URBACT Secretariat

5, rue Pleyel

93283 Saint-Denis Cedex

Tel: +33 (0)1 49 17 46 02

Fax: +33 (0)1 49 17 45 55

Email: a.bucella@urbact.eu

Table of contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| - I - (I) PROJECT IDENTITY | 1 |
| 1. (I.1) Project title, Lead partner and duration | 1 |
| 2. (I.2) Updated summarised description of project and issue addressed | 1 |
| 3. (I.3) Partnership | 1 |
| 4. (I.4) Project cost | 2 |
| - II - (II) SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT PHASE ACHIEVEMENTS | 3 |
| 1. (II.1) List of Activities implemented during Development Phase | 3 |
| 2. (II.2) Definition of the issues to be addressed by the project | 5 |
| 3. (II.3) Summary of partners' situations, expectations and potential contributions | 7 |
| 4. (II.4) Coherence of your partnership | 14 |
| 5. (II.5) EAP recommendations | 14 |
| - III - (III) WORK PACKAGE 1 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT | 16 |
| 1. (III.1) Lead partner management team | 16 |
| 2. (III.2) Activities to be implemented under work package 1 | 17 |
| 3. (III.3) Partners' Involvement in work package delivery | 18 |
| 4. (III.4) List of expected deliverables under work package 1 | 20 |
| - IV - (IV) WORK PACKAGE 2 – TRANSNATIONAL EXCHANGE AND LEARNING | 24 |
| 1. (IV.1) Organisation of the exchange and learning process | 24 |
| 2. (IV.2) Activities to be implemented under work package 2 | 26 |
| 3. (IV.3) Partners' Involvement in work package delivery | 29 |
| 4. (IV.4) List of expected deliverables under work package 2 | 31 |
| - V - (V) WORK PACKAGE 3 – IMPACT ON LOCAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES | 34 |
| 1. (V.1) General Framework of activities to be implemented under work package 3 | 34 |
| 2. (V.2) URBACT Local Support Groups at partner level | 36 |
| 3. (V.3) Participation in transnational activities at network level | 43 |
| 4. (V.4) Participation in national capacity-building scheme | 44 |
| 5. (V.5) List of expected deliverables under work package 3 | 46 |
| - VI - (VI) WORK PACKAGE 4 – COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION | 48 |
| 1. (VI.1) Communication Strategy | 48 |
| 2. (VI.2) Activities to be implemented under work package 4 | 49 |
| 3. (VI.3) Project webmastering | 51 |
| 4. (VI.4) Partners' Involvement in work package delivery | 52 |
| 5. (VI.5) List of expected deliverables under work package 4 | 54 |
| - VII - (VII) MANAGING AUTHORITIES OF OPERATIONAL PROGRAMMES | 57 |
| 1. (VII.1) Cooperation with Managing Authorities of Operational programmes (ERDF and ESF) | 57 |
| - VIII - (VIII) METHODOLOGY AND USE OF EXPERTISE | 60 |
| 1. (VIII.1) Use of the expertise resources allocated by the Programme | 60 |
| 2. (VIII.2) Use of the external expertise on the project budget | 60 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| - IX - (IX) PROJECT WORK PLAN | 63 |
| 1. (IX.1) Project work plan | 63 |
| - X - (X) PROJECT DELIVERABLES SUMMARY | 74 |
| 1. (X.1) Project deliverables summary | 74 |
| - XI - (XI) PROJECT FINANCE | 85 |
| 1. (XI.1) Project finance | 86 |
| 2. (XI.2) Legal basis for decision of funding | 86 |
| 3. (XI.3) Expenditure per year and main budget line | 89 |
| 4. (XI.4) Expenditure per year and source | 90 |
| 5. (XI.5) Project cost per budget line | 91 |
| 6. (XI.6) Expenditure breakdown per objective and main budget line | 93 |
| - XII - (XII) DECLARATION OF MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE | 95 |
| 1. (XII.1) Declaration of maximum amount of expenditure to be certified at the end of the Develo... | 95 |
| - XIII - (XIII) BANK INFORMATION | 96 |
| 1. (XIII.1) Bank information | 96 |
| - XIV - (XIV) DETAILED INFORMATION ON THE LEAD PARTNER AND PROJECT ... | 98 |
| 1. (XIV.1) Detailed information on the Lead partner and Project partners | 98 |
| - XV - (XV) SIGNATURE | 109 |
| 1. (XV.1) Signature of the Lead Partner / project coordinator and of the Elected representative | 109 |
| - XVI - (XVI) ANNEX 1 | 110 |
| 1. (XVI.1) ANNEX 1 – Eligibility criteria for final application for thematic networks | 110 |
| - XVII - (XVII) ANNEX 2 | 111 |
| 1. (XVII.1) ANNEX 2 - Realisation indicators | 111 |

- I - (I) PROJECT IDENTITY

1. (I.1) Project title, Lead partner and duration

Identification

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Acronym | USER Phase II |
| Program reference | TN Call 3 - Phase II |
| Unique number (for search) | 5550 |
| Title | Changes and conflicts in using public spaces |
| Lead Partner | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community (FRANCE) |

Length of project

| Start date | End date |
|------------|------------|
| 2013-02-01 | 2015-04-30 |

2. (I.2) Updated summarised description of project and issue addressed

To face the challenges of metropolisation and post-carbon society, cities work on the Sustainable City of tomorrow. It must be first a city serving the people, by being adapted to their changing ways of living. USER aims to link up urban regeneration and conditions for an effective sustainability by a multi-dimensional approach involving residents and users of the city. USER will focus on the role of public spaces to make a more (convivial, secure, friendly and efficient) liveable City.

3. (I.3) Partnership

| | Partner Institution | Type of institution | Convergence / Competitiveness | Country | Area |
|--------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|---------|-------------|
| Lead Partner | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | Local authority | Competitiveness Zone | FRANCE | Rhône-Alpes |
| | City of Malaga | Local authority | Convergence Zone | SPAIN | Andalucía |
| | City of Pescara | Local authority | Competitiveness Zone | ITALY | Abruzzo |
| | City of Lublin | Local authority | Convergence Zone | POLAND | Lubelskie |
| | City of Krakow | Local authority | Convergence Zone | POLAND | Malopolskie |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------|---------|
| | City of Dresden | Local authority | Convergence Zone | GERMANY | Dresden |
| | City of Copenhagen | Local authority | Competitiveness Zone | DENMARK | Danmark |
| | Lisbon Municipality | Local authority | Competitiveness Zone | PORTUGAL | Lisboa |
| | City of Riga | Local authority | Convergence Zone | LATVIA | Latvija |

4. (I.4) Project cost

| ERDF | | Swiss Fund | | Norway Fund | | Other Financing | Total budget |
|--------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| ERDF | Public total financemnt | Swiss Fund | Public total financemnt | Norway Fund | Public total financemnt | | |
| 541,877.00 € | 189,693.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 731,570.00 € |

- II - (II) SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT PHASE ACHIEVEMENTS

1. (II.1) List of Activities implemented during Development Phase

Many activities were implemented during Development Phase. If most of them were compulsory, we also want to highlight specificities concerning USER.

KICK OFF MEETING (Grenoble / 21-22 June 2012) :

- Participants : 5 initial Cities (Grenoble Alpes Metropole, Malaga, Barakaldo, Pescara and Lublin), Lead expert and URBACT Secretariate
- Objectives : to know each other better - to specify the focus of the project and the pilot Sites of partners Cities - to plan the FAF preparation.
- Results : better understanding of the project by partners - changes in the scope of Pilot Sites for several Cities - improvement on the focus.

ENLARGING PARTNERSHIP :

- Very complex issue mainly due to :
 - * the need to balance Competitiveness and Convergence Cities,
 - * impact of the economic crisis which made potential partners having difficulties to decide commitment on Territorial Cooperation.
- On the other hand, the current context of economic difficulties has shown a big interest for USER topic, especially concerning the need to control the costs of urban services and more generally to focus on efficiency.
- Setting up an application process for potential partners (Form with 6 questions of URBACT DoI and precisions on local focus) :
 - * 15 serious bids analysed and evaluated => pre-selection of 8 partners before the final choice of 5 cities,
 - * Decision to stop the partnership with Barakaldo after discussions (during Site Visit and later) because the thematic focus of USER which did not reach local objectives. Barakaldo was also in a situation to make a choice between 2 URBACT projects for local reasons. We agreed, with Barakaldo, to stop the partnership at the beginning of September (see annexed letter of Barakaldo).
- => Decision, at the end, to work with a partnership of 9 Cities, but with strong involvement to ensure the sustainability of their commitment beyond administrative process. The partnership is for us more coherent (focusing on a same issue : public space and role of users) but also enough diverse with 3 types of urban contexts.

SITE VISITS :

- Binomial Lead expert – Lead partner made together all 9 visits in order to ensure a high quality of mutual understanding. Initially, we planned to visit together only the new partners, but we decided to do it for all partners because Kick off Meeting showed the need of a closer exchange to ensure the coherence of their commitment.
- Objectives : to ensure that partners understand the frame and objectives of USER, to know local neighbourhood recognized as Pilote Site, to agree on the focus and to give strategic informations concerning administrative and financial issues. Drafting of a « Guideline for Site Visit and Partner Profile » (see annex brochure).
- organisation in 2 days with :

* Day 1 : listening and exchanging: meeting project team, decision makers (politicians if possible) and local stakeholders, visit of proposed Pilot site(s).

* Day 2 : working on the definition of partner profile, local involvement and definition of local project (project team, administrative and financial, ULSG, choice of the Pilot Site)

- Results : strong improvement of the understanding of USER by partners and better focus at local level (Pilot Sites & ULSG role) => Way to activate each partner to produce already a common network driving forces in prevision of the Final Conference in Malaga.

The binomial Lead partner & Expert is also very united after this phase which needed a very good coordination. Each one understands better its own role.

FINAL MEETING (Malaga/ 18-19 October) :

- Participants : 8 Cities (Krakow - not refunded - was unable to participate for financial reasons), Lead Expert, URBACT TPM expert and local stakeholders.

- Objectives : validation of Baseline Study, agreeing on budget, finalising the Work Programme, the deliverables and outputs.

- Results :

1. Agreement on the USER focus and approach,
2. Agreement on the USER procedure and implementation methodology,
3. Shared understanding of the partners local challenges concerning public spaces,
4. First discussion on project (presentations of Grenoble's experience and CSTB approach) and political discussion (between 3 politicians).

CHANGES IN THE THEMATIC FOCUS :

- We had to take into account criticism from EAP, TPM and URBACT Secretariate on the difficulties to understand the topic and the scope of USER.

- USER is a topic focused on methodological issues and keep this focus as cross cutting issue to "find new ways to conceive and manage the City by taking advantage of the practical knowledge of users".

- Meantime, we have worked to clarify the thematic focus by defining a scope on "changes and conflicts in the use of public spaces to improve them in a sustainable way". Because Public spaces are crucial places of expression of social mix and dysfunctions, the topic became very much mobilizing for partners.

- The reformulated topic is more concrete with 3 clear sub-themes shared by all partners. It is now more pragmatic, but keep the initial identity of the "role of users".

- The organisation of the Implementation phase is also clearer, with a better coordination between seminars and workshops.

1st ULSG MEETINGS FOR INITIAL PARTNERS:

- Grenoble (2nd of October) : presentation of the project and local issues linked with the project - Exchanges on issues at local level, political commitment and possible impacts - Choice of Pilot Sites with the will (due to multiplicity of local initiatives) to choose 2 Sites and to add some cross-cutting issues taking place elsewhere in the agglomeration.

- Malaga (4th of October) : Urbact local coordinator (Cristobal Gil) and URBACT project officer (Begoña Oliva) presented the project: theme - work programme and goals - social and economic state of the art of the neighbourhoods Trinidad-Perchel

- Information about the Final meeting.

- Pescara (24th of July) : presentation of USER goals and method in resence of L/LE (in escara for the Sire Visit this day) -

Presentation of the objectives of the LAP - Exchanges on issues at local level, political commitment and possible impacts - Links between the Fontanelle-Sambuceto Urban Regeneration Plan and the the USER Project - Visit of the chosen neighbourhood.

- Lublin :(23th of October) : presentation of the USER project and the ULSG part to take in it - Presentation of the pilote sites to be covered by the project - Presentation of some good practices in the revitalisation field in Lublin - Discussion on the problems to deal with in the Stare Miasto (Old City) and Śródmieście (Downtown) districts.

COMMUNICATION :

- Creation of USER Webpages on URBACT Website,
- Creation of USER Graphic charter & logo (see annex),
- Definition of the Communication strategy (see WP4).

FINALISATION OF FAF DOCUMENTS :

- Baseline Study - finalisation after discussion on contents with all partners during Malaga's meeting.
- Final Application Form with annexes to specify some complementary elements.

CHARTER OF COMMITMENT :

- Taking into account URBACT Secretariate advice, we have decided to use the "Joint Convention" as basis of the "USER Charter of Commitment".
- A draft is ready, adding requirements linked to local commitment like following the same approach, defining clearly who are Users, implementing a local experimentation by following a common agenda, ...
- The "Charter of Commitment" will be finalized at the beginning of the Implementation Phase and signed by all partners.

USER ULSG HANDBOOK :

- The ULSG Handbook is a tool to give clear path to partners to implement local work linked to transnational exchanges,
- URBACT has created a ULSG toolbox, which will be integrated into "USER ULSG Handbook"
- Partners will agree on the ULSG Handbook during the first seminar of Implementation Phase (March 2013).
- A draft is already ready, integrating path for experimentation, description of users, ... in accordance with the baseline Study.

2. (II.2) Definition of the issues to be addressed by the project

- The policy challenge addressed by USER is linked to the ability of Policy makers and urban managers to make the City of tomorrow a real sustainable city.
- USER will address this challenge through the issue of public space within the city. Public spaces are a very strategic question because it is place where people meet and exchange. In the city of tomorrow decision-makers will have to cope with the need to constantly adapt public spaces to changes and to prevent conflicts in using public spaces. This is the core of the USER project.
- This challenge will be developed around 3 sub-themes :
 - * more convivial and interactive social spaces to solve dysfunctions and conflicts of uses,
 - * safer public spaces in a friendlier city,
 - * cleaner and better maintained public spaces in a more efficient city.

- For us, the topic is linked to the involvement of stakeholders knowing by the practice and the daily use the way that the city is living : the "users".
 - The USER approach, on that side, is to define users as key-actors of this work. More than a citizen participation issue, USER deals with empowerment of local stakeholders within the frame of improving and managing public spaces in our cities.
 - USER wants, by creating a connexion between transnational exchanges and 9 local experimentations, to produce news findings validated by the practice.
- The Political approach :
 - Political involvement in the Project is one of the main key-elements which will ensure the success of USER. We have decided to involve concretely politician from the beginning of the project with a first discussion between 3 politicians (Grenoble, Malaga and Riga) during the Final Meeting of Development Phase (18th of October),
 - 5 main assumptions were discussed between politicians :
 - * The crisis has to be understood as an opportunity to adjust urban services to the real needs of the people,
 - * In the context of crisis, it is fundamental to pay attention to places where people mix and meet,
 - * Public space are a place where people are concretely citizens because they need to share the space with other citizens,
 - * Fitting public space with changing needs is a real challenge for cities because neighbourhood's residents are not the only ones who use it = need to adapt with the mix of uses,
 - * USER is for politicians an opportunity to introduce new stakeholders in the discussion and to listen more on what happens on the field.
 - The 3 URBACT cross cutting issues are totally part of the USER challenges:
 - How to manage urban development in the context of economic and financial crisis : the financial reality of European cities imposes to renew efficiency in order to maintain a high standard of urban services. The current context needs to design more efficient policies. Efficiency will be mainly linked to the ability to create flexibility to answer conflicts and adaptation to changes in the City.
 - How to foster integrated and sustainable approaches to urban development : Integrated and sustainable approaches needs firstly a wide involvement of stakeholders. Urban development is not anymore a topic privatised by planners, but a democratic issue on "How to live together in the City of tomorrow ?" On that point, public places are a crossroad of many dysfunctions of the City and many solutions.
 - How to develop efficient partnership and multilevel governance processes : The multilevel governance is more a concept than a reality today because each level is focused on its own powers. We need to find new ways to gather partnership and to find concrete solutions. USER will work on that.
 - Added value of USER network : giving new ways to address the issue of improving uses and solving dysfunctions of public spaces in a sustainable way. The "new ways" are related to the involvement of USERS in the process of conceiving and managing public space.
 - European Level interest linked with the EU 2020 Strategy :
 - One of the concerns of the European Union is to find ways for more efficiency in public policies at local level. The strengthening of partnership at local level is a way to reach this concern.
 - A second interest is linked with the goal of the European Union to develop Community-Led local Development (CLLD)

issues with Structural Funds. By the activation of users, USER network will show good practices to involve local stakeholders, considering their diversity, and to help them become key-actors of their local development.

- USER also wishes to give an added value for USER cities in order to help them showing to their Management Authority how the User approach helps to develop an integrated approach focusing on neighbourhood. This approach could be a tool for implementation of Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI) in ERDF Regional Operational Programmes 2014-2020.

3. (II.3) Summary of partners' situations, expectations and potential contributions

Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community

- Local situation regarding the topic : important driving force on urban neighbourhood management with 7 Urban Regeneration projects and development of common tool, the resource centre for neighbourhood management "House of Inhabitants" - Need to mobilize local stakeholders on common issues to improve cross-cutting approaches of urban regeneration and management - Important difficulties in several neighbourhoods in terms of public spaces uses and focusing on very specific territories.
- Main expectations vis-à-vis the network : discovering new methods and practices - ensuring future of the "House of Inhabitants" - Better dissemination of knowledge and know-how at local and regional level - more structured approach of urban regeneration processes
- Issue/ problem we want to address through the Local Action Plan : ensuring better dissemination - better integration of users within local processes of urban regeneration and urban management - Better methodological background for local decision-makers and stakeholders.
- Benefits from the network & added-value to bring to the network :
 - Grenoble will benefit of the good practices of partners and of a more structured approach which will be designed by the network. It will give a new dynamic to local stakeholders.
 - Grenoble will give to partners its own experience and good practices implemented for now more than 6 years on our territory.

City of Malaga

- Local situation regarding the topic: In the 80's, because of economic explosion of the country, certain areas of the city stopped being attractive for living, creating an important phenomenon of immigration to new suburbs located on the outside of the city. This process of depopulation was accelerated by the lack of investment by public authorities. From 1994, the Municipality started a restoration and rehabilitation process promoting social, economic and environmental cohesion of part of the historic centre. Nevertheless, target area alongside the historic city centre were excluded of the process. The neighbourhood presents population under high risk of social exclusion, small incomes, roman settlement, high rates of unemployment and education levels...
- Main expectations vis-à-vis the network:
 - Sharing expertise with other partners developing strategies of rehabilitation on deprived neighbourhoods;

- Exchanging experiences regarding inhabitant's involvement developed by other partners during rehabilitation processes;
 - Learning expertise of how to keep rehabilitation processes going Structural funds ending.
- Issue/ problem we want to address through the Local Action Plan:
 - Physical deterioration of urban environment: streets, squares, gardens, playgrounds, plots, facilities, ...
 - Promotion economic and social development in the area, managing urban environment as a productive element that creates jobs and wealth for neighbours.
 - Lack of permeability stopping transit both, inside neighbourhood and outside other parts of the city.
 - Conflict in the use of public spaces such as squares, streets and plots.
 - Marginal activities (part of residents) as drug sale, consumption, theft...
 - Establishment of open discussion with Regional Government (Junta Andalusia) regarding "uses" of plots that after local forced expropriation process were transferred to them to build public housing.
 - How we can benefit from the network and what they can bring to the network:

Malaga will benefit :

 - Setting up durable and strong dynamics of inhabitants empowering in rehabilitation process,
 - Systems to establish PPPs (Private-public partnerships),
 - Better qualification and training for civil servants, public workers and other staff working on the project,
 - Improvement of skills and abilities of politician, stakeholders, and policy makers, benefits from the involvement in an international project.

Malaga will give :

 - Experiences in developing Integrated rehabilitation processes,
 - Tools in process of inhabitants involvement: School of citizenship, Banks of time, Annual Assembly of URBAN Initiative (URBAN III),
 - Good practices in coordination European projects at local level.

City of Pescara

- Local situation regarding the topic:
 - Need to improve the reconnection by the system of infrastructures and public spaces,
 - Lack of private investments,
 - Need to respond to different needs of citizens and city's users,
 - Lack of harmonisation between neighborhoods.
- Main expectations vis-a-vis the network:
 - Improving results of urban regeneration
 - New way to design public spaces
 - Extend "Neighbourhood management" to all urban territories
 - develop collaborative tools to implement projects
 - Creation of frame and tools to increase efficiency and evaluate neighborhoods management.
- Issues / problems we want to address through the Local Action Plan:

- improving knowledge and skills of local practitioners,
- Evaluation and follow-up of neighbourhood management efficiency,
- shaping a frame / methods for the future,
- new dynamic for local stakeholder.

- How we can benefit from the network and what they can bring to the network:

Potential contribution:

- local good practices,
- background on urban regeneration

City of Lublin

- Local situation regarding the topic:

- 4 years of implementation of regeneration programme show the mismatch between regeneration goals (needs) and accessibility of funding for regeneration projects, especially projects depending on private initiatives.
- Progress of city development (new investments – regeneration of public buildings), new ideas on city management as a process linked with citizens participation

- Main expectation vis a vis the network:

- exchange of knowledge in scope of regeneration processes
- exchange of the best practices (to drain good ideas and to implement checked solutions) and the worst practises (to not commit the same mistake as others)
- buster the way of thinking about regeneration, and improve the maintenance of regeneration in Lublin
- develop cooperation skills through the trainings within the project

- Issues/problems:

- adjust activities of city life line to the ongoing changes (new development, economic changes)
- new investments and suburbanisation process cause significant changes in Lublin. The dynamics of investment makes it very hard to foresee evolutions on main areas of regeneration (the historical area of Lublin, city centre under the preservation requirements

- How they can benefit from the network and what they can bring to the network

Lublin will benefit:

- improvement of knowledge and skills of city politicians, managers, city officers and municipal services, enterprises managers in scope of regeneration,
- users participation in city management,
- revision of regeneration goals (after the 4 years of implementation of city regeneration plan),
- preparation of future regeneration projects

Lublin will bring:

1. review on city centre problems representative of Poland and Central Europe,
2. debate on urban management in a current stage of transition

City of Krakow

- Local situation regarding the topic:

The Azory housing estate, dominated by multi-family housing (over 30% of the area) constructed using large panel methods. The housing estate was designed in the 1960s, in accordance with the contemporary standards, as a typical urban “sleeping district”. As a consequence, as an expression of the functionalism popular at the time, it is mono-functional, homogeneous, lack of zoning, hard linear composition, lack of taking care of architectural and urban details.

- Main expectations vis-à-vis the network

- exchanging experiences with other partners developing strategies of rehabilitation on deprived neighbourhoods;
- exchanging experiences regarding inhabitant’s involvement developed by other partners during rehabilitation processes;

- Issue / problem they want to address through the Local Action Plan:

- preparation of the Local Regeneration Plan, as the basic strategic document, supporting the Local Regeneration Forum and a tool for planning, realization and monitoring of the physical and social-economic space of the housing estate. It will include in particular the target urban vision/concept of ordering the public spaces based on the detailed analysis of possibilities, costs and benefits.
- preparation and adoption of the local spatial zoning plan – the basic spatial management instrument as an act of local law.
- creation of a common information platform as an instrument of integration for managing the housing estate and shaping citizen's community.
- identification and elimination of basic conflicts, in particular ordering and regulating the legal status of the common spaces and introducing legal-economic instruments that enable efficient administration

- How they can benefit from the network and what they can bring to the network

Krakow will benefit:

- of the good practices of partners and instructions and advices which will be designed by the network.
- Setting up durable and strong dynamics of inhabitants empowering in rehabilitation process,
- Better qualification and training for civil servants, public workers and other staff working on the project,
- Improvement of skills and abilities of politician, stakeholders, and policy makers, benefited by the involvement in a multilingual and international project .

Krakow will give :

- Krakow will give to partners its own experience and good practices implemented for now more than 10 years on our territory
- Experiences in developing Integrated rehabilitation processes,
- Good practices in coordination European projects at local level

City of Dresden

- Local situation regarding the topic :

- Area at the western fringe of the city centre which has not undergone comprehensive regeneration since 1990, and which is foreseen to meet considerable re-densification in the next years due to population increase in the overall agglomeration and a promising location.
- Loss of unbuilt space will have to be counterbalanced by improving design and interlinking of public spaces.

- Specific demographic figures will have to be taken into account, as residential blocks with predominantly elderly people, new-built town-houses inhabited by newcoming gentrifiers, old-established population largely depending on welfare benefits elsewhere.
 - Physical specificities: 2 subareas separated by a “railway barrier” and not well-accepted design as well as contested projects.
 - Many people activated in social and cultural associations endeavoring for being included in urban planning issues, designing spaces differently with respect to users’ s needs as bottom-up place-making, urban gardening, robust and uncostly features etc.
 - Various environmental problems.
 - Future maintenance of public space is at stake.
- Main expectations vis-à-vis the network:
 - It is an open-end process. Partners engaged in the LSG do not have to commit themselves to adopt each others views, but to figure out to what extent they can harmonize their views for the benefit of the neighbourhood.
- Issue/ problem we want to address through the Local Action Plan:
 - Analyze current regeneration plan for his area, which focuses on the upgrading of public space: are the municipal plans appropriate and sustainable? Are there alternative or additional proposals originating from stakeholders and users?
- How can we benefit from the network and what can we bring to the network:
 - A major aim is to improve the municipality’s and the stakeholders’ and users’ capacity to development common ideas and proposals. A better mutual understanding and cooperation shall help minimize conflicts and make urban regeneration more efficient.

City of Copenhagen

- Local situation regarding the topic:
 - Sundholm is situated in a deprived area of Copenhagen, and is a part of an integrated urban renewal project; “Sundholmskvarterets Omraadeloeft”. Sundholm is a complex of buildings and functions that all share the same public space, but among themselves have very different purposes. -- Historically Sundholm has been a sanctuary for disadvantaged people. And today many of the enterprises and institutions present in the area still focuses on disadvantaged groups. The area on the other hand also represent artistic and recreational institutions and functions such an art gallery and a climbing club. Three child care centres, the local political council and a new housing complex are all present or planned in the area. In total Sundholm consists of more than 25 different actors.
 - The urban development in the area will demand cooperation and good planning of urban space to assure the ability in the area to adapt to new needs of sharing space among groups that are not necessarily coherent.
 - The identified users in the area are: A variety of social institutions and their clients, a large group of homeless people, new neighbours coming from outside and local residents from neighbouring dwellings. New residents and socioeconomic businesses is under way, and the area is also a target for visitors and urban tourists. In the community garden, volunteers are working together with homeless people, children from nearby schools and kindergarten and new socio economic enterprises like “Copenhagen City Bee”.
- Main expectations vis a vis the network:
 - Copenhagen is looking forward to be inspired by best practice in Europe, and with the supplement of high level academic

support get the latest findings from the scientific world tailored for our specific needs.

- Copenhagen believe that an exchange of ideas and experience will raise not only our own level, but also give Europe an advantage point in realising its urban potentials.

- Issues or problems we want to address through the Local Action Plan:

- Copenhagen has a long tradition for good quality physical urban planning and urban furniture. We now wants to integrate the organization of urban life in our planning procedures. Our goal is to find a way to organize users of urban spaces in partnership with the municipality. The task for this partnership will address themes like:

- * Conflicts between very different type of users (e.g. Homeless vs mothers with babies, noisy young vs tranquilly adults)

- * Better co-ordination among municipality bodies that exists in the area

- * Integrate volunteers in the maintenance and further development of the urban spaces.

These points will be the main task for the LAP which will be developed in very close connection to other development plans and policies regarding the area or the topics.

- How can we benefit from the network and what can we bring to the network?

- We expect to develop a model for local management of urban spaces, based on partnerships between municipality bodies, local stakeholders, NGOs and citizens that can be duplicated in the City of Copenhagen and inspire other cities working on the same agenda.

- We want to make a local action plan that supplements the traditional physical planning with a social and cultural perspective.

- Through the European dialogue we can enhance the quality and ensure a high level approach of ours and our partners work.

Lisbon Municipality

- Local situation regarding the topic :

- Horizonte and Nascimento Costa neighbourhoods have, bad housing conditions, ownership legal issues and are deprived of public space, proximity infrastructures and equipments.

- It's a disconnected territory with social/economic needs and deficiencies.

- The big gap between the real day to day users needs/problems and public response materialise the lack of integrated policies/programming real implementation thru the past 40 years.

- It's a excluded area from the city.

- Main expectations vi-à-vis the network :

- Exchange of practical field experimentations, and with this promote common bases and knowledge

- The development and sharing of the Local Action Plan under USER will allow to reflect and to obtain results on how the build of a public space contributes to the promotion of social cohesion, especially in territories which present very peculiar urban and socio-economic characteristics.

- Issue/problem they want to address through the Local Action plan

- the social and urban fracture between this area and the rest of the city, blocks the social cohesion and bring a cycle of social exclusion.

- Distance between the local “users” and the urban planning decisions makers

- Gap between day to day needs/problems and municipality response
 - Lack of social analysis when addressing urban design
 - Lack of integrated policies/programming/implementation
 - Lack of field real changes
- How they can benefit from the network and what they can bring to the networks
 - The local users diagnosis will help to focus on the real issues, problems and conflicts, and center/prioritise the response.
 - Local partners activation and capacitation will allow the engagement and self response of community own problems.
 - Will bring strong commitment to the proposals/solutions from all partners and local co-responsibility. This will bring more efficiency use to the resources, field projects implementation and coordination, management responsibility and accountability.

City of Riga

- local situation regarding the topic :
 - Existing conflicts of uses among various kind of traffic flows (private, commercial, administrative, emergency services, public transport, tourist coaches, bicycle and rickshaw flows, pedestrian movements) and their impact on public space.
 - Impact of noise and other disturbing factors on all users of urban public space in the Old Town.
 - Impact of divided ownership of land and buildings to the urban public space development issues.
 - Lack of qualitative public consultation actively involving all interested parties. Harmonization of interests by public and private parties, business and social needs.
 - Due to budget and time restrictions lack of high quality investigations before decision making procedure.
 - Insufficient linkage between planning process and budget allocation.
 - No implementation programmes are elaborated and approved to initiate and manage public space and related projects which can positively influence the better use and deminish existing conflicts.
 - Unclear division of responsibilities and insufficient authority of municipal institutions to ensure good management and implementation of urban design projects.
 - There is a lack of resources to maintain well public spaces – as well as lack of co-ordination and efficient management.
 - Riga repeats the mistakes of many West European and North American cities in the past, where insufficient management of commercialization and unlimited overwork has degraded the quality of the historical centre and its human nature.
- main expectations vis-à-vis the network :
 - To achieve better designed, managed and maintained urban public spaces in our city – inviting, accessible for all groups of users, secure and safe for everybody. To improve the overall quality of urban neighbourhoods – improve the quality of overall urban space up-grade, daily and long-term maintenance.
- Issue/ problem they want to address through the Local Action Plan
 - Drawing solutions for improvement of urban space in HCR introducing better – more efficient and flexible – public spaces management.
 - For instance, an implementation programme of Local Action Plan should be elaborated with involvement of local stake holders, incorporated public and other stake holders' responsibilities. LAP will be used in future for applying for finances from other EU cofinanced funds to implement planned actions and projects.

- To improve land-use zoning regulations.

- how they can benefit from the network and what they can bring to the network

Discovering and showing similar challenges and possibilities of tackling them in other cities would raise awareness of local stakeholders and could strengthen political support for further development of citizens' involvement in preparing of decisions about development and improvement of sustainable uses of public space and business activities which have impact on quality of it as well as on living and business environment.

4. (II.4) Coherence of your partnership

When Grenoble Alpes Metropole decided to propose a project on URBACT linked to urban regeneration and management, we decided to define few elements of City profiles we wanted to recruit:

- strongly involved in urban regeneration strategies,
- able to propose a pilot site for experimentation (physical neighbourhood with defined public spaces to improve),
- very good administrative and technical capacities to be able to reach URBACT requirements (which are huge) over the duration of the project,
- diversity in terms of geographical situation (North - South / East - West),
- coherence in terms of size (from 250 000 to 600 000 inhabitants).

These requirements drove us to be very selective and to reject bids from cities which were not on the scope. The success of the partnership will be mainly due to the Commitment of the partners and the ability to show them previously how USER will help them to boost their local challenges.

=> At the end, selected cities are all in the target (except Pescara on population, but with a strong technical capacity).

Our focus needed to ensure that all Cities were able to organise learning and exchanges on the basis of a current experimentation which could be comparable. We asked them to choose urban regeneration issues they wish to tackle during the next 2 years (2013-14), located on a physical neighbourhood and with a specific focus on 1 or 2 location(s) / thematic(s) where "public Space" could show concrete results.

=> USER will not be the core of each urban regeneration project, but an added value to improve its conception / implementation.

Meeting organised during Development Phase (Site visits & Seminars) help to agree on a more precise focus shared by everybody on Pilot Sites connected with local challenges allowing an experimentation and being able to boost local policies. We have also discussed with Cities to ensure their commitment to implement a common methodological frame and calendar to learn and produce knowledge together. Discussions led all Cities to accept to propose an experimentation during the 2 next years and to share the results.

5. (II.5) EAP recommendations

The EAP gave several recommendations. The main ones to take in consideration are the following :

Crit 1- Relevance of proposal and European value added : "the partners should seriously work in finding a more specific focus to the project which is totally shared by all partners".

- Decision to precise the focus around the concept of "conflicts and changes on public spaces" which make more concrete the topic and gives operational objectives to partners. The sub-themes (friendly, safety and efficiency) give now a clear direction for exchanges and a stronger coherence of partnership.
- Decision to deepen the local situation of partners to ensure they share the topic and they already understand the challenges they will have to tackle at local level.

Crit 2- Coherence of proposal : "high level of participation and commitment is expected of all partners and other participants working in the ULSG".

- Decisions to propose to partners to develop, within the frame of the project, a local experimentation fed by methodological tools to partners (CSTB involvement as external expertise and "USER methodological handbook" will be part of it - see WP2 & VIII.2 on FAF).
- During site visits, LP and LE have worked to ensure with each partner the focus to analyse local conditions of involvement to produce knowledge on transnational exchange.
- USER will give them local support to implement concretely a project (workshops, toolbox) to improve practices and strengthen their commitment.

Crit 3 - Quality of expected results : "The expected impact of the project on the policies and future actions of the partners is shown to a certain degree; more elaboration would have been an asset / local stakeholders, are key players in the action and are expected to participate actively and with considerable commitment / The lead partner and other external expertise will spend considerable time and effort in guiding the work of the ULSG".

- Connection with a local experimentation is a way to ensure the commitment of partners. They will have opportunity to apply knowledge / to share learnings during the network duration,
- Involvement of CSTB is an answer to ensure the capacity to guide the work of partners at local level and to produce knowledge able to be disseminate at European level.
- Each partner will also work with local stakeholders in capacity to disseminate knowledge at local level (universities, networks of professionnals, ...).

Concluding remarks : "the partners should seriously work during the development phase to guarantee that all local experiences are explained to become transferable to other cities (within and outside the network)".

- By focusing on Public Space, the topic is more understandable by cities. It is a way to ensure transferability. Meantime, diversity of partner's situations is a way to ensure that the USER approach would be transferable in different contexts.
- Strong empowerment of partners on their duty to contribute to exchanges from their local practices.
- Strong thematic focus on concrete and mutualised objects allow exchange watever the urban context and the cultural background of partners.

In conclusion, our approach has been modify by EAP recommendations in the way that it helps us to precise the focus and to ensure the capacity of Cities involved in USER to commit on objectives of the project and ways to reach them.

- III - (III) WORK PACKAGE 1 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1. (III.1) Lead partner management team

EXPERIENCE OF GRENOBLE ALPES METROPOLE IN TRANSNATIONAL EXCHANGES :

Grenoble Alpes Metropole has been involved as partner in several URBACT networks during the first generation of URBACT programmes (2004-2006) :

- PARTECIPANDO on citizen participation,
- ECO-FI-NET on tools for economic development in deprived neighbourhoods.

Grenoble Alpes Metropole is currently participating in 2 ULSGs led by Municipalities located in the metropolitan area and member of Grenoble Alpes Metropole :

- CASH network on energy efficiency in social housing led by the City of Echirolles,
- Urban N.O.S.E on social economy led by the City of Grenoble.

Grenoble Alpes Metropole is a current member of a new Alpine Space project called RURBANCE focused on urban-rural functional relationships in the alpine metropolis context.

Grenoble Alpes Metropole was also partner of 2 European cooperation projects:

- Concerto 2005-2010 on energy efficiency,
- IEE - Presto project 2010-2012 on bicycle development in the Cities as a soft transport mode.

Apart from cooperation programmes, Grenoble Alpes Metropole is takes actively part in Eurocities' network :

- vice-charing "mobility forum" from 2006 to 2010,
- participating in "Social affairs Forum - SAF"
- organising SAF meeting (May 2011 - 80 participants) on social innovation.

Following these experiences, we consider to be able to lead a European Network as a next step in our European involvement.

EXPERIENCE OF USER LEAD PARTNER PROJECT STAFF :

For the transnational coordination & management of the USER Network, Grenoble Alpes Metropole proposes a team of three operating staff members (declaring staff costs) :

- Claire PREDAL, in charge of the overall project coordination : recruited specifically to manage USER, she is experienced in coordinating and managing, as partner, an URBACT Project (CASH for Rhône-Alpes Region). She has also managed for the Rhône-Alpes Region the Urban Integrated Approach of Structural Funds (ERDF - ESF) in 2007-2013. She speaks/writes English.
- Elodie CASTELLO, in charge of the administrative & financial coordination : experience in managing structural funds (URBAN 2001-06 as managing authority, structural funds in 2007-13 as lead partner of an integrated urban project) and managing, as a partner, a European exchange project of Intelligent Energy Europe (2010-2012). She speaks/writes English and Spanish.
- Valérie GUERIN, in charge of communication : communication officer at Grenoble Alpes Metropole in charge of several

Communication Projects. She has a background of international work by an experience in Canada. She speaks/writes English.

Also, Eruic RUIZ, as head of the "Territorial and Social cohesion department (which hosts the USER project within the Grenoble Alpes Metropole organisational chart) will supervise the project - both in its transnational & local dimension. He is an expert on urban and social territorial cohesion and has a long experience working as architect / urbanist in Brasil & Mayotte Island. He speaks/write English, Spanish and Portuguese (not declaring staff costs).

2. (III.2) Activities to be implemented under work package 1

1. SETTING GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK WITH THE URBACT SECRETARIATE :

* Establish a complete formal framework with the URBACT secretariat for implementation phase :

Official documents are to be produced at the beginning of implementation phase :

- a new subsidy contract specific to phase 2 ;
- the joint convention defining the legal, moral and budgetary agreements between the lead partner and the partners. The standard model will be adapted by the lead partner as the 'Charter of Commitment' of the USER project ;
- a new expertise request form to state the expectations of partners regarding expert participation to the network at implementation phase ;
- Letters of approval of first level controllers for the new partner cities having a decentralized national system (initial partners already in phase 1 : only in case of change).
- Audit trail documents for the new partners (initial partners already in phase 1 : only in case of change).

2. ORGANIZING MANAGEMENT & COORDINATION WITH PARTNERS :

* Hold regular meetings to ensure continual coordination between partners concerning project administrative & financial management : Management work sessions will punctuate the 27 months life cycle of the USER project as it is being rolled-out according to WP2. The transnational meetings used for this purpose will be : seminar 1 (Copenhagen) , seminar 3 (Lisbon) , seminar 4 (Krakow) , seminar 6 (Grenoble). Each time, the lead partner will remind requirements as to partner expenditures, trace back the already achieved administrative milestones, announce the next ones (mainly the 6 monthly progress reports) with a 'to do list' on a precise timeline. It will also be the opportunity to assess the quality of partner administrative coordination and to propose improvements if judged necessary. These sessions cannot officially deal with particular situations of such or such a partner, which shall always be dealt with separately (during the venue and/or before and/or after).

* Make available facilitating tools to smoothen project management with partners : a dedicated USER project LP e-mail address , management file-sharing platform.

3. IMPLEMENTING ADMINISTRATIVE & FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS :

* 'Teach' or remind partners of the main eligibility rules and administrative procedures to be respected in connection with local project spending.

* Distant follow-up of administrative & financial work : reminder of rules, of necessity to use Presage CTE to enter expenditures and to have them certified by local FLC. A timeline will be set ahead for every reporting period.

* Manage the 6 monthly reporting and the final reporting, both from a content and a financial point of view : between meetings, the lead partner has to collect the content to be compiled within the progress reports and final report due for the Secretariat. The lead partner will keep records of all the input received by partners to this end (use of management file-sharing platform).

Prior successful management organisation (regular meetings & efficient distant coordination) with respect to partners is crucial for an overall project-scale delivery !

* Financial treatment of costs and ERDF redistribution :

Choice of a decentralized management system : the lead partner takes on its local costs (as partner) + the majority share of transnational costs. Each partner spends and certifies its own costs, which include local costs + an agreed share of 'localized' transnational costs (mainly by hosting a seminar meeting; or only payed by the lead partner - as each partner spends and certifies their local costs). Anyhow, the lead partner remains responsible and should guarantee compliance with EU and structural funds eligibility and accountability rules.

The lead partner will receive 100% of the ERDF and is responsible for transferring the correct amount of ERDF to project partners.

Observation regarding the Management of the expertise resources :

Separate budgets support expert resources ; however the lead partner is responsible for guiding, checking and keeping track of expert work to ensure due payment by the secretariat.

3. (III.3) Partners' Involvement in work package delivery

Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community

Grenoble Alpes Metropole, as lead Partner :

The USER team (ensuring the general coordination of the project, its administrative & financial management as well as the transnational communication & dissemination) will dedicate the time necessary to meet requirements. The project operating manager (Claire PREDAL) will work full-time, while the other 2 members (Elodie CASTELLO & Valérie GUERIN) will adapt time spent on USER according to phases coming up in the work programme and to reporting periods for URBACT.

This involvement is also under the form of providing the following coordination & management facilitating tools :

- a management file sharing platform : to centralize main URBACT documents & main formalized productions of the projects, including communication material : for consultation and downloading purposes ; the place for partners to put their material to feed progress reports.
- a dedicated USER e-mail address to be used by partners : to 'isolate' USER project exchanges between LP and its partners from any other business.

City of Malaga

As seen in the final meeting of development phase with all present partners (initial + new ones - except Krakow) :

The project partner City of Malaga commits to answering to general and/or individualized requests from the LP so as to contribute to the needed input for project compiling purposes.

To this end, the partner commits to assigning a project coordinator (assisted or not on specific dimensions - especially financial) in order to meet these needs for the smooth management of the project.

City of Pescara

As seen in the final meeting of development phase with all present partners (initial + new ones - except Krakow) :

The project partner City of Pescara commits to answering in due time to general and/or individualized requests from the LP so as to contribute to the needed input for project compiling purposes.

To this end, the partner commits to assigning a project coordinator (assisted or not on specific dimensions - especially financial) in order to meet these needs for the smooth management of the project.

City of Lublin

As seen in the final meeting of development phase with all present partners (initial + new ones - except Krakow) :

The project partner City of Lublin commits to answering in due time to general and/or individualized requests from the LP so as to contribute to the needed input for project compiling purposes.

To this end, the partner commits to assigning a project coordinator (assisted or not on specific dimensions - especially financial) in order to meet these needs for the smooth management of the project.

City of Krakow

As discussed during preparatory contacts with the new partner, the city of Krakow :

The project partner City of Lublin commits to answering in due time to general and/or individualized requests from the LP so as to contribute to the needed input for project compiling purposes.

To this end, the partner commits to assigning a project coordinator (assisted or not on specific dimensions - especially

financial) in order to meet these needs for the smooth management of the project.

City of Dresden

As seen in the final meeting of development phase with all present partners (initial + new ones - except Krakow) :

The project partner City of Dresden commits to answering in due time to general and/or individualized requests from the LP so as to contribute to the needed input for project compiling purposes.

To this end, the partner commits to assigning a project coordinator (assisted or not on specific dimensions - especially financial) in order to meet these needs for the smooth management of the project.

City of Copenhagen

As seen in the final meeting of development phase with all present partners (initial + new ones - except Krakow) :

The project partner City of Copenhagen commits to answering in due time to general and/or individualized requests from the LP so as to contribute to the needed input for project compiling purposes.

To this end, the partner commits to assigning a project coordinator (assisted or not on specific dimensions - especially financial) in order to meet these needs for the smooth management of the project.

Lisbon Municipality

As seen in the final meeting of development phase with all present partners (initial + new ones - except Krakow) :

The project partner City of Lisbon commits to answering in due time to general and/or individualized requests from the LP so as to contribute to the needed input for project compiling purposes.

To this end, the partner commits to assigning a project coordinator (assisted or not on specific dimensions - especially financial) in order to meet these needs for the smooth management of the project.

City of Riga

As seen in the final meeting of development phase with all present partners (initial + new ones - except Krakow) :

The project partner City of Riga commits to answering in due time to general and/or individualized requests from the LP so as to contribute to the needed input for project compiling purposes.

To this end, the partner commits to assigning a project coordinator (assisted or not on specific dimensions - especially financial) in order to meet these needs for the smooth management of the project.

4. (III.4) List of expected deliverables under work package 1

| | Product | Quantity | Delivery date |
|----|---|----------|----------------------------|
| 1 | subsidy contract | 1 | March 2013 |
| 2 | joint convention / USER Charter of commitment | 1 | March 2013 |
| 3 | Letters of approval of First Level Controllers | 1 | March 2013 |
| 4 | 1st progress report | 1 | August 2013 |
| 5 | 2nd progress report | 1 | March 2014 |
| 6 | 3rd progress report | 1 | April 2014 |
| 7 | 4th progress report | 1 | october 2014 |
| 8 | Final report | 1 | April 2015 |
| 9 | 1st certificate & statement of expenditure | 1 | August 2013 |
| 10 | 2nd certificate & statement of expenditure | 1 | March 2014 |
| 11 | 3rd certificate & statement of expenditure | 1 | April 2014 |
| 12 | 4th certificate & statement of expenditure | 1 | october 2014 |
| 13 | Final certificate & statement of expenditure | 1 | April 2015 |
| 14 | Audit trail documents | 1 | March 2013 |
| 15 | Management File-sharing platform | 1 | February 2013 |
| 16 | USER management LP e-mail account | 1 | February 2013 |
| 17 | Cities certificates & statements of expenditure | 45 | for every reporting period |
| 18 | management sessions | 4 | during 4 of the 6 seminars |

Describe each deliverable listed in the table above

Subsidy contract :

it is the contractual document which links the Lead Partner to the Urbact programme. It gives the LP the overall responsibility of the project.

Joint convention / USER Charter of commitment :

it is the contractual document which links the Lead Partner to the other partners of the project. It states the commitments and requirements of all partners vis a vis the project. An annex per partner with each city budget will be signed by each partner. The LP adapts this document as the Charter of Commitment to highlight USER-specific expectations. Any specific commitment taken by a partner as regards the transnational dimension of the project will be specified in the annexe (for eg hosting a seminar or leading a workshop group).

Letters of approval of first level controllers :

FLC are compulsory to carry-out expenditure control of every partner (mainly coherent with the project, budget, eligibility and national rules). For partners from Member States which have not pre-assigned a first level controller (decentralized system), the partner needs to propose a First Level Controller of its choice by filling in a checklist (to test the profile), which it sends to a national approbation body. If the person suits requirements, the national approbation body establishes a letter of approval which is directly sent to the URBACT Secretariate.

Audit trail documents :

It is a sheet that each partner must fill and which contains answers to a series of standard questions regarding project administrative and financial framework and organisation ; it is intended to check the general soundness of the features of project management adopted at city level and also to facilitate potential controls.

New partners from phase 2 will have to provide their audit trail document in time for transmittal by LP to the Urbact Secretariate before the end of March 2013. The initial partners of phase 1 already provided an audit trail document which is sufficient, unless changes make a new audit trail document necessary.

Progress reports :

Every 6 months, the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) a progress report to explain and show where the project stands in terms of work plan accomplishments and of production of corresponding deliverables.

Final report :

It is the report which will complete reporting at the end of the project and recompile + synthesize the material from previous progress reports in order to give an overall information on effective project accomplishments throughout implementation phase.

Certificates and statements of expenditure :

- From all 9 cities : all their local expenditures are to be entered & certified into Presage CTE with a view to the general financial reporting by LP.
- General : Every 6 months, together with the progress report , the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) the certificate and statement of expenditure which is the 'financial translation' of activities carried out over the given period. It is a compilation of expenditures from all cities (spent and controlled at local level). This is a component - with the progress report - of the payment claim to claim ERDF.

Final certificate and statement of expenditure :

Same as the 6 monthly certificates, only it is to ask for the last ERDF funds of the project (and maybe also allows to summarize all the project expenditures from the beginning).

Management File-sharing platform :

A management file sharing platform : to centralize main URBACT documents & formalized productions of the projects, including communication material : for consultation and downloading purposes ; the place for partners to put their material to feed progress reports.

USER management LP e-mail account :

To 'isolate' USER project exchanges between LP and its partners from any other business. Will facilitate exchanges between an increased number of partners in implementation phase, generating many messages.

Management sessions :

During seminars 1,3,4 and 6 : an item on the seminar agenda will be specifically dedicated to administrative and financial issues of the project, always with a powerpoint presentation.

- IV - (IV) WORK PACKAGE 2 – TRANSNATIONAL EXCHANGE AND LEARNING

1. (IV.1) Organisation of the exchange and learning process

1 - STARTING SITUATION AFTER DEVELOPMENT PHASE.

- At the end of Development Phase, the work has already begun through the Site Visits, the writing of Baseline study and FAF and exchanges during Final Meeting in Malaga. The Development Phase was an opportunity to share and agree on the process with all partners.
- The way to understand and to address the 3 core dimensions (more user-friendly, interactive public spaces solving dysfunctions and conflicts of uses / Safer public spaces in a friendlier city / Cleaner, better maintained and upgraded public spaces in a more efficient city) are quite different among European member states due to governance issues (institutional organization, powers and competences of cities and other public sector institutions are diverse), legal frameworks, ways to deliver urban services, ways to involve inhabitants and how neighbourhoods are defined (conceptual definition, scale of projects, ...) but all cities have to tackle with the same kind of issues.
- USER wants to experiment how this challenge can be faced and how local stakeholders and local authorities can carry out pilot actions in this field and test new and innovative solutions.
- The development phase has allowed to check that all Cities will be able to be committed despite different policies and backgrounds. For these reasons, it is appropriate to frame the process through a shared vision of goals and methods among all partners. The clarification of the understanding and commitment is the starting point of the network.
- Producing collective knowledge is also a key issue for urban policies. Often, networks of cities who share a common space during a short period of time are not able to really produce collective knowledge. USER wants to make effective the exchange process to become a learning and production process creating new knowledge.

2. LINKING TRANSNATIONAL & LOCAL WORK

- USER wants to address the topic by developing a process at 2 levels : transnational and local which will feed each other constantly. For that reason, Cities will develop during the period an experimentation on several Pilot Sites.
- A process in 3 steps is designed to involve actively cities: the first one must achieve a common knowledge and a shared conceptual framework of the topic to give cities tools for implementing their LAP. In a second step, production of concrete exchanges, learning processes, experimentations and capitalization of good practices will be organized through decentralized workshops. At the end, a last step will ensure and communicate results of the work to target audience, from local to European level.

3. ORGANISATION OF THE WORKSHOP STEP :

Cities will be grouped by 3. Currently, the proposal is :

- Group 1 : Krakow, Lisbon and Grenoble - deprived areas with modern architecture and situated in peripheral location. Issues linked to occupation of public spaces within the neighbourhood.
- Group 2 : Dresden, Copenhagen and Pescara - issues on integration of sub-central neighbourhoods with internal dysfunctions related to a lack of connexion with surrounding neighbourhoods.
- Group 3 : Riga, Malaga and Lublin - issues of central neighbourhoods (often heritage listed) where conflicts of occupation occurred with different kinds of uses and challenge to maintain residents within the area.

Workshops will propose to deepen analysis between small group of Cities, with capacity for them to decide to deepen a specific question if needed.

4 - CAPITALIZATION AND PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE.

- USER is focused not only on learning, exchanging and analyzing the current practices. It wants to generate conceptual and practical knowledge as a fruit of experimentation by considering itself as a pilot research-action project.

- Rethinking the conceptual framework of urban planning regarding public spaces (ways that cities are conceived, need to create new and virtuous interactions between urban conception and urban management and need of anticipating urban changes) will have to take into account the strategies, projects and reflections of the partner cities. The project (through a process of analysis, systematization and capitalization) aims to validate the previous assumptions through the diversity of existing practices and pilot actions (involving a variety of actors through a practical and interactive experience).

- Likewise USER is going to take advantage of outside knowledge and good practices, to integrate them as inputs for the production of new knowledge regarding public spaces issues:

* the pertinence of the assumption tested through the experimentation process will allow USER to propose new strategies to conceive and manage public spaces in a renewed way.

* in parallel, comparison and local experimentation activities, under the lead expert coordination and with the collaboration of different expertises (including CSTB) will perform a systematic and continuous process of capitalization.

- Capitalization will produce conceptual and methodological knowledge which will be the main findings to disseminate within the URBACT community. It will produce also a grid of analysis to choose USER best practices to be presented to the URBACT community.

- Creating and carrying out the systematization and capitalization process. A methodological framework will be created to ensure progress in the production of new knowledge as a result of the network exchanges and learning process. It includes mainly: collecting information and documentation, synthesis of contributions, debates and discussions during seminars and workshops and the set up of a group of experts that is going to play the role of a laboratory, a sort of “research & development” (R+D) department of the network. This laboratory will generate drafts and discussion papers during the network life that are going to feed the final conceptual document “Conceiving and managing the city otherwise”. The lead expert is going to coordinate this systematization and capitalization process with the support of the lead partner.

5 - TOOLS FOR THE NETWORK :

The process in 3 steps (learning - experimenting - consolidating) is a good way to ensure meantime production of knowledge and dissemination at local level if it is linked with a strong methodological frame.

* CONCERNING LEARNING & CAPITALIZATION PROCESSES.

Five issues are going to be driven to facilitate and to carry out this process of effective learning:

a) creating a previous framework of ideas, perspectives, issues and common challenges that should bring coherence to the exchange process = Baseline Study + 3 thematic seminars,

b) encouraging cities at an early stage, to be participative, critical, bold and innovative in the way they participate = Input in FAF + 3 thematic seminars,

c) clarifying the methodological procedure of exchanging, clarifying and simplifying the tools to be used = adaptation of "URBACT toolbox" + USER Web Platform = "USER methodological Toolbox" (see below),

d) making strong connections between network level (thematic seminars, exchanges....) and local level = Workshop process,

e) reinforcing LAPs role in the learning process and in the knowledge building = role of ULSG and local experimentations.

=> This method aims to reinforce a common knowledge & a common conceptual frame as a basis for producing and making ideas emerge from the cities. It allows to sharing in deep analysis and proposals during WS (with "peer review" an "perception reports" as tools to link LAP with transnational exchanges).

*FOR A COLLABORATIVE WORK BETWEEN PARTNERS - Beyond this process, we will built collaborative tools under the label of "USER Methodological Toolbox":

- Creation of an open source "Web Plateform" (tools 2.0 with the lead expert playing the role of "community developer") to ensure consolidation, capitalization and dissemination of exchanges developed during seminars and workshops to encourage city partners to discuss and disseminate their local approaches,
- The "Methodological ToolBox" will integrate concrete methods coming from partners experience (bottom-up approach) & proposals from LE/CSTB (top-down approach to evaluate through practices),
- The platform will be a common space of USER to share in between the foreseen seminars and workshops and be a place to introduce documents, photos and other information provided by the cities,
- Involvement of CSTB (French Public Research center, Dpt of urban sociology with a strong experience on neighbourhood management) as external expertise to design and develop USER toolbox. The CSTB will help partners to analyse their local experimentation and be able to capitalise and to feed the network (and beyond). The CSTB ensure scientific commitment on deliverables.
- The Platform will be an open door of USER to other institutions, cities, other Urbact II Networks, etc.,
- Also, use as much as possible URBACT mini-site & Newsletter to ensure complementary information of partners during the whole period of exchanges (see WP4) and to highlight productions of the Toolbox.

ROLE OF POLITICIANS :

- Politicians are the first decision-makers in all public policy, USER as promoter of new ways to address urban issues has to involve them as soon as possible in the process and give them an active role,
- The first level of involvement will take place within each local experimentation (they will lead) which will play a role to ensure understanding of the project,
- Through their participation at the ULSG, they will give input by validating methods and bringing them at transnational level,
- At the end of the network, we will work with them to produce policy recommendations.

2. (IV.2) Activities to be implemented under work package 2

USER is organised in 3 steps coinciding with 3 periods and 3 objectives in order to ensure a very good connexion between transnational and local levels and to give to Cities the habit of working together in a progressive process.

As starting point of the process, each partner will present itself to others in detail by writing a methodological paper presenting its Pilot Site, methods, partnership and goals it wants to reach within USER framework.

The aim of this stage is to ensure a common knowledge while activating all partners at transnational level.

STEP 1 "LEARNING" (Months 1 to 12) - Deepening the Thematic Focus:

3 thematic seminars: learning and exchange to share objectives, approaches and methodologies within the 3 core dimensions of USER: (3 sub-themes based on the baseline study analysis) :

- Seminar 1 (Copenhagen - March 2013) : "more user-friendly and interactive social spaces to solve dysfunctions and conflicts

of uses.

- Seminar 2 (Riga - July 2013) : Safer public spaces in a friendlier city - this seminar will be organised the same week as the URBACT Summer University to facilitate participation of USER partners at the Summer University.

- Seminar 3 (Lisbon - January 2014) : cleaner and better maintained public spaces in a more efficient city.

Each seminar will last 2 days with a common agenda :

- Day 1 - Knowledge day (open conference) : presentations from host city, external experts intervention, presentation of case studies, presentations from 3-4 cities selected to make contributions, exchanges and conclusions + Site Visit.

- Day 2 - Know-How Day : work on methodological tools built from feed-back on opportunities and difficulties of the Cities. It will be the moment - built with the assistance of CSTB - to give practical ways to organise the future work of ULSG and to validate good practices. Presentations, experimentations and exchanges around tools will be organised.

* The proposed transnational exchange process needs a clear organization between lead partner and lead expert. The 3 thematic seminars will be co-steered by lead partner and lead expert.

* They will be also a way to generate findings, face main challenges of the different sub-themes and produce first knowledge linked with the « USER methodological toolbox ».

STEP 2 "PRODUCING" (Months 8 to 20) - exchanges on progress linked to local experimentations.

- USER will organize a closer work between 3 groups of 3 Cities with common issues and similar challenges to facilitate comparisons and mutual learning. The choice of groups is made by lead partner and lead expert, considering potential added-value between each local situation.

- Objective to reinforce LAPs definition and implementation in each city, discussion and learning coming from the LAPs implementation processes, analysis and proposals - coaching the LAPs. The workshop will also be an opportunity to involve members of the ULSG of the host cities to participate actively in the exchange process. The Workshops process allows the host city to show, analyze and exchange around its own local policies and projects.

- To ensure the global coherence of the learning strategy among the 3 groups of cities, the lead expert will lead the whole process. The workshop agenda will be organized to allow lead expert to participate in all the meetings.

- The lead expert will prepare the WS with the host City and lead the work with a common method / frame for all workshops, on the basis of a position paper written previously (objectives of the meeting, goals of the different LAPs). Workshop Reports will be sent to all partners. The lead partner will steer this process.

STEP 2 – ORGANISATION OF WORKSHOPS & GROUPS OF CITIES

- Following this structure, 3 series of 3 Workshops will be organised (total: 9 meetings of 2 days each one). They will follow the "Methodological frame for local experimentations" presented in WP3 around the following calendar :

* WorkShop 1 (in 3 Cities tbd - October 2013)

* WorkShop 2 (in 3 Cities tbd - April 2014)

* WorkShop 3 (in 3 Cities tbd - November 2014)

- Groups will be composed to give a wide range of situations helping a capitalisation process helpful to provide lessons for many European cities :

* Group 1 : Lublin, Malaga and Riga = central old areas with a heritage value,

* Group 2 : Grenoble, Lisbon and Krakow = peripheral mono-functionals areas build during the 70's-80's,

* Group 3 : Copenhagen, Dresden and Pescara = peri-central spaces with issues of opening and connexion with the City

=> 3 Cities (Lublin, Lisbon and Dresden or Pescara - tbc) will have the charge to lead the WS process for their group. They

will assist LP/LE to ensure a right commitment of partners (agenda, deliverables, participation, ...).

- Each workshop will be organised around a common framework during 2 days with :

* Morning Day 1 - Field Visit : presentation of territory - "guided tour of uses"

* Afternoon Day 1 - Meeting with local stakeholders + LAP presentation & exchanges to share concrete aspects on USER work in progress (use of training tools)

* Morning Day 2 - deepening together specific issues / Difficulties on USER topic.

* Afternoon Day 2 - Conclusion of the WorkShop : What have we understood ? What could partners suggest ? First feedback (perception reports by hosted cities)

- WORKSHOPS are ways to strengthen the LAPS. Activities to produce and share knowledge will be linked with the implementation of local strategies / LAPs with :

* Integrating previous contributions of cities on LAPs elaboration progress,

* Peer review of the host City (by Lead expert & the 2 visitors Cities) to give an external feedback on practices, difficulties and local specificities (part of the LAP coaching). A previous methodological framework is going to be produced by the lead expert,

* exchange on LAP implementation : difficulties, improvements, feedback of practices.

=> It is meantime a process of LAPs' peer review and exchanges between cities on methods aspects. The knowledge linked to exchanges of local strategies will achieve concrete findings regarding the key challenges and new knowledge that will be useful for all the involved cities.

STEP 3 "CONSOLIDATION" (Months 18 to 27) : producing and finalizing USER Findings.

3 seminars with the 9 Cities will be organised to consolidate the work done in Steps 1 & 2 and produce findings and contributions at European level.

- Seminar 4 (July 2014 - Krakow) : 1st consolidation seminar (between WS2 and WS3) to discuss guidelines and first results for the consolidation process. It will give the foundations of the final outputs. Management authorities will be invited to oversee how findings could be integrated at regional level.

- Seminar 5 (February 2015 - Paris) 2nd consolidation seminar only with cities Project Teams (Project Officer and local project expert) will be organized to deepen the findings and results achieved by the network. This seminar will work on evaluation by measuring indicators on achievement and systematizations of first findings produced by the network. It will last 1 day 1/2. We plan to organise it in Paris to be able to involve strongly CSTB skills and to associate URBACT Secretariate (input in terms of consolidation / dissemination).

- Final Seminar (April 2015 - Grenoble tbc) between all 9 cities to finalize common conceptual and methodological findings, to validate best practices and to discuss outputs of LAPs to be presented at the Final Conference followed directly (day after) by ...

- Final conference (April 2015 - Grenoble tbc) : presentation of results to a larger audience (involving private and NGO stakeholders, public institutions, professional bodies, universities) - European level event.

=> At the end of the project, USER will have carried out 6 transnational seminars and 3 series of 3 transnational workshops + Final Conference.

3. (IV.3) Partners' Involvement in work package delivery

Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community

As lead Partner, Grenoble Alpes Metropole will have to:

- organise all the process of seminars and workshops with the local organisers,
- Give a clear calendar of integrating requirements,
- ensure with LE the design and the implementation of the "USER Methodological toolbox",
- ensure active participation of the LE.
- produce with LE the final deliverables for the all network.

As partner, Grenoble Alpes Metropole will have to:

- describe in depth the local situation and the Pilot Site experimentation they will implement, showing tools they plan to use, practices they already implement in the field,
- participate actively in the 6 seminars and give input for the seminars,
- host a Workshop and participate actively to other workshops,
- feed the "USER Toolbox" with their own local practices and experimentations,
- give input to the mid-term and final deliverables insuring their commitment on the results.

Specifically, Grenoble Alpes Metropole will have to lead the "Seminars 5, 6 and the Final Conference" organisation : working with LE to ensure the agenda and commitment of partners and deliverables

City of Malaga

To deliver WP2, Malaga will have to :

- describe in depth their local situation and the Pilot Site experimentation they will implement, showing tools they plan to use, practices they already implement in the field,
- participate actively in the 6 seminars and give input for the seminars,
- host a Workshop and participate actively in other workshops,
- feed the "USER Toolbox" with their own local practices and experimentations,
- give their input to the mid-term and final deliverables insuring their commitment on the results.

City of Pescara

To deliver WP2, Pescara will have to :

- describe in depth their local situation and the Pilot Site experimentation they will implement, showing tools they plan to use, practices they already implement on the field,
- participate actively in the 6 seminars and give input for the seminars,
- host a Workshop and participate actively in other workshops,
- feed the "USER Toolbox" with their own local practices and experimentations,
- give their input to the mid-term and final deliverables insuring their commitment on the results.

Specifically, the City of Pescara will have to lead the Workshop process for the Group 2 (tbc) : working with LP/LE to ensure the agenda and commitment of partners and deliverables

City of Lublin

To deliver the WP2, Lublin will have to :

- describe in depth their local situation and the Pilot Site experimentation they will implement, showing tools they plan to use, practices they already implement in the field,
- participate actively in the 6 seminars and give input for the seminars,
- host a Workshop and participating actively in other workshops,
- feed the "USER Toolbox" with their own local practices and experimentations,
- give their input to the mid-term and final deliverables insuring their commitment on the results.

Specifically, the City of Lublin will have to lead the Workshop process for the Group 1 : working with LP/LE to ensure the agenda and commitment of partners and deliverables

City of Krakow

To deliver the WP2, Krakow will have to :

- describe in depth their local situation and the Pilot Site experimentation they will implement, showing tools they plan to use, practices they already implement on the field,
- participate actively in the 6 seminars and give input for the seminars,
- host a Workshop and participate actively in other workshops,
- feed the "USER Toolbox" with their own local practices and experimentations,
- give their input to the mid-term and final deliverables insuring their commitment on the results.

Specifically, the City of Krakow will have to lead the "Seminar 4" organisation : working with LP/LE to ensure the agenda and commitment of partners and deliverables.

City of Dresden

To deliver the WP2, Dresden will have to :

- describe in depth their local situation and the Pilot Site experimentation they will implement, showing tools they plan to use, practices they already implement in the field,
- participate actively in the 6 seminars and give input for the seminars,
- host a Workshop and participate actively in other workshops,
- feed the "USER Toolbox" with their own local practices and experimentations,
- give their input to the mid-term and final deliverables insuring their commitment on the results.

Specifically, the City of Dresden will have to lead the Workshop process for the Group 2 (tbc) : working with LP/LE to ensure the agenda and commitment of partners and deliverables.

City of Copenhagen

To deliver the WP2, Copenhagen will have to :

- describe in depth their local situation and the Pilot Site experimentation they will implement, showing tools they plan to use, practices they already implement in the field,
- participate actively in the 6 seminars and give input for the seminars,

- host a Workshop and participate actively in other workshops,
- feed the "USER Toolbox" with their own local practices and experimentations,
- give their input to the mid-term and final deliverables insuring their commitment on the results.

Specifically, the City of Copenhagen will have to lead the "Seminar 1" organisation : working with LP/LE to ensure the agenda and commitment of partners and deliverables.

Lisbon Municipality

To deliver the WP2, Lisbon will have to :

- describe in depth its local situation and the Pilot Site experimentation they will implement, showing tools they plan to use, practices they already implement in the field,
- participate actively in the 6 seminars and give input for the seminars,
- host a Workshop and participate actively in other workshops,
- feed the "USER Toolbox" with their own local practices and experimentations,
- give their input to the mid-term and final deliverables insuring their commitment on the results.

Specifically, the City of Lisbon will have to lead the "Seminar 3" organisation : working with LP/LE to ensure the agenda and commitment of partners and deliverables.

City of Riga

To deliver the WP2, partners will have to :

- describe in depth their local situation and the Pilot Site experimentation they will implement, showing tools they plan to use, practices they already implement in the field,
- participate actively in the 6 seminars and give input for the seminars,
- host a Workshop and participate actively in other workshops,
- feed the "USER Toolbox" with their own local practices and experimentations,
- give their input to the mid-term and final deliverables insuring their commitment on the results.

Specifically, the City of Riga will have to lead the "Seminar 2" organisation : working with LP/LE to ensure the agenda and commitment of partners and deliverables.

4. (IV.4) List of expected deliverables under work package 2

| | Product | Quantity | Delivery date |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Position papers for Thematic Seminars | 3 | February, June and December 2013 |
| 2 | Contributions of Cities | 27 | March, July 2013 and January 2014 |
| 3 | Organisation of 3 thematic seminars | 3 | March 2013, July 2013, January 2014 |

| | | | |
|----|--|----|--|
| 4 | Thematic Seminars reports | 3 | April 2013, September 2013 and February 2014 |
| 5 | Catalogue of case studies | 1 | September 2013 |
| 6 | Presentation of the WorkShop process | 1 | September 2013 |
| 7 | Organisation of 9 Workshops | 9 | October 2013, April 2014, November 2014 |
| 8 | WorkShops reports | 9 | Novembre 2013, May and December 2014 |
| 9 | Perception Reports (by Cities) | 18 | Novembre 2013, May and December 2014 |
| 10 | Final report of the WorkShop Phase | 1 | January 2015 |
| 11 | organisation of 3 consolidation seminars | 3 | July 2014, February 2015, April 2015 |
| 12 | Methodological USER Toolbox results | 1 | March 2015 |
| 13 | Research Paper: "New ways to conceive and manage public spaces in European cities" | 1 | April 2015 |
| 14 | A "Concrete method for neighbourhood management Handbook" | 1 | April 2015 |
| 15 | USER Best Practices Handbook | 1 | April 2015 |
| 16 | Organisation of Final Conference | 1 | April 2015 |

Describe each deliverable listed in the table above

Each step will be connected with specific deliverables.

STEP 1

- Position papers (elaborated by the lead expert) for each thematic seminar. These papers will include: state of the art (developing several issues coming from the Baseline Study), objectives of the seminar, findings expected, and summary of the challenges evoked by the city partners. Previously the lead partner will make an inquiry among the partners. The position papers will be elaborated and distributed previously among the partners as a basic tool to better focus the seminars.
- Catalog of Case studies linked to the set of problems addressed by the network. These cases will be collected from outside the network and will play the role of relevant references of designing and managing public spaces otherwise.
- Contributions of each City for thematic seminar (way to address the issue, state of local practices). These contributions will be framed in a common format and structured to facilitate comparison and benchmarking.
- Organisation of the 3 thematic seminars
- 3 Thematic Seminars reports with selection of Cities contributions, conferences of experts, main findings and learning's, main conclusions.

STEP 2 :

- Presentation of the WorkShop process : methodological document precisising the frame, objectives and tools for WorkShops.

- Organisation of the 9 workshops.
- Workshops reports: The reports will emphasize in the comparison, the common and the differential features, and the main challenges that are being faced by the different cities through its LSG and the elaboration of the LAPs.
- "Perception Reports" a result of the peer reviews process. Cities reviewing other cities will be committed to write a short report with their general and specific perceptions of what is taking place in the reviewed city. These sorts of 'journalistic accounts' are going to be published and distributed among all the cities of USER and beyond. Perception reports are specific outputs emerging from the learning and exchanging process. What make "perception reports" a specific output of USER is the focus which will be to look at hosting City with impressionistic look = saying what surprised the visitor, what is different, ... Perception reports will be subjective view on the hosting city with goal to "break the codes" of usual peer reviews.
- Final report on workshop phase. This report will include the main conclusions of the different workshops with a cross cutting analysis among all the cities.

STEP 3 :

- Organisation of the 3 Consolidation seminars.
- Final report: synthesis of exchanges, findings and learnings coming from thematic seminars and workshops. The report will include final recommendations linked with the issues of the network. It is foreseeable that the final report will include a set of guidelines to set up an integrated process of urban regeneration including designing-management-involving citizens, as a comprehensive and innovative approach to achieve a more convivial, friendlier and better managed public spaces.
- Local Actions Plan of all 9 Cities members of USER Network.

FINAL OUTPUTS OF URBACT PROJECT :

- Final Conference : dissemination of the main results of USER in an european level Conference.
- methodological USER toolbox results : finalizing the results of the findings produced by the USER toolbox (collective production for the network)
- Research Paper: "New ways to conceive and manage public spaces in European cities". This deliverable is the foreseen output of the proposed systematization and capitalization process. The document is the result of conceptual reflections based on initial hypotheses: the crisis of the traditional process of producing the city including its conception and its management. The document will have a clear European orientation to become a reference of a new conceptualization of the process of conceiving and managing urban public spaces to achieve sustainability.
- A "Concrete method for neighbourhood management Handbook"; as an operational version of research paper for practitioners : what lessons learned ?
- "USER Best Practices Handbook" destined to European practitioners: examples of best practices selected by the Cities for their quality and repeatability by European Cities.

- V - (V) WORK PACKAGE 3 – IMPACT ON LOCAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

1. (V.1) General Framework of activities to be implemented under work package 3

• **ROLE OF ULSG in the OVERALL PROCESS** is firstly to ensure impact on local governance and urban policies, but also to feed the transnational work by concrete inputs based on local driving forces. USER should list specific requirements for ULSG and Local Action Plans:

- Objectives: to activate local stakeholders through a process linking local experimentation and exchanges between peers.
- Each ULSG will drive a clear work plan including elaboration of the LAP, procedure to follow and capitalization of local policies. Members of the ULSG are committed to highlighting the strategic situation (strengths and weaknesses) of urban regeneration processes at local level and to integrate conclusions as starting point for the LAP.
- The ULSG members should be aware that the aim of the group is to face several challenges that were identified at the beginning (see partners profiles). These challenges are concerned with the obstacles and constraints of the current approach to design and manage public spaces.
- Local Action Plans (LAPs) : ULSG will (on the basis of a common framework provided by the lead expert) carry out a pilot action as a practical test of implementation. Thematic orientation of this pilot test are the decision of each ULSG, but within the frame of USER transnational network.
- The LAP should be a test or a laboratory dealing with a new way of understanding and designing the city (public spaces), searching for new approaches and procedures to link design and management and linking these two issues with the empowerment of users and residents as local actors that will fuel the whole process with its practical knowledge.
- Therefore the setting up of the partners LAPs will be previously framed through a conceptual and methodological common guideline provided by USER.
- The LAPs elaboration in USER should be an interactive and dynamic process of experimentation, systematization and design of proposals. Regarding diversity of situations, the implementation of different pilot actions in different fields of public spaces will be possible. Cities, following the system's chain (designing / managing / empowering) will decide on which sub-themes the LAP will be focused. The systematization and capitalization process enhanced by the members of the ULSG will constitute the basis and inputs for the whole Local Action Plan.
- Agenda and animation: each ULSG will be co-led by the USER local project coordinator and one other actor belonging to the local authority and concerned with urban policies. The frequency of ULSG meetings will be linked with transnational seminars (At least 1 ULSG meeting before, 1 after ; and again 1 before and 1 after the next) to strengthen connection between local and transnational levels – to be discussed by partners.

• **ULSG ROADMAP** : It is proposed that each ULSG have to work at local level through a common methodological frame:

1. Setting up ULSG: presentation of the network (issues, objectives, methods, role of ULSG, membership, commitment of local stakeholders, ...).
2. Organizations and implementation of a short seminar for members of the ULSG. This training session will contribute to the cohesion and the common understanding of the members of the ULSG.
3. Local diagnosis deepening the baseline study. This short diagnosis will be focused on the previous practices in different fields of urban regeneration, as significant references to work on urban management and design.
4. Definition of a working programme for each ULSG.

5. Defining, planning and launching the Local Action Plans.
6. Integrating main findings, ideas and learning emerged from the transnational exchanges in the ULSG
7. Hosting one Workshop for each Cities: presentation of city objectives, presentation of LAP in progress, peer review process
=> LAP assesment and "perception report".
=> The objective is to produce the LAP with a common approach / road which has to "take into account the users" (see ULSG comosition below).

• **METHODOLOGY OF ULSG / LAPs definition - ITINERARY & PROCEDURE**

- USER propose to the 9 partners to follow a common methodology in a circular process from Identification of a pilot site to the capitalization of findings taking into account cross-cutting issues (partnership, adaptation of local organisations, expertises of uses) The experimentation process will follow a common itinerary in all the city partners under the coordination of the Lead Expert with 6 stages (see map on annex):

*1st step: Identifying problems, conflicts and dysfunctions in the uses of a specific public space already advanced through the partner profile document and to be developed during the first month of the project.

*2nd step: Observing current uses (specifically conflictive uses). This observation is a dynamic and continuous process, involving those users that are concerned with a specific issue. Users should be organized and their knowledge should be enhanced through participative processes

*3rd step: Understanding the causes of dysfunctions, conflicts and evolutions of uses. It entails organizations of workshops, drawing rapid diagnosis and rapports, ensuring good debate and exchange where all the stakeholders concerned with the issue should be involved, users but also managers, designers and planners.

*4th step: Drawing and testing initial solutions to the identified problems and conflicts. The different solutions linked to different themes, conflict and users, should entail different kind of measures and resources. They will deal with measures in different dimensions: regulations, negotiations, lobbying, services restructuration, investments, new public services, public-private agreements.

*5th step: Designing and planning the implementation process of identified solutions. It deals with the elaboration of the Local Action Plan and its expected outputs. Indicators of outputs achievement should be clearly defined. The LAP should be very practical including just those measures and proposals that where identified in the previous steps. It will be a roadmap to implement the foreseen and designed solutions. Some of the LAP proposal can be implemented during the USER period, others will need more time and resources. In any case, the LAP has to become the compass for each city partner on the USER topic.

*6th step: Capitalisation of findings and learning's. It deals with a systematization process shared by all the members of the ULSG. It is important that as a result of this experimentation, a permanent process of preventing and managing urban changes and dysfunctions is implemented and consolidated.

This 6 stages will be linked to the transnational learning process in term of agenda.

- LAPs are the commitment of each city to organise its work following these stages, to experiment USER approach "in vivo" to feed the network. Cities, through Pilot Site experimentations, create a laboratory of "making the City of tomorrow through public spaces".

=> To reach that objective, USER will adapt the URBACT ULSG toolkit" as guidelines to implement action at local level (ULSG Handbook - draft ready for the end of Development Phase) and will organise exchanges of information through the USER methodologic toolkit" (Open source platform - see WP2).

- **PRINCIPLES FOR ULSG COMPOSITION.**

- The partnership is a crucial point of the success of LAPs. If possible, it will be better to link the ULSG with an existing group of local stakeholders to avoid creation of ex-nihilo group. Working with existing groups has the advantage that previous links are already built among local stakeholders. ULSG should be created as a key space or platform to experiment new partnership (laboratories of “urban management and urban designing of public spaces”).
- Several questions has been asked to City to help them in composing their ULSG : What kind of resources do we need? Who will lead? What link with current local policies?.
- A wide involvement of stakeholder should be targeted. Because USER will play a role in experimenting new ways of linking design and management of public spaces taking uses into account. Therefore all those local stakeholders that are concerned with these two dimensions shall be active members of the ULSG.
- ULSG could be composed of Departments of the local authority (Municipality Departments & urban designers), regional and National public institutions, Civil Society Organizations, housing companies (public and private), private companies (when implementing urban services), citizens (residents, users, neighbours...individuals or through NGO's) and academics (university and researchers to ensure systematization and dissemination among the future practitioners), fieldworkers (from local governments or private companies when implementing urban services through private companies) because the added-value of USER need their participation.
- Political representatives will be involved at local level to ensure a political involvement within the process
- Partners can organise their work at 2 levels with a core ULSG (short membership, mainly formed by local authority members - decision makers) and a broader ULSG (broad composition, with just a consultation function or more operational linked to case study). It is strongly recommended to organise ULSG with this model to ensure link between decision-making process and experimentation.

2. (V.2) URBACT Local Support Groups at partner level

Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community

- **ULSG ORGANISATION :**

- Considering the achievement of the main objectives, Grenoble Alpes metropole has decided to implement actions at European level with the will to concentrate on a focus : role of inhabitants and users within the city and neighbourhood management processes. The main idea is that the Sustainable City has to answer needs of people which are living and working in a context where ways of life are diverse and constantly changing.
- The “House of inhabitants” follow the objective to capitalize on experience, to facilitate exchanges and learnings, to develop new practices and facilitate partnerships with the aim to produce a common knowledge between elected representatives, practitioners, and inhabitants for a better efficiency of urban management.
- => For these reasons, the ULSG will be composed from the “House of inhabitants” dynamics. The ULSG will be organised with two levels :
- * The "House of inhabitants" ULSG platform to allow to gather a broader partnership (landlords, developers, communities, elected officials and residents' NGOs) to consolidate and build on the findings of experiments developed on the two selected neighborhoods for the LAP. It will also share experience and knowledge learned during the 2 years length of USER project. The ULSG will link with several training organisations (CNFPT or academics, Ecole de la rénovation urbaine).
- * Two subgroups integrating operational stakeholders will be created for each case study. Led by Grenoble Alpes

Metropole and Municipalities in charge of the project, they will ensure linkages and consistency of USER project between the two scales of local partnership. They will capitalize the work developed within the project to feed transnational work and capitalization of knowledge production.

- COMPOSITION OF ULSG:

- ULSG co-led by Grenoble Alpes Metropole & House of Inhabitants – resource centre (Pont de Claix),
- Municipalities : Grenoble & Saint martin d'Hères (study cases), others depending the will,
- Social Housing Companies (public and private),
- NGOs : representing inhabitants, social housing residents, private housing interests,
- Caisse des Dépôts, Ecole de la rénovation urbaine (tbc), CSTB, University,
- Others ...

City of Malaga

- Setting up ULSG composed by Wellbeing Department, Historic Centre District, OMAU- European Programme Service, Social Services in centre District, Urban Planning Office, Environment Department, Security Department, Local Policy, Culture & Tourism Department, Local Institute for Training & Employment, Local Institute for Housing, Association of Patios Trinidad and Perchel, Association of Neighbours Trinidad-Centro, Association Arrabal, Public School Bergamín, Health Care Public Center "Jesús el Cautivo", Civil Society and Technicians of public services, professionals sand other socio-economic actors operating in the area.
- The ULSG coordinator in Málaga will be D. Cristobal Gil, Director of Social Services in Historic District.

- Organisation of ULSG in Málaga:

- Steering Committee: led by the Municipal Board of Central Municipal District, Department of Social Rights and European Programme Service. Political and decision making level. It would be advised and assisted by technical experts of the Project Task Forces.
- Project Task Forces: LAP will determine the range of projects to be developed. Each project should organise a task force made up of users reference the specific scope of the project in working areas: waste treatment; governance and inhabitants participation, economic promotion, urban planning and social cohesion. A local technician and an expert in designing Local Action Plans, will coordinate every thematic workshop.
- Assembly - wider group: Shall consist of the set of “users” that are part of ULSG. These meetings must report to all participants of ULSG and monitor all process in the development of the LAP.

- Activities of ULSG in Málaga:

Project task force in 5 thematic areas, (meeting twice a year 2013-2014, once 2015). They will be responsible for neighbourhood involvement and citizen participation as primary users of the area.

1 Steering Committee, (meeting once a year 2013-2015). It main purpose is the follow up the proposals and works of working areas and make decisions about LAP.

1 Annual Assembly (2013-2015)- Final Assembly en 2015 will present LAP to citizens and media.

City of Pescara

The participation processes applied to the Green Spine project address to different and various actors. Some of these are

present in every phases of the Local Action Plan, while other ones are interested only in a specific phase.

Therefore, we can imagine participatory forums organized at different levels but linked by some aspects: a Core LS, composed by institutional authorities and the main decision makers; a Wider LSG, formed by different types of users; a Project Team formed by experts who elaborate the project proposals.

It must be defined a project schedule, regarding phases and timetable, which will represent a precious tool to elaborate the Local Action Plan respecting the overall GANTT of the USER Project.

The potential members of the participative organization chart are for the core LSG:

- Major of Pescara and S. Giovanni Teatino
- Council Members of Pescara and S. Giovanni Teatino
- Representative of the Region of Abruzzo
- Representative of the Provinces of Pescara and Chieti
- President of ANAS (National Autonomous Roads Corporation),
- President of Trenitalia (the primary train operator in Italy)
- President of GTM (company managing public transports in the metropolitan area of Pescara)
- Presidents of Asso Industria CH-PE
- President of the Chamber of Commerce
- University G. d'Annunzio
- Professional Associations
- President of the Airport of Abruzzo
- Comander of the Coast Guard

Wider LSG 1 Green Spine (in addition to the members of the Core LSG):

- Environmental organizations
- Sport and cultural associations
- Representatives of old people
- Representative of schools
- Citizens
- Religious Associations
- Green spine project team
- Technical offices in the Municipality
- Council Members of the Municipalities of Pescara and San Giovanni Teatino

City of Lublin

Lublin would like to invite the representatives of local non-governmental organizations, representatives of local politicians chosen by citizens to District Board, representatives of crucial SMEs and cultural institutions. The small local support group will meet with users at open meetings.

To solve problems identify above, we want to invite representatives of local politics chosen to district boards of Old Town and Downtown. They are work close with citizens and know problems of citizens living in the districts. They are representatives of citizens and have influence on implementation some initiatives and investment planning and implementing such investment by public money.

The group of NGOs should be represented by clusters of enterprises, cluster of restaurant, associations of students, Employers' Union of Lublin, Space Culture Forum.

Lublin community should be represented by public officers work on: spatial planning (Spatial Planning Department), regeneration (Department of Strategy and Investors Supporting), cultural heritage 21 preservation (in case of area of Old Town as a place define as Historical Monument), consultancy and communication with citizens and social participation (President Department) and representatives of public enterprises such as: City Transport Board as a supervisory institution of The Municipal Public Transport Company (is a commercial company owned by the municipality of Lublin) [area of public transport], Municipal Property Management Board [area of maintenance of municipal buildings and public facilities and administrative buildings].

As non-regular member of LSG we plan to invite on some meetings representatives of thematic institutions, associations and office departments, in case of meeting topic.

The way of LSG working, is planned as a small board of LSG consist of maximum 5 members. To some thematic subgroups we planned to invite up to 6 new members, regarding, that each representative of the strictly board of LSG will be a leader of thematic subgroup.

The communication plan of LSG working concerned a minimum one meeting per month. The way of working of subgroups will be decided personally by the leaders of each groups, and it will be depend on subject, members of subgroup, and preferred ways of communication (directly bilateral meeting, e-mail communication, common meeting of whole members of subgroup). The meaning of Lublin USER is connected to representatives of organisations which has influence on local development and regeneration in general. USERS in Lublin are the representatives of institutions and organisation, which tasks and services covers in the chosen subject of project.

Association “Forum for Revitalisation”, as a “second level” partner for USER declares to assist the project and to spread it’s outcomes among Polish cities (according to given funding possibilities) through conferences, trainings, publications and website. (Lublin is a member of “Forum”).

It gives the following composition :

1.1 Lublin City Office:

- Monika Kłos, Non-Investment Projects Department,
- Wojciech Wilk, Chancellery of the Mayor,
- Hubert Maćik, Cultural Heritage Preservation Office
- Elżbieta Matuszak, Municipal Planning Department,
- Michał Karapuda, Culture Department
- Daniel Grzeszczuk, Non-Investment Projects Department
- Ewa Kipta, Municipal Planning Department
- Joanna Kapica, Chancellery of the Mayor
- Joanna Szelağ, Chancellery of the Mayor
- Robert Źysko, Development Strategy and Investor Assistance Department
- Jacek Warda, Development Strategy and Investor Assistance Department

- Józef Wrona – Environment Protection Department
- Krzysztof Łątka, Department of Non-Investment Projects

2. Users :

- Ryszard Milewski, President of Local Council for District of Downtown (Śródmieście)
- Łukasz Bilik, Zarząd Nieruchomości Komunalnych – Board of Municipal Real-Estates
- Rafał Tarnawski, Zarząd Transportu Miejskiego, Board of Municipal Transportation
- Grzegorz Malec, Zarząd Transportu Miejskiego, Board of Municipal Transportation
- Jan Kamiński, Council of Culture of Space, Catholic University of Lublin
- Marcin Skrzypek, Council of Culture of Space, „Brama Grodzka – Teatr NN” Centre

3. Users (already invited or identified)

- Mr Krzysztof Niećko, President of the Lublin Development Forum
- Mr Krzysztof Gorczyca, Association for Nature and Man
- Mr Mirosław Augustyniak, President of Restaurateurs and Hoteliers Cluster
- Mrs. Paulina Wojdak-Dziąła – Director of the Office of the Lublin's Union of Private Employers "Lewiatan"
- Mr Łukasik Adam Krzysztof, President of Townhouses Owners Association in Lublin
- Mr Marcin Pukas - President of Local Council for District of the Old Town (Stare Miasto)
- Mr Marek Jakubowski, Chairman of the Urban Development and Environmental Protection Committee at the City Council
- H. Ch. Andersen Theatre (located at the Old Town representatives)
- The Dominican Order (located at the Old Town) representatives

Coordinator of the LSG – will be selected democratically by the members of the group at the next meeting in December 2012.

City of Krakow

Participants of the ULSG in Krakow will be the following (tbc):

- 2 leaders of local communities (representatives of the residents, acting actively in the statutory bodies of housing cooperatives, housing associations, social organisations active within the housing estate area, etc.)
- 2-3 representatives of the owners and administrators of the real estate
- 2-3 representatives of the commercial entities acting within the housing estate area
- 3-4 representatives of the units and institutions of social infrastructure, such as nursery schools, schools, universities, welfare homes, culture homes, sport organisations
- 1 councillor of the City Council of Kraków
- 2 councillors of the District Councils
- 3 representatives of the selected departments of the Office for the City (Housing Department, Urban Planning Department, Strategy and Development Department)
- 2-3 representatives of the selected urban units and private entities responsible for the functioning of the municipal and council infrastructure
- 1 representative of the Municipal Social Welfare Centre
- 1 expert: representative of professional organisations or associations (architects, urban planners, etc.) or from university

- representatives of the institutions responsible for safety (Police, Fire Services)

These persons coordinating the Works will be: Project Manager of the USER Project (Natalia Biernat) and thematic expert (Leszek Jasinski)

In addition we are looking for an external expert: representative of professional organizations or associations (architects, urban planners, etc.) or from university (Urban Planning or Architecture – Polytechnics) who will be responsible for thematic preparation of meetings, coordinating the works, animating the meetings, collecting data to prepare LAP and writing (physically) LAP.

The meetings will be organized periodically, each time a concrete subject will be launched (at least 10 days before the meeting to make a good preparation of the subject) to have a reach discussion concerning problems and finding solutions.

Krakow will also buy equipment (in USER budget) to implement work at local level.

City of Dresden

The composition of the ULSG is in process of being finalized.

While the municipality will coordinate the general achievements, two non-municipal coordinators are envisaged for the interior functioning of the ULSG :

- Quartier Friedrichstadt (registered association) as the first coordinator
- Umweltzentrum Dresden / Environmental Centre (registered association) as the second coordinator
- Entwicklungsforum Dresden (registered association)
- Friedrichstadt Zentral e. V. (registered association)
- Mobile Arbeit Friedrichstadt Outlaw gGmbH (streetwork on behalf of the municipal youth welfare office)
- Florian Ehrler, landscape architect with freiraumentwicklung ehrler Garten- und Landschaftsarchitektur, experienced as managing director of the former „Weisseritz Initiative“ (2004-2010)
- Dresden Technical University, Faculty of Environmental Studies, Geographical Institute, Section Economic & Social Geography
- The main housing companies / associations: so far, we have identified a major housing cooperative and three large-scale private dwellers, one of them being engaged in a somewhat controversial construction project which has recently started to fill in a green area close to pre-existing residential buildings, another being the residential manager of former publicly-owned buildings, the third one a developer of new-built townhouses
- tbc: Local Agenda 21 for Dresden (registered association)
- tbc: Schokostudio architects (engaged in community development)

The municipality will be represented by the City planning office (CPO) in the first place. The CPO will be invited to each plenary session / working group meeting of the ULSG. The CPO will assure the participation of any municipal department concerned by current topics.

The Saxonian Ministry of the Interior as Managing Authority for the implementation of European structural funds in the field

of sustainable urban development will be kept informed about the USER working process, and invited to plenary sessions of the ULSG and any ULSG workshop upon agreement.

Users – others than the aforementioned ULSG members - are those individuals or groups (residents, shopkeepers, commuters, people belonging to various ages and social groups) who will have to be identified by the ULSG throughout the process in order to participate in the debates and introduce their experience and proposals. They cannot be committed immediately, as this would not comply with the city's role. The ULSG will assume the collection of most various users' proposals and statements by means of interviews, surveys, invitation to the ULSG meetings and other appropriate and empowering measures, thus providing knowledge to observe and to anticipate urban changes.

City of Copenhagen

ULSG in Sundholm will be composed by:

- Coordinator of the ULSG – Sia Boesen (City of Copenhagen),
- the Vice chairman of the local council,
- the Integrated Urban Renewal steering committee,
- project leader for a unified development plan for Amager, the Technical Administration,
- the coordinator for social housing and regeneration in Amager, the Technical Administration,
- the head of the activity centre for the homeless, the Social Administration,
- a central coordinator of inclusion, the Social Administration,
- head of the day-care institution, the Children and Youth Administration
- a member of the board in the new housing establishment, NGO,
- head of the Factory for art and design, NGO,
- a member of the Urban Garden group, NGO,
- a member from the local Friends of Sundholm group, NGO,

- Organisation and activities of ULSG at partner level

The ULSG coordinator will be connected to the secretariat of Integrated Urban renewal in the Sundholm District. Meetings will be held in the ULSG every 3rd month. Bilateral meetings are expected to be held whenever needed.

Workshops, seminars and festivals: Every half a year the ULSG will host a local workshop, seminar or festival to address the issues raised in the daily work. The idea of these events is to assure common learning and knowledge is shared among stake holders participating in or residing in the area.

Lisbon Municipality

Lisbon ULSG will be composed from the following stakeholders :

- Municipality: BIP/ZIP office, Sectorial municipality bodies, Politic decision makers
- Local Authorities
- NGO's
- Local Housing Associations
- Informal Community groups
- LNEC – National Engineering Laboratory
- IRHU – National Rehabilitation and Housing Institute

When the project will begin, others local stakeholders, representing mainly Users will join the group.

City of Riga

USLG will mainly consist of potential stakeholders and representatives of various interests of two main local users' groups (local residents and local SMEs businesses) :

- Responsible departments of the Riga City Council (City Development Department, Financial Department, Traffic Department, Property Department, Housing and Environment Department, Riga City Building Construction Directorate, Riga Tourism Development Bureau, Riga Municipal Police)
 - State Inspection for Heritage Protection,
 - Neighborhoods' Non-Governmental Organizations and Associations (like "Vecrīgas biedrība" – association of residents and small-scale businesses of Old Town),
 - Latvian Trade Association (representing interests of retail businesses),
 - The Association of Hotels and Restaurants of Latvia, Latvian Association of Architects and Latvian Association of Spatial Planners
- ULSG Coordinator will organize all local level activities and information exchange between local stakeholders, other participants and institutions, as well as with relevant projects' groups in Riga and/or in the rest of Latvia.
- It is planned to involve inhabitants of different groups of age and social circles as well as specific interest groups like 'green activists', bicycle users' association etc. One of the measures in the framework of HCR development could be the establishment of multi-functional HCR information and education centre – one stop shop – where education, culture, recreation and entertainment, practical and commercial consultations, digital HCR model, library with materials and publications about HCR, electronic database with research works and data carried out during the implementation of HCR development plans' documents could be accessible for all groups of city users.
- Municipality of Riga considers that mutual cooperation with the inhabitants of RHC territories would promote their awareness about the arrangement of surroundings and preservation of the environment of culture and history. Thus, the wider support groups will be formed to involve inhabitants in preservation of culturally historical environment.
- Responsible: Ms. Solvita Kalvīte, Head of Public Involvement Division, Board of Urban Development, City Development Department of Riga City Council

Riga will also buy equipment (in USER budget) to implement work at local level.

3. (V.3) Participation in transnational activities at network level

Each partner is requested to attend transnational seminars and workshops (2-3 participants for each partner included on travel budget). Discussion (during Site Visit, Seminars of Development Phase, ...) were made to define profiles of officers and politicians which are able to be involved on transnational meeting: practitioner on urban policies, speak English, involved on ULSG.

In order to reach the objectives and to deliver the actions and outputs expected, Partners will implement this work package

through analysis and exchanges within the ULSG and, if needed, specific survey ordered to local experts.

ULSG and LAPs are at the core of URBACT networks in order to ensure the objective of dissemination within each network.

LAPs are the main output for Cities and meantime the basis of the operational knowledge for the network. The challenge for USER is to create a real and strong link between transnational exchanges and local policies.

LINKS WITH THE WHOLE NETWORK:

- USER wants to effectively connect ULSG with transnational exchanges. The detection of good practices, lessons learnt and shared knowledge emerging from the network level should feed the local actions plans and the LSG of each partner city.

Inversely, ULSG and LAPs should feed the transnational exchanges and learnings at network level. This is a key issue and a crucial challenge for USER project: avoiding separation between the two levels.

- ULSG will be requested to contribute to transnational exchanges by showing their own practices, organising a seminar and a Workshop, by giving their input to the 3 seminars of the 1st Step. semaine

=> All partners inputs will feed the USER methodical Toolbox to be describe, evaluate and validate by the trinomial LP/LE/CSTB.

4. (V.4) Participation in national capacity-building scheme

Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community

Grenoble Alpes Metropole will propose the participation of the LSG coordinator, which is a binomial :

- Simon CAEN, project officer in charge of "Urban & Social Neighbourhood management" at Grenoble Alpes Metropole
- Perrine TAULEIGNE, project officer in charge of the House of Inhabitants,
- the third participant will come from NGO's appointed by residents.

Budget is estimate with the following costs :

- 1 travel per person + 1 night + 1 diner =(250 €*3 seminars)*3 persons = 2 250 €

City of Malaga

City of Malaga will propose the participation of :

- Cristobal Gil coordinator of Málaga's Local Support Group ,
- Dolores Alcarazo, Social Services Technician in the Historic District on behalf,
- an expert in designing Local Actions Plans to be hired by the City Council.

We consider they are target audience of capacity scheme, because of their daily contact and work with population in the area, playing a relevant role as link between citizenship and stakeholders. The expert (to choose) to be hired for designing Local Action Plan, should be involved in the capacity-building scheme, in order to improve his/her expertise, and also because of the interest to be part of exchange of know-how and good practices. The expert should have language skills in order to actively take part in peer-reviews.

Budget is estimate with the following costs :

- 1 travel per person + 1 night + 1 diner =(250 €*3 seminars)*3 persons = 2 250 €

City of Pescara

City of Pescara will propose the participation of :

- a representative from the Municipality of Pescara,
- a representative from the Municipality of San Giovanni Teatino,
- the LSG coordinator.

escara has chosen them because they are elected representatives and work on programming activities. Thanks to their support, the Local Action Plan will surely be carried out in an effective way.

Budget is estimate with the following costs :

- 1 travel per person + 1 night + 1 diner =(250 €*3 seminars)*3 persons = 2 250 €

City of Lublin

City of Lublin will propose the participation of :

- Marek Jakubowski – chairman of City Development,
- Łukasz Bilik - Head of Exploitation Department at the Board of Municipal Real-Estates.
- Jan Kamiński - President of Council of Culture of Space (NGO)
- Marcin Skrzypek – an employee of "Grodzka Gate - NN Theatre" cultural centre, (NGO)

Budget is estimate with the following costs :

- 1 travel per person + 1 night + 1 diner =(150 €*3 seminars)*3 persons = 1350 €

City of Krakow

City of Krakow will propose the participation of :

- Natalia Biernat – Municipality of Krakow – project manager of the USER project,
- Jakub Kosek – head of the local councilor from Azory district - as the person elected by the inhabitants (representative of local interests),
- third one to be choosen from the Regional Policy Department from the Marshall Office of Malopolskie Voivodeship.

Budget is estimate with the following costs :

- 1 travel per person + 1 night + 1 diner =(150 €*3 seminars)*3 persons = 1350 €

City of Dresden

City of Dresden will propose the participation of :

- One of two project officers from the municipality (e. g. Bruno Buls)
- ULSG-coordinator 1: Tom Umbreit from Quartier Friedrichstadt (registered association)
- ULSG-coordinator 2: Stefan Mertenskötter from Umweltzentrum Dresden / Environmental Centre (registered association)

Budget is estimate with the following costs :

- 1 travel per person + 1 night + 1 diner =(250 €* 3 seminars)*3 persons = 2 250 €

City of Copenhagen

City of Copenhagen will propose the participation of :

- Sia Boesen, LSG coordinator, project manager, secretariat of Integrated Urban Renewal in Sundholm District Copenhagen
- Per Hansson, citizen of Sundholm district, Head of the steering committee of the Integrated Urban renewal in Sundholm District, member of friends of Sundholm. Per Hansson has been chosen because of his great interest in the neighbourhood and core role in defining and identifying networks and participants in the local area.
- June Baasch, representative of the social administration. Head of The Activity Centre for the Homeless at Sundholm. June Baasch has been chosen due to her insight in the area and her connection to the many different disadvantaged groups at Sundholm.

Because Copenhagen is the Capital City of a small size State, budget is estimate with the following costs :

- no travel, no night + 1 diner per person $= (50 \text{ €} * 3 \text{ seminars}) * 3 \text{ persons} = 450 \text{ €}$

Lisbon Municipality

Lisbon Municipality will propose the participation of :

- Project officer Miguel Brito,
- Local authority representative (tbd)
- NGO representative (tbd),

Because Lisbon is the Capital City of a small size State, Budget is estimate with the following costs :

- no travel, no night + 1 diner per person $= (50 \text{ €} * 3 \text{ seminars}) * 3 \text{ persons} = 450 \text{ €}$

City of Riga

City of Riga will choose between the following participants of the ULSG :

- Neighborhood's Non-Governmental Organizations and Associations (like "Vecrīgas biedrība" which represents interests of inhabitants and small businesses of Old Town area)
- Latvian Association of Architects, Section of Young Architects,
- Latvian Association of Spatial Planners (unites professional urban planners from municipalities and private practices)
- The Association of Hotels and Restaurants of Latvia (involved in implementation of USER as the association that unites hotels, guest houses, motels and restaurants for a professional cooperation)
- LSG Coordinator.

Because Riga is the Capital City of a small size State, budget is estimate with the following costs :

- no travel, no night + 1 diner per person $= (50 \text{ €} * 3 \text{ seminars}) * 3 \text{ persons} = 450 \text{ €}$

5. (V.5) List of expected deliverables under work package 3

| | Product | Quantity | Delivery date |
|---|--|----------|---------------|
| 1 | Partners presentations : state of the Art of local practices | 9 | April 2013 |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------|
| 2 | Reports of ULSG meetings 1st phase | 9 | February 2014 |
| 3 | Mid-term review of local action plans | 9 | March 2014 |
| 4 | Catalog of local "good practices" | 9 | December 2014 |
| 5 | Final report of ULSG Meetings | 9 | February 2015 |
| 6 | LAPs | 9 | April 2015 |
| 7 | Final report of participation at National Capacity Building Scheme | 9 | December 2014 |

Describe each deliverable listed in the table above.

Through this work, the project will deliver the following deliverables:

1- Presentation of the 9 Cities to introduce each partner to others based on project they will implement during the 2 years time
 - State of the art of practices at local level to highlights how partners work on the field, what kind of methods they use and what results / experience they could already bring to the network.

* Description of local experiences for Cities linked to USER Topic (successes and failures) in term of projects and methodologies

* Deepening the baseline study, integrating experimentations, proposals and recommendation that take place during the work program of USER, through the workshops and through the ULSG activities.

2 & 5- Reports of all the meetings of the ULSG with main conclusions and decisions (at the end of hte first phase and at the end of the overall process).

3- Mid-term review of Local Action Plans

4- Catalog of local good practices carried out by the partner cities of USER, as a fruit of the reflection and cooperation within the ULSG. The catalog will highlight all those practices that show the new ways to link conception, management, and involvement of citizens.

6- Presentation of Local Action Plans at the end of the process which will include, as a basic table of content, the following items:

* The context. Designing and managing the city. Issues, evolution and main challenges,

* Data base. Main features and trends,

* Background: previous projects, lessons learned conclusions,

* Stakeholder's involvement. Who is who... Links among them, conflicts, coalitions, etc. Public sector, private sector, NGOs,

* Experimentations and pilot actions linking design management and citizen involvement.

* Main conclusions and challenges,

* Strategic goals of the LAP. Towards a new conception and a new management of the city

* Proposals and measures of the LAP,

* The LAP as a strategic framework to enhance and to implement new interventions of urban regeneration,

* A system of monitoring, following and evaluation the progress of the LAP.

7- Final report of participation at National Capacity Building Scheme to conclude the process by showing how Cities have participated and what do this project bring to them for implementing the ULSG.

- VI - (VI) WORK PACKAGE 4 – COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION

1. (VI.1) Communication Strategy

- **COMMUNICATION STRATEGY:**

Communication & dissemination are essential issues of all URBACT networks in general. Objectives of the communication strategy of the USER project will be firstly to collect and manage effectively results / findings of the network and then to promote them to different targets (locally, regionally, transnationally - see below target audience). To reach those aims, USER will follow recommendations of "URBACT Communication toolkit" and propose specific tools or initiatives.

- **TARGET AUDIENCE:**

Considering the USER topic, targets should be institutions (from local to European level) and inhabitants (at local level to show what Europe is doing for people and urban territories). Our communications strategy proposes specific tools according to our communication targets:

- partners in each country (with National Dissemination Points) = practitioners who make and manage the City of today,
- networks of professionals = important target for dissemination,
- local politicians = decision-makers, especially for the involvement of Users,
- students (crucial point to have a good dissemination/communication on academic target - architecture, urbanism, political studies, social studies) = to reach future practitioners of urban policies.
- medias
- general public (audience) = because citizens are central in USER process

- **COMMUNICATION PRIORITIES:**

According to URBACT requirements, the Communication will be addressed in 2 dimensions:

- organizing and managing the information flux within the network : it seems important to establish a work method between partners who will gather information from each. Common tools will be created and managed by the Lead partner (article writing by the partners dedicated to the mini website, creating newsletters, reports, etc., web platform to develop a database of information and visual documents, ...).
- promoting the information and inputs produced by the network. The collected information will be distributed to selected targets. Moreover, it is interesting to combine our thoughts with students involved in urban renewal. Indeed, all the partner cities are student cities. Tools and specific actions will be implemented in this direction.

- **WHO WE ARE ?** USER communication strategy is based on a "Baseline argument" to present the project:

- USER is a partnership of 9 Cities working together to experiment new ways of conceiving and managing the City. USER focuses on urban public spaces through to knowledge of Users of the city. By this, USER wants to participate on making the "Sustainable City of tomorrow".
- Key messages: working together on the issue and discuss this topic, we want to convey to the public a strong message: your city, your community is involved in a European program to reflect and build the city of tomorrow.

- **WHAT DO WE AIM TO DO ?**

Under USER, we want to facilitate the communication between the various partners, to know the progress of work of each and

share the results, experiences. For this we propose to implement communication tools unified and synthetic.

- **MAIN OBJECTIVES** - As lead partner, our main objectives in communication are:
 - Communicate a coherent picture of the project (especially thanks to the graphic identity),
 - Provide visibility equal to each partner,
 - Create accessible and synthetic tools,
 - To live network, federating.
- **APPLICATION OF GRAPHIC CHARTER** :
 - The graphic charter was presented to partners during the 2 meetings of the Development Phase. It is composed of USER logo and its authorized applications. Partners must respect the Charter in all communication relating to USER.
 - After checking possibility with URBACT Secretariate, we propose a declination of the logo for each partner,
 - The graphic charter is presented in the annexes.

2. (VI.2) Activities to be implemented under work package 4

BASE OF USERS' COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

- **1 - PLARFORM** for communication:
 - Creation of a web platform to stock informations related to the project linked to information and dissemination,
 - Collecting informations related to Cities agenda at local level,
 - Collecting "news" from newspapers, radios or TV at local level,
 - Collecting pictures and videos from partners,
 - communication between partners (and beyond).

=> The Platform will be organised as a social network in order to intensify distribution of information and exchanges.
- **2 - COMMUNICATION KIT**:
 - Grenoble Alpes Metropole will create a Communication Kit for local communication to facilitate communication at local / national level,
 - Grenoble Alpes Metropole creates graphism of common communication tools flexible and easy to use, like :
 - * USER flyer in English (the translation of the flyer being borne by partners),
 - * Kit stationery (letterhead, envelopes, press kits),
 - * Goodies (notepads, pencils).
 - The Communicatio Kit gives each partner the opportunity to communicate USER while respecting the identity of the project and use it freely during each partner events (exhibitions, fairs, exhibitions, press conferences, etc.)..
 - In addition, other tools (Rollouts, 40 x 60 Poster, Postcards with visual of each city) could be developed around a strong visual to create and have intended to promote awareness of partners through USER.
- **3 - MEDIA COVERAGE**:
 - The lead partner is responsible for the dissemination of the international media and each partner maintains its own list of

local press. Tools broadcast on local networks will be common and / or customized.

The lead partner will ensure to:

- make available to media releases and press kits on site USER
- collect newspaper articles / interventions in the press to call the press review
- Particular attention should be paid to the seminars and the Final Conference (production of press releases, press conference to the Final Conference)

• 4 - NEWSLETTERS for Dissemination (9 issues in 27 months):

- The Newsletter is in English and each partner has to translate it on its own language for diffusion at local level,
- Frequency: the letter will punctuate each seminar or workshop. These are held every 3 months, it is suggested that a newsletter each seminar is between 8-9 newsletters for the duration of the program.
- the LP will make 2 versions of the newsletter: version in English on .pdf + version on text format (.doc) for translation with space for local information,
- Format of the Newsletter is a A4 paper with :
 - * 1 page 1/2 for transnational informations (network info, local examples, events, ...)
 - * 1/2 page with URBACT Programme informations (presentation of URBACT, USER project team, ...) - The same for all 9 newsletters
 - * This 1/2 page become a local page on local version of the newsletter with informations adapted to local stakeholders that do not involve the entire network,
- The newsletter will be written by a business writer specializing in issues of urban renovation (eg a journalist). The style should be concise and precise. Headings will be repeated for better monitoring (news, return to the previous seminar, no progress of each project and difficulties or issues, schedule). They will be "people oriented writing" = each one present a story involving one City (9 partners, 9 newsletters, 9 stories),
- Dissemination actions (predicting the distribution plan) should be provided by all partners. The newsletter will be sent by mail to the networks of each partner USER, journalists targeted, as well as URBACT networks (Eurocities, etc.). It will also be posted on the website and USER will be posted on the websites of each partner.
- Dissemination at the project level : USER is part of an issue reclassification of public space. It is therefore important to create a mailing list in which will be listed:
 - * Institutions (eg departments, boards, councils, etc.).
 - * Specialized media (urbanism, architecture, public service, ect.)
 - * Providers and project partners
- Dissemination at the local level : each partner is responsible for disseminating its local version of the newsletter to its partners, its elected officials, its media. To do this, it will recommend everyone to create a mailing list that will be used throughout the project.

SPECIFIC EVENTS / PROJECTS USER WANTS TO IMPLEMENT - ADDED VALUE OF THE NETWORK

• 5- THE COMMON PUBLIC EVENT:

- The partnership agrees to produce together a common public event able to be organised in a decentralised way.
- The principle of this event is to provide a highlight to the general public in each partner city. The aim is to inform the public that its city is involved in a European project, with other cities to build the city of tomorrow. It is a well known communication

rather than information.

- The proposal carried by the lead partner revolves around three axes:

- * an event that does not require logistics too heavy,
- * an event that can be invested differently partners,
- * a festive event.

- The partnership agree on Grenoble Alpes Metropole proposal of a VIDEO PROJECTION on aesthetic images representative of each partner city.

- Inspired by the Festival of Lights in Lyon, the video is designed to be shown on suport like facades or big walls. It will be conducted at night in each city.

- The Lead Partner is responsible for achieving the video and partners to provide support with local materials (graphics / pictures / videos). The video must be made by the end of 2014 to allow partners to broadcast before April 2015.

- Advantages: Flexible usage event (video) therefore no expos, media / Each partner to the extent that it may wish the event (public broadcasting in committee, on a website)

- Difficulties: Each partner will invest the project / A complementary budget may be dedicated to this operation / In addition to budget implementation, there shall be a specific budget communication for local communication around the event (media campaign, posters).

• 6 - THE CAMPUS PROJECT

- It was found that all partner cities USER hosted university campuses or schools.

- It was therefore proposed to partners at the Kick Off Meeting to build a project USER OFF. Students, future leaders and future designers would be put in a position to think of the city of tomorrow without limitation or restraint.

- Students involved are not only planners and architects but also students in psychology, sociology, art students or crafts, etc..

- The principle of this collaboration would be to allow students to work on the same issues and the same pilot sites for professionals involved in USER. They will be asked to talk about their notion of public space.

- To be recovered, the projects carried out by students will be a special presentation at the Final Conference .

- Objectives: Link professionals - students / Remove uses, open horizons / Networking students from different campuses / schools based on student active channels (association, student house)

- Difficulties: Involve students and professors around the world / Unlock a specific budget / Devote time to this project / Bring to life the project, maintain continuity knowing that students change every back

• 7 - THE TRAINING PROJECT:

- The Training project is the creation by each City of a prototype of "training" focus on students, practitioners or elected representatives (choice of the City).

- It could be a specific lesson, a workshop process or something else helping stakeholders to introduce the issue of "users as stake holders of the City of tomorrow" approach on their practices or knowledge.

- It has to be design progressively as soon as possible to be implemented either in 2013-14 or 2014-15 academic year.

3. (VI.3) Project webmastering

Valérie GUERIN, Communication Officer at Grenoble-Alpes Métropole, will be in charge of fulfilling and u-dating the

project mini-site. Communication Officer of USER Network, she works on a daily basis with Web medias.

4. (VI.4) Partners' Involvement in work package delivery

Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community

- Partners will be requested to inform the Lead Partner Communication Officer of their local agenda. They will be request to address regularly documents (in English).
- Communication carried by the lead partner must provide communication tools unifying and synthetic. These tools are all project partners.

The lead partner must ensure that:

- Communicate a coherent picture of the project (thanks to the graphic identity)
- Provide visibility equal to each partner
- Create accessible tools and synthetic
- To live network, federating

To date, the tools developed in this direction are:

- The creation of a logo and a graphic
- The online site USER via the URBACT website

The tools that the Lead Partner must achieve are:

- Communication Plan: It outlines activities and achievements in terms of communication Throughout The program USER.
- The Flyer: it is a common communication document written in English and each Stock That partner can use the framework of icts in the USER program.
- A Video: Video is the central element of the public event. Each partner will be Invited to Disseminate, as he wishes, before April 2015.
- The update minisite
- Newsletters: the newsletter will present the progress of the project so summarized and popularized.

As partner, Grenoble Alpes Metropole will have, like other partners to :

- Transmit Lead Partner information and news relating to their work USER (for updating the minisite particular)
- Translat Newsletters into the language of their country (if desired) and write text on their local - Translated Newsletters into the language of their country and write text on their local information (to be included in the space provided for this purpose in the Newsletter)
- Provide for the dissemination of video communication on the diffusion
- Organize and implement their collaboration on "Campus project", "Training Project" and "Common Public Event".

City of Malaga

In the context of the communication partners USER shall:

- Transmit Lead Partner information and news relating to their work USER (for updating the minisite particular)

- Translated Newsletters into the language of their country and write text on their local information (to be included in the space provided for this purpose in the Newsletter)
- Provide for the dissemination of video communication on the diffusion
- Organize and implement their collaboration on "Campus project" "Training Project" and "Common Public Event".

City of Malaga propose several complementary initiatives :

- "Trinidad-Perchel" Local Action Plan printed in paper (50-100 copies) in Spanish. If required, it will be translated into English (10-20 copies).
- Up-dating USER Urbact mini-site, with information and photos of Workshops, seminars, ...
- Roll-up of the project to be exposed in all meetings, seminars, workshops, news conference...
- Promotion of key days and events like International Environment Day, European day... Those special events will be animated by ULSG coordinator in target area, in the framework of 5 thematic areas.

City of Pescara

In the context of the communication partners USER shall:

- Transmit Lead Partner information and news relating to their work USER (for updating the minisite particular)
- Translated Newsletters into the language of their country and write text on their local information (to be included in the space provided for this purpose in the Newsletter)
- Provide for the dissemination of video communication on the diffusion
- Organize and implement their collaboration on "Campus project" "Training Project" and "Common Public Event".

City of Lublin

In the context of the communication partners USER shall:

- Transmit Lead Partner information and news relating to their work USER (for updating the minisite particular)
- Translated Newsletters into the language of their country and write text on their local information (to be included in the space provided for this purpose in the Newsletter)
- Provide for the dissemination of video communication on the diffusion
- Organize and implement their collaboration on "Campus project" "Training Project" and "Common Public Event".

City of Krakow

In the context of the communication partners USER shall:

- Transmit Lead Partner information and news relating to their work USER (for updating the minisite particular)
- Translated Newsletters into the language of their country and write text on their local information (to be included in the space provided for this purpose in the Newsletter)
- Provide for the dissemination of video communication on the diffusion
- Organize and implement their collaboration on "Campus project" "Training Project" and "Common Public Event".

City of Dresden

In the context of the communication partners USER shall:

- Transmit Lead Partner information and news relating to their work USER (for updating the minisite particular)
- Translated Newsletters into the language of their country and write text on their local information (to be included in the space

provided for this purpose in the Newsletter)

- Provide for the dissemination of video communication on the diffusion
- Organize and implement their collaboration on "Campus project" "Training Project" and "Common Public Event".

City of Copenhagen

In the context of the communication partners USER shall:

- Transmit Lead Partner information and news relating to their work USER (for updating the minisite particular)
- Translated Newsletters into the language of their country and write text on their local information (to be included in the space provided for this purpose in the Newsletter)
- Provide for the dissemination of video communication on the diffusion
- Organize and implement their collaboration on "Campus project" "Training Project" and "Common Public Event".

Lisbon Municipality

In the context of the communication partners USER shall:

- Transmit Lead Partner information and news relating to their work USER (for updating the minisite particular)
- Translated Newsletters into the language of their country and write text on their local information (to be included in the space provided for this purpose in the Newsletter)
- Provide for the dissemination of video communication on the diffusion
- Organize and implement their collaboration on "Campus project" "Training Project" and "Common Public Event".

City of Riga

In the context of the communication partners USER shall:

- Transmit Lead Partner information and news relating to their work USER (for updating the minisite particular)
- Translated Newsletters into the language of their country (if desired) and write text on their local - Translated Newsletters into the language of their country and write text on their local information (to be included in the space provided for this purpose in the Newsletter)
- Provide for the dissemination of video communication on the diffusion
- Organize and implement their collaboration on "Campus project" "Training Project" and "Common Public Event".

5. (VI.5) List of expected deliverables under work package 4

| | Product | Quantity | Delivery date |
|---|----------------------------|----------|----------------|
| 1 | Newsletter 1 (Seminar 1) | 10 | February 2013 |
| 2 | Newsletter 2 (Seminar 2) | 10 | June 2013 |
| 3 | Newsletter 3 (Work Shop 1) | 10 | September 2013 |
| 4 | Newsletter 4 (Seminar 3) | 10 | December 2013 |
| 5 | Newsletter 5 (Work Shop 2) | 10 | March 2014 |
| 6 | Newsletter 6 (Seminar 4) | 10 | June 2014 |

| | | | |
|----|---|----|---------------|
| 7 | Newsletter 7 (Work Shop 3) | 10 | October 2014 |
| 8 | Production of Video for COMMON PUBLIC EVENT | 1 | November 2014 |
| 9 | Newsletter 8 (Seminar 5) | 10 | January 2015 |
| 10 | Newsletter 9 (Final Conférence) | 10 | March 2015 |
| 11 | Campus Project Presentation | 9 | April 2015 |
| 12 | Training project Presentation | 9 | March 2015 |
| 13 | Broadcast of Video on Local Public Events (Common public event) | 9 | Spring 2015 |
| 14 | Creation and printing of USER Communication Kit | 1 | March 2013 |

Describe each deliverable listed in the table above

- **NEWSLETTERS 1 to 9:** The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) should summarize what was discussed in the seminar and to the development of various projects. A local version (in the language of the country) may be written by the partners.
- **PRODUCTION OF VIDEO FOR PUBLIC COMMON EVENT:** Video is the central element of the public event.
 - Grenoble Alpes Metropole will produce a video, given to partners to broadcastit in a Local Event,
 - Each partner will be invited to disseminate the Video,in at least one event, before April 2015.
- **CAMPUS PROJECT Presentation:**
 - A project implemented by all 9 Cities at local level to ask students to participate to USER approach,
 - Each City choose the kind of project they want to propose under a prescription book written by the LP,
 - At the Final Conference, Campus project will be highlighted on a format to define.
- **TRAINING PROJECT Presentation:**
 - Each 9 Cities are required to develop a prototype of training at local level.
 - They will present results of their work at the last Meeting
- **Broadcast of VIDEO on Local Events:**
 - Each artner is required to broadcast a video (created by the LP) in a local event,
 - This presentation could be broadcast on an existing event (it is even strongly recommended),
 - The presentation will take place during the first semester of 2015.
- **Creation and printing of USER Communication Kit:**
 - Grenoble Alpes Metropole will create a communication Kit for local communication,
 - The Communicatio Kit gives each partner the opportunity to communicate USER while respecting the identity of the project and use it freely during each partner events (exhibitions, fairs, exhibitions, press conferences, etc.).
 - The Communication kit could consist of communication:
 - * USER flyer in English (the translation of the flyer being done by partners)

* Kit stationery (letterhead, envelopes, press kits)

* Goodies (notepads, pencils)

- VII - (VII) MANAGING AUTHORITIES OF OPERATIONAL PROGRAMMES

1. (VII.1) Cooperation with Managing Authorities of Operational programmes (ERDF and ESF)

Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community

Préfecture de Région Rhône Alpes

Secrétariat Général aux Affaires Régionales (General Secretariate for Regional affairs)

Mission "Europe"

Contact person : Sophie BOUSSAC-LOAREC

The MA wants to follow USER to look how to produce innovative methods and new tools to practitioners of urban regeneration. This topic is supported by the measure "neighbourhood regeneration" in the ROP ERDF 2007-2013. Tools and new forms of governance developed by USER will also be interesting in the context of emerging CLLD dynamic on European Policies for 2014-2020.

City of Malaga

- Associated Managing Authority: Dirección General de Fondos Europeos y Planificación, in Consejería de Economía, Innovación, Ciencia y Empleo, Regional Government Andalucía. The responsible person is Patricia Egulior Arranz (Phone:+34 955065015, e-mail: feuropeos.ceice@juntadeandalucia.es). Contac person: Adolfin Martínez Guirado, Head of Service of planning and public coordination) in the Regional Government Andalucía (Phone:+34 955064923, e-mail: adolfina.martinez@juntadeandalucia.es).
- We would like them to be a part of ULSG, playing an active role in workshops regarding thematic area urban planning and Annual Assemblies. We consider very important them to be involved in the project as owners of few plots with no uses, placed in key areas within the site.
- At national level, the Managing Authority is Dirección General de Fondos Comunitarios, in Ministerio de Hacienda y Administraciones Públicas. Contac person: Iñigo Enríquez Amibia (Phone: +34 915835234, e-mail: IEnriquez@sepg.minhap.es).
- They are informed of the project, and they support it. But as Managing Authorities for all Spanish participation in URBACT project, they cannot guarantee a formal support (or attendance) to all projects, so they assign this responsibility to Regional Governments.

City of Pescara

REGIONE ABRUZZO

Direzione Affari della Presidenza - Servizio Attività Internazionali (Inernational Affairs Department)

Ufficio Attività Comunitarie ed Internazionali (Office of Communities and International Activities)

Contact person: Antonio Sorgi & Vincenzo Calvisi

AS Associated Managing Authority, the Region Abruzzo wishes, by its support :

- ensure complementarity with other measures and in this way will determine the value added;
- ensure that the issues addressed by the project are relevant in order to provide information regarding City priorities, programs

and initiatives on the theme of the plan action; this will ensure the integration of local action plan in the making of policies and programs at regional level. This way we will get better governance, avoiding duplication and waste of resources.

- integration of action plan in the Structural Funds and local public policies.
- to consolidate partnerships between MA, transferring best practices and tools among the regions. That horizontal collaboration between MA could represent added value for both the City and for the Managing Authorities.

City of Lublin

Management Authority:

Council of the Lubelskie Region

Marshall's Office of the Lubelskie Region

ul. Spokojna 4 - PL-20-074 Lublin

Marshall : Krzysztof, Hetman

Operational Programme 'Lubelskie'

The MA will be invited to all ULSG meetings including transnational ones and disseminations events. We will work together on urban policies matters of relevance for both city of Lublin as the capital of the region and other cities of the region to be included in a new financial perspective 2014-2020 and regional operational programme of the Lubelskie Voivodship.

The programming for 2014-20 along with the outlines of the EU Cohesion Policy is considered in Lublin and Lubelskie region as critical for efficient and rational development in Eastern parts both of Poland and of the EU which have been displaying a rather poor economic indicators. The willingness of co-operation between regional and city administration has been declared. A MA's representative has been attending working meetings at the developpement phase

City of Krakow

Managing Authority:

Marshall Office of Malopolskie Voivodeship.

Department of Regional Policy, responsible for coordinating and monitoring the works linked with European funds and preparing the region for the new programming period 2014-2020.

Director Jakub Szymanski, contact: + 48 - 12 29 90 700, e:mail: sekretariat.pr@umwm.pl

The MA will be fully involved in the implementation of the USER project. The person from the Regional Policy Department will be the member of the ULSG. HE/she will actively participate in all the meetings and transferr the information to his/her department.

City of Dresden

- Responsibilities regarding several ERDF funding lines have been delegated from the Saxon State Ministry for Economic Affairs, Labour and Transport, who assumes reponsibility as Managing Authority for the administration of the ERDF fund in Saxony, to the Saxon State Ministry of the Interior, Wilhelm-Buck-Straße 4, 01097 Dresden.

Mr Weßling is in charge of the implementation of various ERDF funding programmes in Saxony (christian.wessling@smi.sachsen.de, phone + 49 351 564 3543).

- Drafted text regarding a forthcoming letter of intent to be submitted by the M.A.: "The Saxon State Ministry of the Interior

welcomes the participation of the City of Dresden in the USER network (Urban Sustainable and Efficient Regeneration) in the framework of URBACT II and is willing to provide any useful information related to this project.

- The executive officer who will participate in the findings of the Local Support Group and the setting up of the Local Action Plan on behalf of the Managing Authority will be Mr Weßling Due to the available time budget, the Managing Authority will probably not be able to ensure attendance at LSG meetings on a regular basis, but will do its best to be kept informed and contribute to the LSG's findings whenever possible.“

City of Copenhagen

Ministry of Housing, Urban and Rural Affairs is managing Authority of Denmark. The Copenhagen programme is connected to Trine Tophøj Heinemann, from the section of analysis and international affairs.

Lisbon Municipality

- Lisbon will involve the relevant Management Authority, Ministry of urban Development DGDOTDU, in charge of structural funds.

- They are already informed of the project and will participate in the steering of the project at local level.

City of Riga

State Regional Development Agency / Territorial Cooperation Project Control Department

Contact person : Mr. Maris Krastins, director

- VIII - (VIII) METHODOLOGY AND USE OF EXPERTISE

1. (VIII.1) Use of the expertise resources allocated by the Programme

The remaining days of URBACT expertise will be assigned to the Lead Expert, Fernando BARREIRO.

=> Remaining working days allocated by the programme (166 – 42 already used in the Development Phase) = 124 working days.

The Lead expert plays a general role of technical coordination ensuring the coherence between network focus and the partner's pilot local actions. Likewise he has to ensure the learning, capitalisation and knowledge production process as a main output of the network working process

These working days are going to be distributed among the following activities:

1. Coordination of the working programme with the Lead partner team along the network life.
2. Coordination with CSTB regarding methodological and conceptual issues.
3. Design and elaboration of the methodological tools regarding thematic seminars, workshops and local actions. Delivering among partners and giving support for its implementation.
4. Upgrading ULSG-LAP Handbook. Support to city partners to implement their road-map at local level.
5. Coordination of the thematic seminars. Preparation of "Position Papers", animating seminars and producing final rapports.
6. Coordination, participation and ensuring production of the 9 workshops grouping 3 cities each one.
7. Animating and following the virtual space (facebook, blog...)
8. Giving technical support to the partner cities when needed.
9. Designing, coordination and producing the case studies catalogue
10. Collecting information and production of the USER best practices handbook
11. Coordination of the Research Paper.
12. Coordination and elaboration of the Final Rapport of the Workshops phase.
13. Giving support to the Lead Partner in the Newsletter production.
14. Elaboration of the User toolbox
15. Elaboration of the Final Conference Rapport.

The LP doesn't plan to call an additional ad hoc expertise by another expert.

2. (VIII.2) Use of the external expertise on the project budget

- GRENOBLE ALPES METROPOLE:

A) Assistance on methodological aspects and deliverables of dissemination by CSTB (French Research Centre which has developed skills on neighbourhood management through a research team specialised on "urban sociology") -external expertise dedicated to the whole partnership.

The CSTB will have 4 main duties :

- 1- Analysis of practices et methodologic needs of partners (in accordance with Lead Expert duties),

2- Enrichment of capitalization process by trainings to help partners to acquire tools = interventions in the 3 first seminars with 3 days of capacity-buildings,

3- Support for the development of a Web platform (as social network) to animate a collaborative work producing good methodologies capitalisation.

4- Assistance for creation of training products (targeted to actual & future practitioners like professionals, politicians, students, inhabitants) adapted to different institutional contexts.

- The CSTB will integrate their participation on their official research programme to ensure a capacity

- This partnership aims to give added value to the all partnership

B) House of inhabitants support for capitalisation and dissemination at local level.

House of inhabitants will co-pilot Grenoble's ULSG and will organise capitalisation for the network.

- PESCARA:

- Delegation to an external body of the tasks of project, financial and administrative coordination.

- LAP / ULSG expertise.

- First Level Control.

- MALAGA:

- Delegation to an external body of the tasks of project, financial and administrative coordination.

- LAP / ULSG expertise.

- LUBLIN:

- Evaluation of local regeneration programme (revision – diagnosis of 4 years implementation, good and bad solutions – mistakes; revision of goals, recommendation to local regeneration programme adjustment),

- LAP / ULSG expertise.

- USERS / interests analysis (stakeholders analysis by the problems),

- Preparation of variant scenarios for chosen 3 most important/problematic places.

- DRESDEN:

- Administrative tasks for co-organisation / coordination of the LSG, also considering that the LSG should be perceived as a "semi-autonomous" entity, not fully governed by municipality

- Expertise of Technical University of Dresden, Institute for Economic & Social Geography to provide surveys, seminars & students' involvement.

- RIGA:

- LAP/ULSG expertise

- Additional studies & hire of external staff assisting in organization of public polls/surveys through the elaboration/implementation of LAP;

- LISBON:

- LAP / ULSG expertise.

- KRAKOW:
 - LAP / ULSG expertise.

- COPENHAGEN:
 - First Level Control.

- IX - (IX) PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. (IX.1) Project work plan

| Objective | Action | Start date | End date | Description | Localization | Main partner | Participating partners | Products | Amount |
|-----------|--------|------------|----------|-------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|----------|--------|
| | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--------------------|
| <p>Work package 1 – Project management</p> | <p>Action 1 - Setting the general administrative framework with the URBACT Secretariate</p> | <p>2013-02-01</p> | <p>2013-03-31</p> | <p>This aspect focuses on the role of the LP with regards to the Urbact Secretariate, on behalf of the full partnership. It deals with setting up the framework (at the beginning of implementation phase) : > Setting up the framework : by the end of March 2013 . Subsidy contract . Joint convention = USER Charter of Commitment . Audit trail documents (for new partners & initial partners in case of changes) . FLC letters of approbation (for partners w/ a decentralized system - initial ones too in case of changes)</p> | | <p>Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community</p> | | <p>1 Subsidy contract - 1 Joint convention / USER Charter of commitment - 1 Audit trail documents - 1 Letters of approval of first level controllers</p> | <p>10,494.00 €</p> |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------|------------|--|----------------------|--|---|--|------------|
| | Action 2 - Carrying out management and coordination with partners | 2013-02-01 | 2015-04-30 | <p>This aspect deals with methods, tools and procedures the LP applies with its partners, in order to then be in a position to succeed in its task vis a vis the URBACT Secretariat. Without a smooth management going on with partners, the overall reporting objective could be compromised. It is therefore a key issue as far as project management is concerned.</p> <p>Mainly, this action consists in :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - holding regular management sessions during seminars (not during all of them, but a strategic selection according to project's life cycle), - sending messages by e-mail when necessary, with enough delay (+ phone calls when easier) - sharing files useful as reporting input, for cities internally/locally, for the LP towards the URBACT Secretariate. | Isère - presentation | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | City of Malaga - City of Pescara - City of Lublin - City of Dresden - City of Copenhagen - Lisbon Municipality - City of Riga - | 1 Management File-sharing platform - 1 USER management LP e-mail account - 4 Management sessions | 5,489.00 € |
|--|---|------------|------------|--|----------------------|--|---|--|------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------|------------|--|------------|--|----|---|--------------|
| | Action 3 - Implementing administrative & financial requirements | 2013-02-01 | 2015-04-30 | This activity consists in : - informing partners on URBACT administrative and financial rules, - having a distant 'follow-up' of administrative & financial work donr by partners (consulting Presage CTE input is one way to base exchanges on), - managing the 6 monthly reporting and the final reporting, - dealing with financial treatment of costs and ERDF corresponding redistribution | Isère - no | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | no | 1 1st General Certificate and statement of expenditure - 1 2nd General Certificate and statement of expenditure - 1 3rd General Certificate and statement of expenditure - 1 4th General Certificate and statement of expenditure - 1 Final certificate & statement of expenditures - 45 Cities certificates & statements of expenditure - 1 1st progress report - 1 2nd progress report - 1 3rd progress report - 1 4th progress report - 1 Final report | 93,014.00 € |
| | | | | | | | | Sub total | 108,997.00 € |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--------------------|
| <p>Work package 2 – Transnational exchange and learning</p> | <p>Action 1 - Step 1 - LEARNING : deepening the thematic focus</p> | <p>2013-02-01</p> | <p>2014-01-31</p> | <p>STEP 1 "LEARNING" (Months 1 to 12) - Deepening the Thematic Focus: 3 thematic seminars: learning and exchange to share objectives and methodologies within the 3 core dimensions of USER: (3 sub-themes based on the baseline study analysis): - Seminar 1 (Copenhagen - March 2013): "more convivial and interactive social spaces to solve dysfunctions and conflicts of uses - Seminar 2 (Riga- July 2013): Safer public spaces in a friendlier city - this seminar will be organise the same week than URBACT Summer University to facilitate participation of USER partners at the Summer University - Seminar 3 (Lisbon - January 2014): cleaner and better maintained public spaces in a more efficient city Each seminar will length 2 days with a common agenda</p> | | <p>Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community</p> | <p>City of Malaga - City of Pescara - City of Lublin - City of Krakow - City of Dresden - City of Copenhagen - Lisbon Municipality - City of Riga -</p> | <p>3 Position papers for thematic seminars - 1 Catalogue of case studies - 27 Contributions of Cities for thematic seminars - 3 Thematic Seminars reports - 3 Organisation of 3 thematic seminars</p> | <p>85,832.00 €</p> |
|---|--|-------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------|------------|--|---|--|--|--|--------------|
| | <p>Action 2 - Step 2 - PRODUCING - Exchanges on progress linked to local experimentations</p> | 2013-10-01 | 2014-11-30 | <p>STEP 2 "PRODUCING" (Months 8 to 20) - exchanges on progress linked to local experimentations: - USER will organize a closer work between 3 groups of 3 Cities with common issues and similar challenges to facilitate comparisons and mutual learning. - Objective to reinforce LAPs definition and implementation in each city, discussion and learning's coming from the LAPs implementation processes, analysis and proposals, coaching the LAPs. - 3 series of 3 Workshops will be organised (9 meetings of 2 days each one): * Work-Shop 1 (in 3 Cities - Oct. 2013), * Work-Shop 2 (in 3 Cities - April 2014), * Work-Shop 3 (in 3 Cities - Nov 2014).</p> | no specific localization - all partners host events | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | <p>City of Malaga - City of Pescara - City of Lublin - City of Dresden - City of Copenhagen - Lisbon Municipality - City of Riga -</p> | <p>1 Presentation of the WorkShop process - 9 WorkShops reports - 18 Perception Reports (by Cities) - 1 Final report of the WorkShop Phase - 9 Organisation of 9 Workshops</p> | 114,442.00 € |
|--|---|------------|------------|--|---|--|--|--|--------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|------------|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|--------------|
| | Action 3 - Step 3 - CONSOLIDATION : producing and finalizing USER findings | 2014-07-01 | 2015-04-30 | STEP 3 "CONSOLIDATION" (Months 18 to 27) : producing and finalizing USER Findings. 3 seminars with the 9 Cities will be organised to consolidate the work done on Steps 1 & 2 and produce findings and contributions at European level: - - Seminar 4 (July 2014 - Krakow) : 1st consolidation seminar (between WS2 and WS3) to discuss guidelines and first results for the consolidation process - Seminar 5 (February 2015 - Paris) 2nd consolidation seminar with only cities Project Teams + URBACT & CSTB - Final Seminar between all 9 cities to finalize common conceptual and methodological findings + FINAL CONFERENCE | No specific localization | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | City of Malaga - City of Pescara - City of Lublin - City of Krakow - City of Dresden - City of Copenhagen - Lisbon Municipality - City of Riga - | 1 Research Paper: "New ways to conceive and manage public spaces in European cities" - 1 A "Concrete method for neighbourhood management Handbook" - 1 USER Best Practices Handbook - 1 Methodological USER Toolbox results - 1 USER FINAL CONFERENCE - 3 Organisation of 3 consolidation seminars - 1 FINAL CONFERENCE | 85,832.00 € |
| | | | | | | | | Sub total | 286,106.00 € |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|--|---|--------------------|
| <p>Work package 3 – Impact on local policies and practices</p> | <p>Action 1 - Launching ULSG & LAP</p> | <p>2013-02-01</p> | <p>2014-03-31</p> | <p>The WP3 is divided in 2 parts corresponding to 2 stages of the process. - The first stage corresponds to the first year of work at local level where each partner has to launch the ULSG and to begin to prepare the LAP, - The first phase will be linked with several deliverables ensuring that all cities are in a process of experimentation and capitalization.</p> | | <p>Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community</p> | | <p>9 Reports of ULSG meetings 1st phase - 9 Mid-term review of Local Action Plans - 9 Partners presentation : state of the art of local practices</p> | <p>95,982.00 €</p> |
|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|--|---|--------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------|------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|--|-------------|
| | Action 2 - Finalizing and presenting LAPs | 2014-04-01 | 2015-04-30 | The WP3 is divided in 2 parts corresponding to 2 stages of the process. - The second stage corresponds to the second year of work at local level where each partner has to finalize the LAP and to produce result of the experimentation on a pilot Site. - The second phase will be linked with several deliverables ensuring that all cities gives the final outputs of local side of the Network. | No specific localization | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | City of Malaga - City of Pescara - City of Lublin - City of Krakow - City of Dresden - City of Copenhagen - Lisbon Municipality - City of Riga - | 9 Catalog of local "good practices" - 9 Final report of ULSC Meetings - 9 LAPs | 94,942.00 € |
| | Action 3 - Participation in the National Capacity Building Scheme | 2013-02-01 | 2014-12-31 | The National Capacity Building Scheme is proposed by URBACT and is a compulsory activity for each network partner. The "Action 3" of the Work Plan has the objective to ensure the Participation of USER partners and to give a feedback of the added value of this "training scheme" | No specific localization | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | City of Malaga - City of Pescara - City of Lublin - City of Krakow - City of Dresden - City of Copenhagen - Lisbon Municipality - City of Riga - | 9 Final report of participation at National Capacity Building Scheme | 43,373.00 € |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|------------|--|---------|--|--|--|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | Sub total | 234,297.00 € |
| Work package 4 – Communication and dissemination | Action 1 - Transnational Communication framework and tools | 2013-02-01 | 2015-04-30 | This action cover organisation and implementation of Communication Startegy by the Lead Partner : - Base of the USER Communication strategy : 1- Data Base 2- Communication Kit 3- Media Coverage 4- Creation and edition of Newsletters Specific events / project giving added value of USER 5- Common Public Event (coordination and production of Final deliverables - Video 6- Coordination of Campus project 7- Coordination of Training project | Isère - | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | | 1 Newsletter 1 - 1 Newsletter 2 - 1 Newsletter 3 - 1 Newsletter 4 - 1 Newsletter 5 - 1 Newsletter 6 - 1 Newsletter 7 - 1 Newsletter 8 - 1 Newsletter 9 - 1 Producing the Video for Public common Event - 1 Creation of USER Communication KIT | 49,700.00 € |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|--|--------------|
| | Action 2 - Communication at partners level | 2013-02-01 | 2015-04-30 | This action covers local requirements for communication + local extra initiatives coming from Cities | No specific localization | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | City of Malaga - City of Pescara - City of Lublin - City of Krakow - City of Dresden - City of Copenhagen - Lisbon Municipality - City of Riga - | 9 Newsletter 1 - 9 Newsletter 2 - 9 Newsletter 3 - 9 Newsletter 4 - 9 Newsletter 5 - 9 Newsletter 6 - 9 Newsletter 7 - 9 Newsletter 8 - 9 Newsletter 9 - 9 Campus project presentation - 9 Training Project Presentation - 9 Broadcast of VIDEO on Local Events | 52,470.00 € |
| | | | | | | | | Sub total | 102,170.00 € |
| | | | | | | | | Total | 731,570.00 € |

- X - (X) PROJECT DELIVERABLES SUMMARY

1. (X.1) Project deliverables summary

| Product | Type | Value | Description |
|---|-----------------|-------|---|
| Position papers for thematic seminars | study | 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State of the art preparing each thematic seminar (from Baseline Study with partners contributions), - Summary of the challenges, objectives , findings expected. - The position papers will be shared with cities partners to better focus - LP / LE |
| Catalogue of case studies | study | 1 | Document linked to the set of problems addressed by the network. These cases will be collected from outside the network and will play the role of relevant references of good practices relating to designing and managing public spaces otherwise. |
| Contributions of Cities for thematic seminars | document | 27 | Contributions of each City for thematic seminar (way to address the issue, state of local practices). These contributions will be framed in a common format and structured to facilitate comparison and benchmarking |
| Thematic Seminars reports | thematic report | 3 | Thematic Seminars results with selection of Cities contributions, presentations of experts, main findings and learning's and main conclusions from each seminars |
| Presentation of the WorkShop process | document | 1 | methodological document precisig the frame, objectives and tools for WorkShops. |

| | | | |
|--|------------------------|----|--|
| WorkShops reports | thematic report | 9 | The reports will emphasize in the comparison, the common and the differential features, and the main challenges that are being faced by the different cities through its LSG and the elaboration of the LAPs |
| Perception Reports (by Cities) | report | 18 | "Perception Reports" a result of the peer reviews process. Cities reviewing other cities will be committed to write a short report with their general and specific perceptions on what is taking place in the reviewed city |
| Final report of the WorkShop Phase | working group | 1 | This report will include the main conclusions of the different workshops with a cross cutting analysis among all the cities |
| Research Paper: "New ways to conceive and manage public spaces in European cities" | dissemination action | 1 | This deliverable is the foreseen output of the proposed systematization and capitalization process. The document is the result of conceptual reflections |
| A "Concrete method for neighbourhood management Handbook" | dissemination action | 1 | An operational version of research paper for practitioners : what lessons learned ? |
| USER Best Practices Handbook | good practice examples | 1 | Examples of best practices selected by the Cities for their quality and repeatability potential by European Cities |
| Partners presentation : state of the art of local practices | study | 9 | Presentation of the 9 Cities to introduce highlight on - how each partner work on the field, - what kind of methods they use, - what results / experiences they could already bring to the network, - what they will implement during the 2 years time |

| | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|---|
| Reports of ULSG meetings 1st phase | local support group | 9 | Reports of all the meetings of the ULSG with main conclusions and decisions (at the end of the first phase and at the end of the overall process). |
| Mid-term review of Local Action Plans | local action plan | 9 | Presenting to each other at what stage they are on the way to define their futur LAP |
| Catalog of local "good practices" | dissemination action | 9 | Catalog of local good practices carried out by the partner cities of USER, as a fruit of the reflection and cooperation within the ULSG. The catalog will highlight all practices that show the new ways to link conception, management and involvement. |
| Final report of ULSG Meetings | local support group | 9 | Reports of all the meetings of the ULSG with main conclusions and decisions at the end of the overall process to conclude the local involvement by a highlight of the work done and the local results of the project. |
| LAPs | local action plan | 9 | Presentation of Local Action Plans at the end of the process : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic goals of the LAP. Towards a new conception and a new management of the city, - Proposals and measures of the LAP, - A system of monitoring, following and evaluation. |
| Final report of participation at National Capacity Building Scheme | partner | 9 | Final report of participation at National Capacity Building Scheme to conclude the process by showing how Cities have participated and what do this project bring to them for implementing the ULSG. |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----|--|
| Methodological USER Toolbox results | web site and collaborative tools | 1 | Methodological USER toolbox results : finalizing the results of the findings produced by the USER toolbox (collective production fo the network |
| USER FINAL CONFERENCE | meeting | 1 | Final Conference : dissemination of the main results of USER in an european level Conference. |
| Newsletter 1 | newsletter | 10 | The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) will summarize topic of next seminar and the development of various projects. + Local version in the language of each partner |
| Newsletter 2 | newsletter | 10 | The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) should summarize topic of the seminar and to the development of various projects + A local version in the language of each partner. |
| Newsletter 3 | newsletter | 10 | The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) should summarize topic of the seminar and to the development of various projects + A local version in the language of each partner. |

| | | | |
|--------------|------------|----|---|
| Newsletter 4 | newsletter | 10 | The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) should summarize topic of the seminar and to the development of various projects + A local version in the language of each partner. |
| Newsletter 5 | newsletter | 10 | The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) should summarize topic of the seminar and to the development of various projects + A local version in the language of each partner. |
| Newsletter 6 | newsletter | 10 | The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) should summarize topic of the seminar and to the development of various projects + A local version in the language of each partner. |
| Newsletter 7 | newsletter | 10 | The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) should summarize topic of the seminar and to the development of various projects + A local version in the language of each partner. |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|----|---|
| Newsletter 8 | newsletter | 10 | The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) should summarize topic of the seminar and to the development of various projects + A local version in the language of each partner. |
| Newsletter 9 | newsletter | 10 | The Lead Partner Newsletter be drafted by one between each seminar or workshop. Joint Newsletter (in English) should summarize topic of the seminar and to the development of various projects + A local version in the language of each partner. |
| Producing the Video for Public common Event | communication tools | 1 | VIDEO FOR PUBLIC COMMON EVENT: Video is the central element of the public event. - Grenoble Alpes Metropole will produce a video, given to partners to broadcastit in a Local Event, |
| Campus project presentation | spin off projects | 9 | - Each 9 Cities are required to develop a prototype of training at local level. They will present results of their work at the last Meeting |
| Training Project Presentation | spin off projects | 9 | - Each 9 Cities are required to develop a prototype of training at local level. They will present results of their work at the last Meeting |
| Broadcast of VIDEO on Local Events | communication tools | 9 | Each will ahve to broadcast the Video during a local event (or more) of their choice. The objective is to present to inhabitants USER |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|
| Creation of USER Communication KIT | communication tools | 1 | -The Communication kit could consist of communication: * USER flyer in English (the translation of the flyer being borne by partners) * Kit stationery (letterhead, envelopes, press kits) * Goodies (notepads, pencils) |
| Subsidy contract | partnership agreement | 1 | Subsidy contract : it is the contractual document which links the Lead Partner to the Urbact programme. It gives the LP the overall responsibility of the project. |
| Joint convention / USER Charter of commitment | partnership agreement | 1 | it is the contractual document which links the Lead Partner to the other partners of the project. It states the commitments and requirements of all partners vis a vis the project. An annex per partner with each city budget will be signed by each partner. The LP adapts this document as the Charter of Commitment to highlight USER-specific expectations. Any specific commitment taken by a partner as regards the transnational dimension of the project will be specified in the annexe (for eg hosting a seminar or leading a workshop group). |

| | | | |
|--|----------|---|--|
| Audit trail documents | document | 1 | It is a sheet that each partner must fill and which contains answers to a series of standard questions regarding project administrative and financial framework and organisation ; it is intended to check the general soundness of the features of project management adopted at city level and also to facilitate potential controls. New partners from phase 2 will have to provide their audit trail document in time for transmittal by LP to the Urbact Secretariate before the end of March 2013. The initial partners of phase 1 already provided an audit trail document which is sufficient, unless changes make a new audit trail document necessary. |
| Letters of approval of first level controllers | document | 1 | FLC are compulsory to carry-out expenditure control of every partner (mainly coherent with the project, budget, eligibility and national rules). For partners from Member States which have not pre-assigned a first level controller (decentralized system), the partner needs to propose a First Level Controller of its choice by filling in a checklist (to test the profile), which it sends to a national approbation body. If the person suits requirements, the national approbation body establishes a letter of approval which is directly sent to the URBACT Secretariate. |
| 1st progress report | report | 1 | Every 6 months, the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) a progress report to explain and show where the project stands in terms of work plan accomplishments and of production of corresponding deliverables. 1st period should be : Feb 2013-Aug 2013 |

| | | | |
|---------------------|--------|---|---|
| 2nd progress report | report | 1 | Every 6 months, the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) a progress report to explain and show where the project stands in terms of work plan accomplishments and of production of corresponding deliverables. 2nd period should be Sep 2013 - Mar 2013 |
| 3rd progress report | report | 1 | Every 6 months, the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) a progress report to explain and show where the project stands in terms of work plan accomplishments and of production of corresponding deliverables. 3rd period should be apr 2014 |
| 4th progress report | report | 1 | Every 6 months, the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) a progress report to explain and show where the project stands in terms of work plan accomplishments and of production of corresponding deliverables. 4th period should be may 2014-> oct 2014 |
| Final report | report | 1 | It is the report which will complete reporting at the end of the project and recompile + synthesize the material from previous progress reports in order to give an overall information on effective project accomplishments throughout implementation phase. |

| | | | |
|--|--------|---|--|
| 1st General Certificate and statement of expenditure | report | 1 | Every 6 months, together with the progress report , the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) the certificate and statement of expenditure which is the 'financial translation' of activities carried out over the given period. It is a compilation of expenditures from all cities (spent and controlled at local level). This is a component - with the progress report - of the payment claim to claim ERDF. |
| 2nd General Certificate and statement of expenditure | report | 1 | Every 6 months, together with the progress report , the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) the certificate and statement of expenditure which is the 'financial translation' of activities carried out over the given period. It is a compilation of expenditures from all cities (spent and controlled at local level). This is a component - with the progress report - of the payment claim to claim ERDF. |
| 3rd General Certificate and statement of expenditure | report | 1 | Every 6 months, together with the progress report , the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) the certificate and statement of expenditure which is the 'financial translation' of activities carried out over the given period. It is a compilation of expenditures from all cities (spent and controlled at local level). This is a component - with the progress report - of the payment claim to claim ERDF. |

| | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----|--|
| 4th General Certificate and statement of expenditure | report | 1 | Every 6 months, together with the progress report , the LP will provide (through Presage CTE) the certificate and statement of expenditure which is the 'financial translation' of activities carried out over the given period. It is a compilation of expenditures from all cities (spent and controlled at local level). This is a component - with the progress report - of the payment claim to claim ERDF. |
| Cities certificates & statements of expenditure | report | 45 | To be created locally in Presage CTE by each project officer, in order to be integrated into the general sheet by the LP for every reporting period. |
| Management File-sharing platform | web site and collaborative tools | 1 | A management file sharing platform : to centralize main URBACT documents & formalized productions of the projects, including communication material : for consultation and downloading purposes ; the place for partners to put their material to feed progress reports. |
| USER management LP e-mail account | web site and collaborative tools | 1 | To 'isolate' USER project exchanges between LP and its partners from any other business. Will facilitate exchnages between an increased number of partners in implementation phase, generating many messages. |
| Final certificate & statement of expenditures | report | 1 | Same as the 6 monthly certificates & statements, only it is to ask for the last ERDF funds of the project (and maybe also allows to summarize all the project expenditures from the beginning). |

| | | | |
|--|---------|---|--|
| Organisation of 3 thematic seminars | meeting | 3 | <p>Organisation of thematic seminar to deepen the focus according to the 3 sub-theme of the project :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copenhagen in Marche 2013, - Riga in July 2013 - Lisbon in January 2014 <p>Conference will lenght 2 day (day 1 knowledge day open to exteranl)</p> |
| Organisation of 9 Workshops | meeting | 9 | <p>Workshops will be organised october 2013, April 2014 and November 2014. They will join 3 groups of 3 Cities to deepen the LAPs and exchanges on difficulties and findings with a peer review process. Each City will host one Workshop.</p> |
| Organisation of 3 consolidation seminars | meeting | 3 | <p>During the 2nd part of the project, 3 Consolidation seminars (July 2014 in Krakow, February 2015 in Paris and April 2015 in Grenoble) will allow to finalize finding of USER and Final outputs of the project to be presented at the Final Conference</p> |
| FINAL CONFERENCE | meeting | 1 | <p>The Final Conference (Grenoble - tbc - in April 2015) will be an open events with an European target with the aim to present results of USER project and exchange on the role of Public Space on the Sustainable City of tomorrow</p> |
| Management sessions | meeting | 4 | <p>During seminars 1,3,4 and 6 : an item on the seminar agenda wil be specifically dedicated to administrative and finacial issues of the project, always with a powerpoint presentation.</p> |

- XI - (XI) PROJECT FINANCE

1. (XI.1) Project finance

ERDF

| Name of partner | ERDF | % ERDF | Public contributor | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|---------------------|---------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | EX ANTE | State | Region | Local | Other public financing | Private | Public total financing | | |
| Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | 135,310.00 € | 70.00 % | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 57,990.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 57,990.00 € | 193,300.00 € | |
| City of Malaga | 64,360.00 € | 80.00 % | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 16,090.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 16,090.00 € | 80,450.00 € | |
| City of Pescara | 64,645.00 € | 70.00 % | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 27,705.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 27,705.00 € | 92,350.00 € | |
| City of Lublin | 37,040.00 € | 80.00 % | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 9,260.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 9,260.00 € | 46,300.00 € | |
| City of Krakow | 36,520.00 € | 80.00 % | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 9,130.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 9,130.00 € | 45,650.00 € | |
| City of Dresden | 60,400.00 € | 80.00 % | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 15,100.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 15,100.00 € | 75,500.00 € | |
| City of Copenhagen | 60,998.00 € | 70.00 % | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 26,142.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 26,142.00 € | 87,140.00 € | |
| Lisbon Municipality | 42,700.00 € | 70.00 % | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 18,300.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 18,300.00 € | 61,000.00 € | |
| City of Riga | 39,904.00 € | 80.00 % | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 9,976.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 9,976.00 € | 49,880.00 € | |
| Sub total | 541,877.00 € | | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 189,693.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 189,693.00 € | 731,570.00 € | |
| Total | 541,877.00 € | 74.07 | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 189,693.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 189,693.00 € | 731,570.00 € | |
| Total % | 74.07 % | 74.07 % | 0.00 % | 0.00 % | 0.00 % | 100.00 % | 0.00 % | 0.00 % | 25.93 % | 100 % | |

2. (XI.2) Legal basis for decision of funding

ERDF

| Name of partner | Public contributor | Total | Legal basis |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------|-------------|
| | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | ERDF | 135,310.00 € | 135,310.00 € | ERDF | | |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | State | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Region | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Local | 57,990.00 € | 57,990.00 € | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | | |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | | | | |
| City of Malaga | ERDF | 64,360.00 € | 64,360.00 € | ERDF | | |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | State | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Region | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Local | 16,090.00 € | 16,090.00 € | City of Malaga | | |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | | | | |
| City of Pescara | ERDF | 64,645.00 € | 64,645.00 € | ERDF | | |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | State | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Region | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Local | 27,705.00 € | 27,705.00 € | City of Pescara | | |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | | | | |
| City of Lublin | ERDF | 37,040.00 € | 37,040.00 € | ERDF | | |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|--|--|
| | State | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Region | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Local | 9,260.00 € | 9,260.00 € | City of Lublin | | |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | | | | |
| City of Krakow | ERDF | 36,520.00 € | 36,520.00 € | ERDF | | |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | State | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Region | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Local | 9,130.00 € | 9,130.00 € | City of Krakow | | |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | | | | |
| City of Dresden | ERDF | 60,400.00 € | 60,400.00 € | ERDF | | |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | State | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Region | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Local | 15,100.00 € | 15,100.00 € | City of Dresden | | |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | | | | |
| City of Copenhagen | ERDF | 60,998.00 € | 60,998.00 € | ERDF | | |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | State | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Region | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Local | 26,142.00 € | 26,142.00 € | City of Copenhagen | | |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Lisbon Municipality | ERDF | 42,700.00 € | 42,700.00 € | ERDF | | |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | State | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Region | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Local | 18,300.00 € | 18,300.00 € | Lisbon Municipality | | |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | | | | |
| City of Riga | ERDF | 39,904.00 € | 39,904.00 € | ERDF | | |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | State | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Region | 0.00 € | | | | |
| | Local | 9,976.00 € | 9,976.00 € | City of Riga | | |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | | | | |

3. (XI.3) Expenditure per year and main budget line

| Expenditure category | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Total | % |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|
| Project coordination | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| Personnel | 110,000.00 € | 124,000.00 € | 41,945.00 € | 275,945.00 € | 37.72 % |
| Meetings organisation | 31,000.00 € | 34,800.00 € | 11,550.00 € | 77,350.00 € | 10.57 % |
| Travel and accommodation | 59,000.00 € | 67,000.00 € | 22,700.00 € | 148,700.00 € | 20.33 % |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------|
| Communication and dissemination | 16,200.00 € | 32,500.00 € | 32,472.00 € | 81,172.00 € | 11.10 % |
| External expertise | 58,500.00 € | 66,000.00 € | 21,903.00 € | 146,403.00 € | 20.01 % |
| Equipment | 2,000.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 2,000.00 € | 0.27 % |
| URBACT Local Support Groups | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| Managing Authorities | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| Total | 276,700.00 € | 324,300.00 € | 130,570.00 € | 731,570.00 € | 100 % |
| % | 37.82 % | 44.33 % | 17.85 % | 100 % | - |

4. (XI.4) Expenditure per year and source

| Contributor nature | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Total | % |
|--------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|
| ERDF | ERDF | 204,952.00 € | 240,200.00 € | 96,725.00 € | 541,877.00 € | 74.07 % |
| | EX ANTE | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | State | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Region | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Local | 71,748.00 € | 84,100.00 € | 33,845.00 € | 189,693.00 € | 25.93 % |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Private | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Swiss Fund | Swiss Fund | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | State | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Region | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Local | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Private | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| Norway Fund | Norway Fund | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | State | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Region | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Local | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Other public financing | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Private | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 % |
| | Total | 276,700.00 € | 324,300.00 € | 130,570.00 € | 731,570.00 € | 100 % |
| | % | 37.82 % | 44.33 % | 17.85 % | 100 % | - |

5. (XI.5) Project cost per budget line

| Expenditure category | Subcategories | Total |
|----------------------|---------------|-------|
| Project coordination | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Personnel | Lead partner project officer | 54,000.00 € |
| | Lead partner financial officer | 27,000.00 € |
| | Lead partner communication officer | 9,000.00 € |
| | Partners internal project management team | 185,945.00 € |
| | Total | 275,945.00 € |
| Meetings organisation | Workshop & seminar meetings | 33,130.00 € |
| | ULSG meetings | 44,220.00 € |
| | Total | 77,350.00 € |
| Travel and accommodation | Lead expert travels | 13,700.00 € |
| | Lead partner travels | 15,950.00 € |
| | Partners travels | 119,050.00 € |
| | Total | 148,700.00 € |
| Communication and dissemination | Lead partner transnational communication | 38,000.00 € |
| | Partners communication | 43,172.00 € |
| | Total | 81,172.00 € |
| External expertise | Externalized project management & coordination | 41,000.00 € |
| | LAP and/or ULSG expertise | 80,398.00 € |
| | First level controls | 5,005.00 € |
| | Transnational expertise | 20,000.00 € |
| | Total | 146,403.00 € |
| Equipment | Equipment needs under work package 3 | 2,000.00 € |
| | Total | 2,000.00 € |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| URBACT Local Support Groups | | |
| Managing Authorities | | |
| | Global budget | 731,570.00 € |

6. (XI.6) Expenditure breakdown per objective and main budget line

| | Work package 1 – Project management | Work package 2 – Transnational exchange and learning | Work package 3 – Impact on local policies and practices | Work package 4 – Communication and dissemination | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------|
| Project coordination | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € |
| Personnel | 62,992.00 € | 95,976.00 € | 95,979.00 € | 20,998.00 € | 275,945.00 € |
| Meetings organisation | 0.00 € | 33,130.00 € | 44,220.00 € | 0.00 € | 77,350.00 € |
| Travel and accommodation | 0.00 € | 137,000.00 € | 11,700.00 € | 0.00 € | 148,700.00 € |
| Communication and dissemination | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 81,172.00 € | 81,172.00 € |
| External expertise | 46,005.00 € | 20,000.00 € | 80,398.00 € | 0.00 € | 146,403.00 € |
| Equipment | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 2,000.00 € | 0.00 € | 2,000.00 € |
| URBACT Local Support Groups | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € |
| Managing Authorities | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € | 0.00 € |

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Total | 108,997.00 € | 286,106.00 € | 234,297.00 € | 102,170.00 € | 731,570.00 € |
|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|

- XII - (XII) DECLARATION OF MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE

1. (XII.1) Declaration of maximum amount of expenditure to be certified at the end of the Development phase

I hereby, as signing person of this Final Application form and on behalf of the Lead Partner, attest on my honour that the project development phase (phase I) will be closed with a total and final certified expenditure (from the beginning until the administrative closure of phase I) that amounts to maximum :

68,430.00 €

This total amount will correspond to the following breakdown per category of expenditure :

| Expenditure category | Total |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| Project coordination | 0.00 € |
| Personnel | 29,450.00 € |
| Meetings organisation | 7,000.00 € |
| Travel and accommodation | 25,280.00 € |
| Communication and dissemination | 4,000.00 € |
| External expertise | 2,700.00 € |
| Equipment | 0.00 € |
| URBACT Local Support Groups | 0.00 € |
| Managing Authorities | 0.00 € |
| Total | 68,430.00 € |

I am aware that, at the end of the development phase (phase I), my project will not be allowed to declare and certify more than the amounts per category of expenditure as indicated in the breakdown table above. All exceeding expenditure will not be accepted by the URBACT II Managing Authority.

I am also aware that the sum between the maximum amount of expenditure that will be claimed for phase I and the proposed budget for the implementation phase (phase II) must not exceed the ceiling established for the maximum budget of a thematic network.

- XIII - (XIII) BANK INFORMATION**1. (XIII.1) Bank information**

| Partner | | Bank info. |
|---|--------------------|---|
| Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community | Bank name | BANQUE DE FRANCE- GRENOBLE TRESORERIE DE GRENOBLE MUNICIPALE |
| | Adress | 8-10 avenue Doyen Louis WEIL 496 38016 GRENOBLE CEDEX 1 |
| | Bank code | 30001 |
| | Account number | C3800000000 |
| | IBAN number | FR76 3000 1004 19C3 8000 0000 075 |
| | SWIFT number | BDFEFRPPCT |
| | Internal reference | cle RIB 75 |
| | Account holder | Trésorerie de Grenoble Municipale |
| City of Malaga | Bank name | BBVA |
| | Adress | Marqués de Larios, 14- 1ª planta |
| | Bank code | 0182 5918 47 |
| | Account number | 0000779451 |
| | IBAN number | ES63 |
| | SWIFT number | BBVA ESMM XXX |
| | Internal reference | |
| | Account holder | AYTO. MÁLAGA |
| City of Pescara | Bank name | Caripe spa |
| | Adress | Corso Vittorio Emanuele, 102 |
| | Bank code | 65122 |
| | Account number | 340 |
| | IBAN number | IT27M0624515410000000000340 |
| | SWIFT number | BPALIT41251 |
| | Internal reference | |
| | Account holder | COMUNE DI PESCARA |
| City of Lublin | Bank name | Polska Kasa Opieki SA |
| | Adress | Ul. Krolewsja 20-109 Lublin Poland |
| | Bank code | |

| | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | Account number | 50 1240 1503 1111 0010 0125 3585 |
| | IBAN number | PL50 1240 1503 1111 0010 0125 3585 |
| | SWIFT number | PKOPPLPW |
| | Internal reference | |
| | Account holder | Urząd miasta Lublin |
| City of Krakow | Bank name | |
| | Adress | |
| | Bank code | |
| | Account number | |
| | IBAN number | |
| | SWIFT number | |
| | Internal reference | |
| | Account holder | |
| City of Dresden | Bank name | Ostsächsische Sparkasse Dresden |
| | Adress | Guntzplatz 5, 01307 Desden GERMANY |
| | Bank code | 85050300 |
| | Account number | 3120000018 |
| | IBAN number | DE67850503003120000018 |
| | SWIFT number | OSDDDE81 |
| | Internal reference | ST61139999 |
| | Account holder | Landeshauptstadt Dresden |
| City of Copenhagen | Bank name | Danske Bank |
| | Adress | Holmens Kanal 2-12 |
| | Bank code | 3100 |
| | Account number | 0007087500 |
| | IBAN number | DK3730000007087500 |
| | SWIFT number | DABADKKK |
| | Internal reference | |
| | Account holder | |
| Lisbon Municipality | Bank name | Caixa Geral de Depósitos |
| | Adress | Rua do Ouro n.º 49 1100-060 Lisboa |
| | Bank code | |
| | Account number | 0697588546939 |

| | | |
|--------------|--------------------|--|
| | IBAN number | PT50 0035 0697 0058 |
| | SWIFT number | CDGIP TLP |
| | Internal reference | URBACT II projecto USER |
| | Account holder | Município de Lisboa |
| City of Riga | Bank name | Nordea Bank Finland Plc Latvijas filiāle |
| | Adress | K. Valdemara St. 62, Riga, LV-1013, Latvia |
| | Bank code | |
| | Account number | LB310101800 |
| | IBAN number | LV47NDEA0030101130013 |
| | SWIFT number | NDEALV2X |
| | Internal reference | |
| | Account holder | Riga City Council Finance Department |

- XIV - (XIV) DETAILED INFORMATION ON THE LEAD PARTNER AND PROJECT PARTNERS

1. (XIV.1) Detailed information on the Lead partner and Project partners

Lead Partner Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Partner Institution | Grenoble Alpes Metropole agglomeration community |
| Address | Le Forum 3, rue Malakoff |
| Postcode | 38031 |
| City | GRENOBLE cedex 01 |
| Area | Rhône-Alpes |
| Country | FRANCE |

Contact list

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Name | Ms PREDAL Claire |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | Territorial Cohesion (within Solidarity Department) |
| Function | |
| Phone number | |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |

| | |
|-------|--|
| Email | |
|-------|--|

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Name | M. TOURNAIRE Guillaume |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | Territorial strategy |
| Function | Project coordinator |
| Phone number | + 33 4 76 59 57 06 |
| Mobile phone | + 33 6 29 75 72 79 |
| Fax | |
| Email | guillaume.tournaire@lametro.fr |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Name | Ms CASTELLO Elodie |
| Type | Finance Officer |
| Service | Management service of Solidarity Department |
| Function | Administrative and financial manager |
| Phone number | + 33 4 76 59 58 29 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | elodie.castello@lametro.fr |

| | |
|--------------|----------------------------------|
| Name | M. REDON Jean-Christophe |
| Type | Certifying Body |
| Service | Financial Auditing |
| Function | Financial auditor |
| Phone number | + 33 4 76 59 40 02 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | jean-christophe.redon@lametro.fr |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Name | M. CAEN Simon |
| Type | Local coordinator |
| Service | Territorial Cohesion |
| Function | Metro Officer specializing in deprived areas neighborhood management |
| Phone number | + 33 4 76 59 57 09 |
| Mobile phone | |

| | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Fax | |
| Email | simon.caen@lametro.fr |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Name | M. RUIZ Eric |
| Type | Local coordinator |
| Service | Territorial Cohesion (within Solidarity Department) |
| Function | Head of Territorial Cohesion service |
| Phone number | + 33 4 76 59 57 80 |
| Mobile phone | + 33 6 25 25 93 98 |
| Fax | |
| Email | eric.ruiz@lametro.fr |

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Name | M. GUERIN Valerie |
| Type | Communication Officer |
| Service | Communication department |
| Function | communication projects officer |
| Phone number | + 33 4 76 59 56 43 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | valerie.guerin@lametro.fr |

Partner City of Malaga

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Partner Institution | City of Malaga |
| Address | Avenida Cervantes, 4 |
| Postcode | 29016 |
| City | MALAGA |
| Area | Andalucía |
| Country | SPAIN |

Contact list

| | |
|----------|---------------------|
| Name | Ms OLIVA Begoña |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | European Programme |
| Function | Project officer |

| | |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| Phone number | +34 951 928 833 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | programaseuropeos3@malaga.eu |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Name | Ms ALCARAZO Maria Dolores |
| Type | Local coordinator |
| Service | Social Services in historical Centre District |
| Function | Technician |
| Phone number | +34 951 927 807 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Name | M. GIL Cristobal |
| Type | Local coordinator |
| Service | Social Services in historical Centre District |
| Function | Director Social Services CENTRE |
| Phone number | +34 951 927 815 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | |

| | |
|--------------|---------------------|
| Name | M. MARÍN Pedro |
| Type | Local coordinator |
| Service | European Programmes |
| Function | |
| Phone number | +34 951 928 833 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | +34 951 926 646 |
| Email | |

Partner City of Pescara

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| Partner Institution | City of Pescara |
|---------------------|-----------------|

| | |
|----------|-------------------|
| Address | Piazza Italia n.1 |
| Postcode | 65121 |
| City | PESCARA |
| Area | Abruzzo |
| Country | ITALY |

Contact list

| | |
|--------------|----------------------|
| Name | M. MOLISANI Marco |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | Cabinet of the mayor |
| Function | Director |
| Phone number | 00 39 854 283 608 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | |

| | |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| Name | Ms ANTONIOLI Piera |
| Type | Finance Officer |
| Service | European Policies Department |
| Function | Financial officer |
| Phone number | 00 39 854 283 732 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | + 39 0854 283 299 |

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------|
| Name | M. MORELLI Nevio |
| Type | Local coordinator |
| Service | Town planning department |
| Function | Town planning Officer |
| Phone number | 00 39 854 283 608 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | |

Partner City of Lublin

| | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Partner Institution | City of Lublin |
| Address | |
| Postcode | |
| City | |
| Area | Lubelskie |
| Country | POLAND |

Contact list

| | |
|--------------|------------------------------------|
| Name | M. KLOS Monika |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | Non-investment Projects Department |
| Function | Deputy director of service |
| Phone number | |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | mklos@lublin.eu |

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Name | M. SZELAG Joanna |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | International cooperation unit |
| Function | Manager |
| Phone number | |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | jszelag@lublin.eu |

| | |
|--------------|----------------------|
| Name | M. GRZESZCZUK Daniel |
| Type | Local coordinator |
| Service | |
| Function | |
| Phone number | |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | |

Partner City of Krakow

| | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Partner Institution | City of Krakow |
| Address | |
| Postcode | |
| City | |
| Area | Malopolskie |
| Country | POLAND |

Contact list

| | |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| Name | Ms BIERNAT Natalia |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | |
| Function | |
| Phone number | |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | Natalia.Biernat@um.krakow.pl |

| | |
|--------------|----------------------------|
| Name | Ms MYSONA-MOZDZIERZ Monika |
| Type | Finance Officer |
| Service | |
| Function | |
| Phone number | |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | |

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Name | Ms PISKIEWICZ-BYCZYNSKA Beata |
| Type | Local coordinator |
| Service | |
| Function | |
| Phone number | |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | |

Partner City of Dresden

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Partner Institution | City of Dresden |
| Address | City Planning Office, Urban renewal Section, P.O. Box 120020 |
| Postcode | D-01001 |
| City | Dresden |
| Area | Dresden |
| Country | GERMANY |

Contact list

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Name | M. BULS Bruno |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | City Planning Office Urban Renewal section |
| Function | project coordinator |
| Phone number | + 49 351 488 3509 |
| Mobile phone | + 49 172 3403921 |
| Fax | + 49 351 488 3816 |
| Email | BBuls@dresden.de |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Name | Ms SUREK Jutta |
| Type | Finance Officer |
| Service | City Planning Office, Legal & administration section |
| Function | Officer in charge of budget |
| Phone number | + 49 351 488 3412 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | + 49 351 488 3813 |
| Email | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Name | Ms SUREK Jutta |
| Type | Finance Officer |
| Service | City Planning Office, Legal & administration section |
| Function | Officer in charge of budget |
| Phone number | + 49 351 488 3412 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | + 49 351 488 3813 |

| | |
|-------|--|
| Email | |
|-------|--|

Partner City of Copenhagen

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| Partner Institution | City of Copenhagen |
| Address | Bernstorffsgade 17 |
| Postcode | 1592 |
| City | Copenhagen V |
| Area | Danmark |
| Country | DENMARK |

Contact list

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Name | Ms BOESEN Sia |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | Technical and Environmental Administration |
| Function | Project manager |
| Phone number | +45 3263 0290 |
| Mobile phone | +45 51626278 |
| Fax | |
| Email | A32Z@tmf.kk.dk |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Name | M. LEONARSEN Øystein |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | Tecnical and Environmental Administration |
| Function | Head of secretariat |
| Phone number | +45 3263 0290 |
| Mobile phone | +45 20546919 |
| Fax | |
| Email | oysleo@tmf.kk.dk |

Partner Lisbon Municipality

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Partner Institution | Lisbon Municipality |
| Address | Praça do Município n.º 1 |
| Postcode | 1100 |

| | |
|---------|----------|
| City | Lisboa |
| Area | Lisboa |
| Country | PORTUGAL |

Contact list

| | |
|--------------|---------------------------|
| Name | M. BRITO Miguel |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | GT BIP/ZIP |
| Function | Project manager |
| Phone number | + 35 21 322 73 60 |
| Mobile phone | +351 96 280 05 05 |
| Fax | |
| Email | miguel.brito@cm-lisboa.pt |

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Name | M. AGOSTINHO Santiago |
| Type | Finance Officer |
| Service | GT BIP/ZIP |
| Function | Finance officer |
| Phone number | + 35 21 326 12 02 |
| Mobile phone | |
| Fax | |
| Email | ricardo.santiago@cm-lisboa.pt |

Partner City of Riga

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Partner Institution | City of Riga |
| Address | |
| Postcode | |
| City | |
| Area | Latvija |
| Country | LATVIA |

Contact list

| | |
|---------|--------------------------|
| Name | Ms KOTOVICA Nika |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | Urban economics dividion |

| | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| Function | Head - Project Administrative officer |
| Phone number | 371 6718 1424 |
| Mobile phone | + 371 2922 6404 |
| Fax | + 371 6701 2922 |
| Email | nika.kotovica@riga.lv |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Name | M. KUSKIS Aigars |
| Type | Project Coordinator |
| Service | Historic Centre Planning Division |
| Function | Chief territorial planner, deputy head |
| Phone number | +371 6703 7936 |
| Mobile phone | + 371 2927 6491 |
| Fax | + 371 6701 2922 |
| Email | aigars.kuskis@riga.lv |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Name | Ms EISAKA Marita |
| Type | Finance Officer |
| Service | Urban Economics Division |
| Function | Deputy Head of Urban Economics Division |
| Phone number | +371 6703 7771 |
| Mobile phone | + 371 2943 8916 |
| Fax | + 371 6701 2922 |
| Email | |

- XV - (XV) SIGNATURE

1. (XV.1) Signature of the Lead Partner / project coordinator and of the Elected representative

Signature of the Lead Partner / project coordinator :

Name (capital letters) :

Position :

Date :

Signature of the Elected representative

Name (capital letters) :

Position :

Date :

Official stamp

- XVI - (XVI) ANNEX 1

1. (XVI.1) ANNEX 1 – Eligibility criteria for final application for thematic networks

- o□ The proposal is submitted respecting the procedure outlined in the call for proposals and within 6 months from approval by the Monitoring Committee for Thematic networks.
- o□ The proposal is complete in terms of number of documents required and includes the Final Application. The list of required documents will be provided to approved projects, along with guidelines for Final Application. It will include a letter of commitment for the Lead partner and 1 letter of commitment per partner (all letters shall be signed by an elected representative when appropriate).
- o□ The proposal is complete in terms of information and data required in the documents (all sections in the Final Application, letters of commitment and other documents have been properly filled in according to the instructions).
- o□ All the documents required are signed, dated and stamped by the candidate partners.
- o□ The proposal refers to a project bringing together a minimum of 8 and a maximum of 12 public authorities, from at least 3 Member and Partner States, which have designated a city as candidate lead partner.
- o□ The proposed partnership is balanced in terms of geographical origin with candidate partners from both Convergence objective regions and Competitiveness objective regions. The balance is set at 50% Convergence – 50 % Competitiveness in the case of an even number of partners; 50% +1 Convergence or 50%+1 Competitiveness in the case of an odd number of partners. Partners from Norway and Switzerland shall not be taken into account when setting this balance.
- o□ The proposed partnership does not include more than 3 non-city partners.
- o□ All candidate partners are beneficiaries of the programme as defined in the Operational Programme.
- o□ The candidate partners are not partners in more than one existing URBACT II project.
- o□ The candidate lead partner is not Lead partner in an existing URBACT II project.
- o□ The proposal addresses one of the topics defined for this call for proposals in terms of thematic coverage.
- o□ Regarding the budget, the sum between the maximum amount of expenditure that will be claimed for phase I and the proposed budget for the implementation phase (phase II) must not exceed the ceiling established for the maximum budget of a thematic network.

- XVII - (XVII) ANNEX 2**1. (XVII.1) ANNEX 2 - Realisation indicators**

Group of indicators : project Call 3

| Indicator | | Target |
|---|--------------|-----------------------|
| Specific indicators of the priority | | |
| Number of transnational Exchange and Learning Seminars held by approved projects | Quantitative | 7 (meeting) |
| Number of Male participants in Local Support Groups set up by partners involved in completed projects (55% of 2475) | Quantitative | 55 (male) |
| Number of Female participants in Local Support Groups set up by partners involved in completed projects (45% of 2475) | Quantitative | 45 (female) |
| Number of Local Action Plans having secured funding for the implementation of all or part of their plan | Quantitative | 6 (local action plan) |
| % of Local Action Plans securing Structural Fund assistance (ERDF or ESF Operational programmes) | Quantitative | 6 (%) |
| % of Local Action Plans partially or fully implemented in the programme period | Quantitative | 33 (%) |