

UIA Final Qualitative Report

Fields marked with * are mandatory.



Final Qualitative Report

Dear Project Coordinator,

As stated in the UIA Guidance and in the Subsidy Contract, all closed UIA projects shall deliver, one year after the official end date of the Implementation phase, a Final Qualitative Report.

The aim of this report is to collect qualitative feedback from the perspective of the Main Urban Authority about your experiences of implementing an UIA Project.

You are requested to provide your qualitative feedback on the following dimensions:

- **Operational challenges encountered during the implementation phase**
- **Main results achieved during the year since the official end of the UIA projects**
- **Long-term sustainability and scalability of your UIA project**
- **Overall impressions on the levels of innovation, involvement of local stakeholders and measurability**
- **Overall added value that UIA has brought to your city**

Your honest replies to the different questions will be greatly valuable for us to better understand your experience in leading an UIA project and the added value that such a mechanism can bring to European cities. This is a knowledge that the Permanent Secretariat

will use to feed in the ongoing reflections on how to improve the Initiative in the future but it could also be used to inspire other cities as part of the Knowledge Management activities. This is why the report as such will not be shared publicly but some answers might be used for capitalisation purposes.

Please keep in mind that the Final Qualitative Report does not replace any of the compulsory final administrative documents that you are requested to submit as part of the closure procedure of your UIA Project (final Annual Progress Report, Financial Claim, etc.) We remain at your disposal throughout the process – do not hesitate to contact your lead officer for assistance on any issue that will come up.

The UIA Permanent Secretariat

MUA & Project Information

* Main Urban Authority

City of Lahti

* Project

CitiCAP

* EU Member State

FI - Finland

* First and last name of the person filling the FQR

Anna Huttunen

* Email

anna.huttunen@lahti.fi

1. Feedback on challenges during the implementation phase

In this section, the MUA is asked to provide its final feedback on the [7 pre-identified operational challenges](#) (and additional ones identified by the project) faced during the implementation of your project.

In detail, the MUA is asked to identify in what way and for how long each challenge affected the project implementation, how the project managed to overcome them and what are the lessons learnt in regard to each challenge.

The challenges are those identified at the beginning of the project (and updated during the implementation phase) and analysed by the UIA Expert in the Journals and Zoom in. To fill in this section the MUA should refer to the UIA Experts's analysis and if needed consult him/her.

*** Challenge:**

between 2 and 7 choices

- 1. Leadership
- 2. Public procurement
- 3. Participative approach for co-implementation
- 4. Organisational arrangements within the urban authority (cross-department working)
- 5. Monitoring and evaluation
- 6. Communication with target beneficiaries and users
- 7. Upscaling

*** Challenge 1 - Leadership**

Brief description of the challenge for your particular project

Text of 100 to 800 characters will be accepted

Political acceptance and leadership for implementation of the project activities. Collaboration across a range of city departments to ensure coordination of the SUMP and Master Plan process.

*** Intensity: how intense was this challenge for the city to implement its solution?**

at most 1 choice(s)

- Not intense or of minimal intensity
- Average intensity
- Strong intensity
- Very strong intensity

*** Temporality: how has the challenged evolved over time?**

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

*** Overcoming: how difficult was it to deal with this particular challenge?**

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

*** Solution: what solution did you implement to overcome this challenge?**

1000 character(s) maximum

New council was elected the same year the project started and their commitment was strong to implement the project. Further on, the appointment of Lahti as the EU Green Capital for 2021 and the commitment to be carbon neutral, has helped to raise the profile of the project within the city. CitiCAP was also one of the key elements of the application which of course helped the implementation.

- * Level of learning: how deeper its understanding of and capacity to deal with this challenge is after the project implementation?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Same as before or insignificant
- Average
- Significant
- Very significant

- * Lessons learnt: what are the lessons learnt because of dealing with this particular challenge and applying the solution to overcome it?

1000 character(s) maximum

Timing of our project was the right one. Currently, after the selection of the new council the political support would not be as strong as it is now.

* Challenge 2: Public Procurement

Description

Text of 100 to 800 characters will be accepted

1. Procurement and time management risk:
The risk of legal complains for the procurement of bicycle lane investment.

- * Intensity: how intense was this challenge for the city to implement its solution?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Not intense or of minimal intensity
- Average intensity
- Strong intensity
- Very strong intensity

- * Temporality: how the challenge evolved over time?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

- * Overcoming: how difficult was it to deal with this particular challenge?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality

- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

* Solution: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge (nb of characters limited?)

1000 character(s) maximum

This challenge evolved differently than envisioned. When we first opened the tender process, we did not get any offers that we could have accepted. The second round was more succesful and we got to construct the bicycle highway. However the construction was more expensive than was budgeted and city of course took the costs that exceeded the budget - this, of course has been later on critized by some decision makers.

* Level of learning: how deeper is your understanding of; and capacity to deal with this challenge after the project implementation?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Same as before or insignificant
- Average
- Significant
- Very significant

* Lessons learnt: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge

1000 character(s) maximum

It is hard to estimate the cost of infrastructure, because the price depends on the current markets. Don't know though what would be the learning here. Estimate the costs to be higher?

* Challenge 3: Participative approach for co-implementation

Description

Text of 100 to 800 characters will be accepted

Participation is one of the core themes of the project. Challenge is related to achieving the high level of participation across different stakeholders and reaching the critical mass for PCT market. However, the open process with regards to the bicycle highway planning should not hinder the project implementation within the project's lifetime.

* Intensity: how intense was this challenge for the city to implement its solution?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Not intense or of minimal intensity
- Average intensity
- Strong intensity
- Very strong intensity

* Temporality: how the challenge evolved over time?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)

- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

* Overcoming: how difficult was it to deal with this particular challenge?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

* Solution: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge (nb of characters limited?)

1000 character(s) maximum

Participation has been in the core during the whole project. This "challenge" was overcome with good communication, use of different participation methods and social media marketing. We organised several events for the citizens during the project and of course the app itself created a way for the citizens to participate. We were able to reach the estimated amount of people despite the fact that the covid pandemic made it more difficult to reach out to people any other than digital ways. The public consultation of the bicycle highway was a bit trickier in the end, but this was also solved with some changes in the plan.

* Level of learning: how deeper is your understanding of; and capacity to deal with this challenge after the project implementation?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Same as before or insignificant
- Average
- Significant
- Very significant

* Lessons learnt: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge

1000 character(s) maximum

You need different tools to engage and reach the citizens (also in this constantly changing world). You need to be able to explain things well and simplify topics such as the PCT in order to get people on board.

* **Challenge 4: Organisational arrangements within the urban authority (cross-department working)**

Description

Text of 100 to 800 characters will be accepted

Challenge of having all needed city departments on board to develop the SUMP, identify the needed measures and commit to the implementation of the measures also after the SUMP has been accepted by the council.

* Intensity: how intense was this challenge for the city to implement its solution?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Not intense or of minimal intensity
- Average intensity
- Strong intensity

Very strong intensity

* Temporality: how the challenge evolved over time?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

* Overcoming: how difficult was it to deal with this particular challenge?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

* Solution: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge (nb of characters limited?)

1000 character(s) maximum

This was not a problem in the project. The needed stakeholders were involved in the clearly outlined Lahti Direction (Master Plan and SUMP process). The regional transport organisation LSL is also part of the city organisation which made also their involvement easy.

* Level of learning: how deeper is your understanding of; and capacity to deal with this challenge after the project implementation?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Same as before or insignificant
- Average
- Significant
- Very significant

* Lessons learnt: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge

1000 character(s) maximum

Integrating the SUMP development with the Master Plan was a great approach since it created a clear process and timeline for the development work.

* **Challenge 5: Monitoring and evaluation**

Description

Text of 100 to 800 characters will be accepted

How to ensure the quality and quantity of the data gathered. How to measure the success of the project with the identified indicators.

* Intensity: how intense was this challenge for the city to implement its solution?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Not intense or of minimal intensity
- Average intensity
- Strong intensity
- Very strong intensity

* Temporality: how the challenge evolved over time?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

* Overcoming: how difficult was it to deal with this particular challenge?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

* Solution: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge (nb of characters limited?)

1000 character(s) maximum

We clarified the indicators during the project and were able make the indicator set to fit with the expectations. To ensure the quality of the data for the PCT reserach we collected also baseline data before the launch of the the actual app.

* Level of learning: how deeper is your understanding of; and capacity to deal with this challenge after the project implementation?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Same as before or insignificant
- Average
- Significant
- Very significant

* Lessons learnt: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge

1000 character(s) maximum

It is hard to define the monitoring plan before the project start so it it would be better to define it only after the project is already running.

*** Challenge 7: Upscaling**

Description

Text of 100 to 800 characters will be accepted

To gather interested cities and furthermore gather cities that would have the financial possibility to strat drafting and later on implementing something similar for their city, since no financial resources are allocated for the upscaling and replication. Also the technical limitations for the replication were identified.

* Intensity: how intense was this challenge for the city to implement its solution?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Not intense or of minimal intensity
- Average intensity
- Strong intensity
- Very strong intensity

* Temporality: how the challenge evolved over time?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

* Overcoming: how difficult was it to deal with this particular challenge?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Irrelevant for the project of of minimal temporality
- Problematic in the beginning of the project (<1year)
- Problematic for a certain amount of time (1 to 2 years)
- Problematic for the most of the project (2 to 3 years)

* Solution: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge (nb of characters limited?)

1000 character(s) maximum

It was no challenge to get cities engaged to follow our progress. Since we could not just share the app for free for all interested cities we shared the learnings and results of our pilot. More funds and resurces for the replication work would be needed.

* Level of learning: how deeper is your understanding of; and capacity to deal with this challenge after the project implementation?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Same as before or insignificant
- Average
- Significant
- Very significant

* Lessons learnt: brief description of the solution implemented to overcome the challenge

1000 character(s) maximum

It would be good to have funding also for the replication and resources to start the work with 1-2 follower cities almost in the beginning of the project to ensure their full engagement.

Any other challenge

- Challenge 8
- Challenge 9

2. Results and impacts one year after

In this section, the MUA is asked to report its final feedback on results and impacts achieved by the project one year after the official end date of the implementation phase.

This section is important to analyse the capacity of the project to continue contributing to the achievement of expected results and impacts, while providing important information on its medium term sustainability. This section is even more important for those projects that, due to delays during the implementation phase, have been obliged to reduce the testing phase of the innovative solutions during the 3 years of implementation.

Three levels of information are requested in this section:

- a) updated figures on the results indicators listed in the last Annual Progress report. In order to be able to aggregate and consolidated results indicators, it is compulsory to report on the exact same result indicators as per APR3
- b) information and figures related to any potential additional (collateral or unintentional) results that were observed after the project's end
- c) qualitative information on if and how achieved results and impacts have changed (or will change) policy-making at city-level.

It is compulsory to report at least on the same indicators listed in the last APR. For each indicators, all field of the matrix are compulsory.

* 2.1 Result and results indicators (as per last submitted APR)

- Result 1
- Result 2
- Result 3
- Result 4
- Result 5
- Result 6
- Result 7
- Result 8
- Result 9
- Result 10

Result 1

	Name	Description	Target Value	Value - Baseline	Value - End of the project activities	Value – End of year 4	Do you believe this indicator will keep evolving in the years to come?	If yes, how do you foresee the evolution of this indicators in the next 3-5 years?
Result indicator 1	Urs of the PCT app	mount of users reached for the PCTapplication after launch 09/2019. Target value is the amount of users.	1300	0	2850	0	no	
Result indicator 2	Consumer/mobility services	Amount of newconsumer / mobility services evolved in Lahti bythe end of the project. Target value is the amount.	5	0	5	6	yes	there will plenty of new mobility services in the coing years
Result indicator 3	Three follower cities for PCTtrial	Three follower cities committed for the PCTtrial bythe end of 2020. Target value is the number of cities.	3	0	3	N/A	No more, but there has been plenty of interest among cities towards our approach.	

Result indicator 4	Newintegrated SUMP plan agreed in the City council by2020.	Newintegrated SUMP plan agreed in the City council by2020.	1	0	1	1	in the sense that now the second SUMP round is running	this round is an update and follow up round and we will add measures regarding urban logistics etc.
Result indicator 5	PCTdata platform in use by09/2019.	Five (5) newopen mobilitydata sets published by2019. Target value is the amount of datasets.	5	0	5	7	yes the more mobility services there will be, more data will also be available	

Result 2

	Name	Description	Target Value	Value - Baseline	Value - End of the project activities	Value – End of year 4	Do you believe this indicator will keep evolving in the years to come?	If yes, how do you foresee the evolution of this indicators in the next 3-5 years?
Result indicator 1	Personal carbon trading system and application presented to international conference audience	PCTscheme disseminated in two major international mobility conferences bythe end of 2020. Target value is the amount of conferences.	3		5	6	There are still presentations coming up about citicap results, but probably slowly decreasing	
Result indicator 2	Change in the app users' CO2 emissions from mobility	Change in the app users' CO2 emissions from mobilityduring the pilot phase in 2020. Target value: percentage (%)	25	baseline 21,5 kgco2ekv/week	33,33	probably the same	Hopefully yes! The work does not stop to decrease the carbon emission on mobility.	There will me new measures and regulation implemented, the increase in fossil fuel prices will have an positive impact on the emissions.
Result indicator 3	PCTreceives positive feedback and interest among users	70 %positive feedback by2020 and interest among PCTusers	70	70	70	n/A	the scheme is not running anymore	

Result indicator 4	Change in the modal split/km travelled / walking among app users	Modal share/km based on mobility detection data of the app. Target value: achieved %	5	4,3%	6		the scheme is not running anymore	
Result indicator 5	Change in the modal split/ km travelled / cycling among app users	Modal share/km based on mobility detection data of the app. Target value: achieved %	7	4,9%	8	n/a	the schme is not running anymore	

Result 3

	Description	Target Value	Value - Baseline	Value - End of the project activities	Value – End of year 4	Do you believe this indicator will keep evolving in the years to come?	If yes, how do you foresee the evolution of this indicators in the next 3-5 years?
Result indicator 1	Change in the modal split / km travelled / public transportation among app users. Modal share/km based on mobility detection data of the app. Target value: achieved %	30%	25,9%	16%	16%	hopefully the covid related changes in PT use will decrease	
Result indicator 2	Decreased number of non-occupied Store spaces near the main bicycle highway	30	98	30%	30%	Yes,it will change, because the whole sector is transforming. The future of retail sector.	
Result indicator 3	Fewer official complains of the Lahti direction process in draft and proposal phase in comparison to the previous round	15	15 complaints in 2015	20	n/A		

Result indicator 4	App user perception of their behavioural change towards sustainable mobility. More than 50%of the users have a positive perception about their behavioural change towards sustainable mobility	50		50	n/a	not in use	
Result indicator 5	App user perception of equityof PCTscheme. More than 75%of the users have a positive perception of equitywithin the PCTscheme	75	before implementation	91	n/a	not in use	

* **2.2 How would you describe the main failure of your project?** (e.g. key results not achieved; substantial changes in the original approach; limited political support; limited benefits for target beneficiaries; etc.)

We did not succeed in finding funding for the further development work of the app. Otherwise we were able to implement all the measures despite covid and other challenges.

2.3 Additional results: the project is asked to report on any additional results that were not reported in the APRs and were only appearing to the project in Year 4.

- Result 1
- Result 2
- Result 3
- Result 4
- Result 5

Additional result 1

	Name	Description	Value - end of year 4	Do you believe this indicator will keep evolving in the years to come?	If yes, how do you foresee the evolution of this indicators in the next 3-5 years?
Result indicator 1.1	Implementation of the city bike system	One of the core measures of the SUMP has been the implementation of the city bike system by 2022.	implemented		
Result indicator 1.2	Gobo projected traffic signs	Decision to implement the gobo projected traffic signs on all new main cycling routes	1	yes	we are currently drafting the investment prioritization plan for the main cycling routes
Result indicator 1.3					
Result indicator 1.4					
Result indicator 1.5					

3. Policy-related questions: the project is asked to answer four policy-related questions.

- * Q1: How has or will policy-making process in regard to your topic be influenced or changed as a result of the city's involvement in the implementation of this project?

1000 character(s) maximum

Having the SUMP accepted by the city council offers a good backbone to implement the sustainable mobility measures. It is now officially part of the Lahti Direction process and will be updated and developed further accordingly.

- * Q2: What was the added value of the project to the policy area concerned? How local/regional/national policies were influenced by the results of the project?

1000 character(s) maximum

Politically the SUMP influence has been remarkable. Lahti's SUMP is serving as the base for all other cities in the region and the regional plan has been built based on Lahti's SUMP.

- * Q3: Has the implementation of your UIA project encouraged you to invest and take the risk to test new solutions and to innovate in other policy areas?

1000 character(s) maximum

Yes, there is a lot going on also on other sectors, such as circular economy, sustainable building etc. and definitely CitiCAP has led by example that innovating is good for the city. Also, we are now involved in a Horizon project Campaigners where we develop a sustainable lifestyle challenge app for the citizens. That can be seen as a continuation to CitiCAP since we can also bring our dos' and donts' on the table.

- * Q4: Has the implementation of your UIA project resulted into new forms of governance or working methods within the MUA that are more favourable to innovation?

1000 character(s) maximum

The city was already pretty innovative at that stage. And of course during the EGCA year a plenty of innovative projects and actions took place. Maybe even more colleagues see now the possibilities that the university cooperation can bring to their work.

3. Sustainability, scalability and transferability of the project

In this section, the MUA is asked to report on how the sustainability and the scalability of the project have progressed over the last year since the official end of the implementation phase. This sections focuses on the three following aspects:

- **Sustainability of the project:** the ability and capacity of the consortium to maintain the solution developed through the project in the coming years, and by which means, and the potential of the project's solutions to be sustained in the future.
- **Scalability of the project:** the ability and capacity of the consortium to scale the solution at a bigger level or transfer it in other contexts,
- **Transferability of the project:** the ability and capacity of the consortium to transfer the solution (or parts of it) in different areas/regions/cities in the same country or in the broader EU context.

Project sustainability

- * 3.1 Have you secured funding (by own or other means) for sustaining the project's activities and further achieve results for the near future? If so, please provide details on the source, amount, format, etc.

1000 character(s) maximum

The SUMP is now an official part of the Lahti Direction process and will be maintained. SUMP also becomes compulsory by 2025 through EU legislation. The model of the bicycle highway will serve the future development of main cycling routes. The mobility data has been secured in the city's gis database an can be used for GIS analyzes. The emission calculation models developed by LUT are in use in the Campaigners project.

- * 3.2 Are any of the project's partners still involved in the operation or management of the project's solutions?

1000 character(s) maximum

With LUT we have common projects: Horizon 2020 Campaigners and SUMP related projects on active mobility management in schools.
Moprim is also involved in another project where we encourage our city personnels' active mobility.

- * 3.3: Is the project embedded in a broader policy context in the city (or region, country) that would secure its sustainability?

1000 character(s) maximum

The SUMP model has been embedded in the regional context.

- * 3.4 Is there substantial risk that the current or future political environment will affect the sustainability of the project? If yes, please elaborate.

1000 character(s) maximum

EU legislation supports better than before the SUMP related work. So I don't think so.

Project scalability

3.5 Are the plans to scale-up the project materialising?

Yes

No

* If yes, where and how? Please elaborate and mention indicative budgets and source(s) of funding.

1000 character(s) maximum

This depends. We have shared the learnings of the app development and we know many cities are considering developing apps. For instance Tampere has already developed their solution where they used our knowledge about our development process.

* If not, please specify the reasons why.

1000 character(s) maximum

-

* 3.6 Is there any intention on behalf of the city to replicate the solution to another neighbourhood or context? If yes, please elaborate and mention indicative budgets and source(s) of funding.

1000 character(s) maximum

We are using the model of the bicycle highway in the current and coming up developments. One is already being built (approx. 3,6 m€). Funding sources are usually the city and the state aid funding on cycling infrastructure development.

* 3.7 Is there any intention on behalf of the city to use any project components on different target groups? If yes, please elaborate

1000 character(s) maximum

The Campaigners app takes in to account different consumption sectors and therefore might also attract different groups to join.

- * 3.8 Can you briefly describe the knowledge transfer activities you carried out in regard to the project, and name the stakeholders (partners or other entities) you worked with to this end?

1000 character(s) maximum

Academia: Scientific articles, 1 published and 2 currently in press.

Practitioners: Final reports and results, shared in multiple seminars. We still regularly receive requests to present the project.

Fellow cities: Workshops and 1-1 meetings with several cities abroad (Mainly Europe and North-America (Seattle and Vancouver developers have been very interested). The Cluster in Finland: Tampere, Helsinki, Turku, Lappeenranta.

It is interesting that also service/app developers request sparring sessions from us.

- * 3.9 Do you think your project/solution/approach is transferable? If yes, briefly mention why and which component(s) make it in your opinion transferable.

1000 character(s) maximum

Our SUMP model follows the European Framework and therefore it is transferable in all cities.

Regarding the CitlCAP PCT model and app, the approach has parts that are transferable, but based on the SWOT analysis that we have published and presented in several occasions there are also risks and uncertainties that need be taken into account when developing something alike.

Project transferability

- * 3.10 What would be the main advice to other cities interested in your solution?

1000 character(s) maximum

Our solution is promising but definitely needs further development (see the SWOT).

Keep it simple, concentrate on gamification and make sure you have the needed resources and enough time for the development, that actually never stops (the app must keep evolving all the time).

To be honest: the most efficient way for a city would probably be to procure a ready made solution from a company (and the city would only concentrate on the engagement and marketing) that is developing a solution and will then take care of the technical development, legal issues, data privacy issues, customer service and everything that might be related. (In case there is no such funding available like we had that would actually cover the costs)

- * 3.11 Was any part of the project replicated elsewhere in the EU/outside the EU or did other cities/regions /organisations show interest to replicate your project solution? If yes, please provide examples and details

1000 character(s) maximum

See 3.8.

* 3.12 Did you take part in other transfer activities (on your own)? If yes, briefly mention the type of activities
1000 character(s) maximum

Yes we have had multiple additional meetings with interested parties after the official end of the project.

* 3.13 Would the MUA and the partnership be willing to take part in (future) UIA transfer activities? If yes, briefly mention what type of activities you would be willing to support, when, and the type of resources needed.

1000 character(s) maximum

If there is funding available I think at least the MUA, LUT and Moprim would be willing. I think it would be interesting to draft how the CitiCAP 2.0 could actually "look like".

4. Innovation, partnership and measurability

In this section, the MUA is asked to reflect on and critically self-assess, more than 4 years after the submission of the initial project's proposal, 3 key characteristics that distinguished this project from other proposals: the level of innovation, the quality of the partnership and overall measurability of its results and impact.

Innovation

* 4.1 How innovative is the overall solution you deployed (with 5 being the most innovative)?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

* 4.2 If you had to name the most innovative elements of the deployed solution, which ones would you choose? Why?

1000 character(s) maximum

The chosen approach aka the personal carbon trading that has not been piloted in city wide scale before and also the mobility detection technology used.

* 4.3 What aspect of the challenge addressed could not have been overcome without the innovative approach taken?

1000 character(s) maximum

To achieve climate neutral cities and reduce transport related emissions, we need all kinds of tools and measures to engage different stakeholders and foster the behavioral change needed. Apps like the CitiCAP promote the change, mainly through information sharing, making the related issue i.e. emissions visible and the through challenging the individual. However the responsibility cannot be put on the shoulders of individuals and the city is responsible through infra, regulation etc. to enable and encourage the transformation.

* 4.4 Do you think that the implementation of the UIA project has helped changing the perception and attitude of your colleagues and hierarchy (managers and politicians) towards innovation and risk? If yes, how?

1000 character(s) maximum

Partially yes. We were able to develop a functioning app and showed that taking risk can bring a lot of positive vibes to the city. Also internationally. But there is still work to do, of course. Staff needs training to develop new skills and new mindsets for more innovative, risk-taking approaches.

4.5 In your view, what are the most evident added values that the project's innovative approach brought to the city authority? Ranking (1 - 5, with 5 as the most evident added value)

	1	2	3	4	5
* Improving internal government operations (new way of working)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Anticipating and managing future challenges	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Improving service delivery	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Generating new sources of revenue or resources for the city	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Engaging residents in new ways	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Formalising an innovation strategy/innovation goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Improving data use and capacity in policy design/implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Other - Please specify

Partnership

* 4.6 Can you please name the exact benefits that you experienced because of the partnership composition and/or diversity?

1000 character(s) maximum

We deepened the cooperation with the two universities and have been working closely in several projects and with the students in course related activities.

- * 4.7 What was your relationship with the Wider group of stakeholders? Any difficulties, complementarities, etc.?

1000 character(s) maximum

We have had good networks to build upon and the relationship has been good.

- * 4.8 Has the city's relation with the partners involved changed thanks to the way of working inside the project? If yes, how?

1000 character(s) maximum

-

- * 4.9 Did the cooperation with your partners change their perception towards the city authority? If yes, how?

1000 character(s) maximum

I think some of perceptions did not chane (i.e. that ICT related processes take some time because of all the bureaucrazy) but then on the other hand they have been satisfied how the city has managed the issues along the way.

Measurability

- * 4.10 Can you please name the exact benefits that you experienced because of the partnership composition and/or diversity?

1000 character(s) maximum

- Knowledge and diversity of beneficial skills
- Knowledge on app development and business development
- Active participation and learning frm each other

- * 4.11 Did you manage to measure all project results as mentioned in your AF?

- Yes
- No

* 4.12 Who was in charge of the monitoring and evaluation of your project?

at least 1 choice(s)

- MUA or AUA
- Delivery Partner
- External Experts
- Combination of options 1 and 2
- Combination of 1 and 3
- Combination of 2 and 3

Please specify

MUA and LUT

* 4.13 Did you encounter any difficulties or obstacles in measuring your project's results? (1 - 5, with 5 as a lot of difficulties and obstacles)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Comments/further details

1000 character(s) maximum

-

* 4.14 Which of the following would have helped better measure your results?

- Training on measurability by UIA experts
- Peer-review from other UIA projects
- Having standard result indicators set by UIA
- Dedicating a WP (or an activity) on evaluation only
- Advice from the UIA expert
- Other

Please specify

I think it would be better to define the indicators and baseline in the beginning of the project and not in the application phase. It could be part of the first project deliverables.

* 4.15 After the project implementation, how confident do you feel in replicating the monitoring and evaluation methodology used within UIA to other (future) projects?

1000 character(s) maximum

Every project is different and therefore I can't tell if this would suit for the future projects.

* 4.16 In your opinion and based on your project, what is the ideal timeline for the project's impacts to become evident to the target groups and/or the public?

- 5 years
- 3-5 years
- 1-3 years
- Up to a year

5. The added-value of UIA

In this section the MUA is asked to reflect on and assess the different administrative and financial mechanisms and procedures that have been applied during the implementation phase.

The main objective is to understand to what extent those mechanisms and procedures can be considered as enablers for testing new and complex solution at a real urban scale and therefore to what extent they have facilitated the implementation of the different activities while maintaining a high level of innovation.

When reflecting on each procedure/mechanism, MUA are requested to assess (ranking and comments) their usefulness and efficiency in enabling you implement innovative solutions implying high levels of complexity and risk.

The answers provided in this section will be particularly helpful in feeding the ongoing reflections on how to improve the implementing framework offered to cities testing new solutions with UIA in view of the continuous improvement of this EU instrument.

How satisfied have you been with the following components/procedures of the UIA Initiative?

Ranking 1-5 (1 = not satisfied to 5 very satisfied)

5.1 Call for proposals – Selection process

	1	2	3	4	5	N /A
*						

Calls for proposals: Definition of topics and subtopics, time between announcement and submission deadline, time for the selection process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Call for proposals: Support and communication by the PS (e.g. website, documentation and tools webinars, Applicant Seminars, individual consultations, interaction via email/phone, result notifications)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Comments

1000 character(s) maximum

5.2 Project implementation - UIA framework

	1	2	3	4	5	N /A
* Initiation phase: Support and guidance provided by the UIA PS	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Initiation phase: Timeline (e.g. start date, 6 months duration, initiation and implementation phase running in parallel from day 1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Initiation phase ex-ante control: organisation and performance of the FLC	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Project duration: Implementation time allowed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Budget principles: 80% max. co-financing rate, 20% budget flexibility rule, state aid rules, Advance Payment mechanism (50% after the completion of the Initiation Phase and 30% after the validation of financial claim 1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Budget options: simplified costs (flat rate for Office & Administration costs ; lump sums for preparation and closure costs); fixed percentage to report staff costs on the basis of a staff assignment form	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Monitoring & Evaluation: Flexibility allowed to define results indicators (including during project implementation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

1000 character(s) maximum

5.3 Project monitoring

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
* Implementation and closure: Support and guidance provided by the UIA PS Lead/Review officer (on all levels)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Milestone reviews: Frequency, content, planning and reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Annual Progress Report: functionalities of the EEP and content of the APR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Financial Claim: Interaction with the FLC, timeline (e.g. to receive the second/third advance payment), financial claim, module on the EEP	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Request for Change procedure (if applicable): complexity of reporting, time to process request, necessity of RfC	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Site visits: preparation complexity, necessity, frequency	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Closure procedure: complexity, information requested, time to process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

1000 character(s) maximum

The financial claim has been very heavy and info that has been requested from the MUA has been partially very hard to get due to different reporting procedures and systems in Finland. The 2nd FLC was easier, thanks to the great support received from the Finnish GT controller.

5. Communication and Knowledge

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
* UIA communication tools: Project page, social media presence, events organized by UIA	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* UIA website: Knowledge lab	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* UIA cities links (Ability of UIA to create links between UIA projects/ cities on similar topics or with similar challenges)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* UIA Experts (added value, support provided)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

1000 character(s) maximum

Thank you!



EUROPEAN UNION
European Regional Development Fund



Région
Hauts-de-France

Contact

info@uia-initiative.eu