Sharing Cities Consortium Meeting
12 – 13 July 2016
Burgas, Bulgaria

Record of meeting

_____

Attendance

Name	Organisation
Andrew Collinge	PMO
Nathan Pierce	PMO
Jem McKenna-Percy	PMO
Sandeep Duggal	PMO
Maurilio Zuccalà	CEFRIEL
Leszek Drogosz	City of Warsaw
Marcin Wróblewski	City of Warsaw
Roberto Nocerino	Poliedra (IT)
Miguel Águas	Lisboa E-Nova
Francisco Gonçalves	Lisboa E-Nova
Pedro Machado	Lisboa E-Nova
Piero Pelizzaro	Milan Municipality
Susanna Molteni	Milan Municipality
Gemma Ginty	Future Cities Catapult
Sophia Taborda	Future Cities Catapult
Nuno Sardinha	Empresa Municipal de Mobilidade e Estacionamento de Lisboa
Jana Koleva	City of Burgas
Nuno Xavier	Lisbon Municipality
Maria João Caneiras	Lisbon Municipality
Bernadett Degrendele	Eurocities
Rick Curtis	Greater London Authority
Jason Warwick	UrbanDNA
Antony Page	UrbanDNA
John Polak	Imperial College London
Heather Yedigaroff	Royal Borough of Greenwich / Digital Greenwich
Christophe Colinet	City of Bordeaux
Vera Nunes	EDP Distribuição
Maria Elena Hugony	Teicos
Telma Mota	Altice Labs (formerly PT Inovação)
Demis Lorenzi	Fondazione Politecnico di Milano
Eugenio Morello	Dastu POLIMI
Filipe Santos	Reabilita
André Dias	CEiiA
João Jesus Caetano	CEiiA
Caterina Benvenuto	Legambiente
Roberto Nocerino	Polimi
Maurillo Zuccala	Cefriel

Outline of Agenda

Day 1

1. Welcome and what would you like to get out of the Consortium Meeting?
2. Programme Logic
3. Work Package updates (2 – 4, 7 and 8)
4. Working the 'Hot Topics'

Day 2

5. Introduction to Sharing Cities PMO
6. Work Package updates (5 and 6)
7. Reflections from the Cities
8. City Tour, Burgas
9. Workshop on Use Cases

_____

Summary

This was the first Consortium Meeting of the Sharing Cities programme, and was hosted by the fellow city of Burgas in Bulgaria. The content was coordinated by the transversal PMO with input from the wider partnership.

The theme of this Consortium Meeting was 'connections'. The way in which we connect with each other as a partnership, and with cities outside of the partnership, lies at the heart of the Sharing Cities vision. Therefore, as well as the opportunity for partners to meet and work with each other face-to-face, the objectives of the event were to provide:

- Clarity on the programme aims, values and aspirations
- Share information between cities
- Create connections on cross cutting technical challenges
- A chance to explore a fellow city (Burgas)

The key areas of discussion included a new Programme Logic, updates from Work Package and City Leads, an introduction to the newly formed traversal PMO as well as various 'hot topics' such as budget and resourcing, internal communications and governance, and the development of use cases within the programme.

This report outlines the key points from the main sessions, any actions captured and represents the formal 'minute' of the meeting.

1. Welcome and what would you like to get out of the Consortium Meeting?

Following a welcome from SRO Andrew Collinge and Deputy Mayor of Burgas Ruska Boyadzhieva, partners were asked what in particular they would like to get out of the meeting and what they felt were the most important issues to address within the programme.

These issues included budget and resourcing, deliverables, internal communications and governance, the interface between Work Packages, the way in which we interact with external stakeholders, creating a more visible timeline for the programme, enabling a deeper level of sharing between projects, the programme management tool (Liquid Planner), the way in which applications are developed for citizens, city plans and timelines, Use Cases and the Audacious Goals.

2. Programme Logic

The Programme Director of Sharing Cities Nathan Pierce presented a new Programme Logic for discussion by the partnership, explaining its high level function and taking the group through an example of how a measure would proceed through the Logic.

In groups, partners were asked to discuss a series of statements or questions (one per table) and the key points of the discussion can be summarised as follows:

This logic makes us stronger because…

- It shows the path of / allows for convergence
- It merges city, political and strategic issues – allows co-design and forces cities to politically decide on issues that are not usually in their DNA
- It identifies barriers that we need to overcome
- It helps design market-driven scale up solutions and helps identify barriers (NB. cost effectiveness helps other cities)
- It forces the mixing of more mature and less mature types of technical development
- It combines market and non-market driven approaches
- The logic converges in a final result from which fellow cities can draw inspiration

This logic won't work because…

- City timelines are political (we have to follow those)
- Implementation is around 4 particular measures
- It is too centralised – need to allow projects to evolve (by Work Package and by City)
- Funding for Fellow Cities means they are in a different situation to what is represented

How does this logic take us from €25m to €500m and beyond?

- Enables co-design at different scales in different cities – moves away from silo mentality, and must include smaller cities too. Important to not take for granted that municipalities have a budget to replicate therefore business case must stand on own two feet.
- Enables co-design between different work packages – important because co-design between Work Packages is critical e.g. WP2 – to understand what people want, and WP6 and 7 – to ensure solutions are market driven.
- Helps embed WP7 into other WPs (very practical) – Programme Logic will help but do we need to go further in ensuring WP7 philosophy is present in all other WPs? i.e. build a mechanism to make sure WPs are thinking in a way that's joined up with WP7? Doing this will also help align public and private partners needs/goals.
- Helps leverage different expertise in different cities – includes sharing business models that work and good news stories/examples of success

How would an attendee communicate this to someone who wasn't here?

- The key is that this should be communicated in stages, i.e:

  City / political / strategic phase → technical / design phase → implementation phase
  (to see if it is working as planned) → Monitoring / how we can scale → Market phase

How do we make the principles work as a tool?

'Focus on end user' and 'Design for replicability' were the key principles on which the group focused.

- We make the principles work as a tool/box by creating the right conditions
  - Through a good communication strategy and understanding of what is shared – be clear and share (NB. marketing & communications are different but both necessary)
  - By understanding the timeline and the deliverables – decide on effort
  - By breaking the Work Package and City siloes
- We make the principles work as a tool/box by prioritising
  - Design for replicability and focus on the end user are the most important principles
  - The other principles should be prioritised according to your activity
- We make the principles work as a tool/box by application through AGILE
  - At the focus stage we consider the principles through co-design and planning
  - At the concentration stage we consider the principles while providing enough, but not too much, time
  - At the check points we review results and test those results against the principles as indicators of achieving our ambitions to share
  - We allow time after review for changes, if any are required

What needs to change to ensure we're on track with this logic?

- The group spent time analysing the Programme Logic and determined that the programme appeared to be on track to terms of implementing the key factors.

2.1 ACTION: Programme Director (PMO) to revise Programme Logic based on feedback above and to provide opportunity for further development with partners.

3. Work Package updates (2 – 4, 7 and 8)

Work Package leads presented updates to partners with a reminder of the main content and deliverables within their WP as well as an update on general activity and within each city, and details of their future plans.

These presentations are available on the Sharing Cities Google Drive: https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B2UszkAxtoilcUg0SkYyUnJZOUE

Partners were asked to record any questions or comments and responses from WP Leads will be fed back to partners in the first Sharing Cities internal communications bulletin.

3.1 ACTION: Programme Manger – Partnership Lead (PMO) to upload WP presentations to Sharing Cities Google Drive and provide link to partners.

3.2 ACTION: Programme Manager – Partnership Lead (PMO) to liaise with WP Leads for responses to queries raised by partners based on presentations and include in first internal communications bulletin.

4. Working the 'Hot Topics'

Based on the Work Package updates and general discussion throughout the meeting a number of 'Hot Topics' were identified by the partnership for further discussion. These included how we communicate and connect internally, budget and resources, Use Cases, Programme Logic, achieving a deeper level of sharing, unit costs, the shared vision for SEMS / USP, linking the platform with cities, business model development and alignment of resources across Work Packages.

From this it was decided collectively that the areas partners wished to discuss in more detail were:

Budget and Resources

The chair of the group (PMO Programme Director) hosted a discussion on the budget review process. He presented the budget review process so far and the process moving forward into the third phase.

The feedback received was robust. There were concerns regarding the review process and the outcomes it was trying to achieve. The PMO Programme Director set out the intended outcomes and in particular the need to better match the budget profile to the programme of work. It was highlighted that a change control via INEA is not required for many budget changes and this was noted and seen as a positive for the budget review. A discussion around the proposed distribution of Person Months for WP1 took place where the need for all partners to have programme funding was raised. The PMO agreed to re-evaluate the proposal in light of this.

4.1 ACTION: PMO to incorporate feedback above into Budget Review Phase 3.

Internal Communications and Governance

The chair of the group (PMO Programme Manager – Partnership Lead) presented an overview of the key governance mechanisms within the programme and both existing and forthcoming internal communications mechanisms. She explained that this would constitute the basis for an internal communications plan for the Sharing Cities programme, and invited initial feedback from the group.

This feedback included the need to integrate reporting and internal communications mechanisms, and there was discussion about how this might work. The WP3 Coordinator provided an overview of how communication occurs with that particular work package and it was agreed that this presented good practice that could be shared across the programme.

4.2 ACTION: Programme Manager – Partnership Lead (PMO) to incorporate feedback above into internal communications plan.

Use Cases

The chair of the group (Work Package 4 Lead, UrbanDNA) outlined the situation with 'Use Cases' to date and invited discussion. The key points raised included how many use cases would be needed and how to quality assure these, the need for a user-centric approach and to develop a 'quick and dirty' style before delving into the detail, the need to focus on the result rather than just the data, rewards to help the operational costs and how to motivate citizens to do this, issues around co-creation, greater visibility of the existing template, and how to make use cases extraordinary.

The discussion of Use Cases was continued in a further breakout session the following day.

4.3 ACTION: Work Package 4 Lead, UrbanDNA to incorporate feedback above into work on development of Use Cases.

5. Introducing the new Sharing Cities PMO

The Sharing Cities Programme Director reported that the transversal PMO was now at full capacity and outlined the respective roles comprising the new team.

A breakdown of transversal PMO roles is available on the Google Drive https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B2UszkAxtoilcUg0SkYyUnJZOUE

The PMO Programme Managers (Compliance and Partnership Leads) presented to partners on key areas of their portfolio. The key points included:

Reporting – Internal

- Liquid Planner – Big announcement! The PMO announced that they have been reviewing the use of Liquid Planner as the programme's management tool and are proposing to cease using it as a programme management tool. Whilst Liquid Planner is a powerful management tool, the recent exercise to upload all programme plans and feedback from partners has highlighted that the tool does not meet our requirements.

  PMO will investigate alternative options which include engaging with Liquid Planner to ensure the full capabilities of the programme have been understood. But in the meantime partners were asked to continue to manage their programme plans on Excel as an interim measure.

- PMO reporting mechanisms
  - Risk and Issues Register
  - WP Updates
  - Design Authority
  - Programme Management Tool (Liquid Planner)

- Use of the Programme Management tool
  - This is vital
  - Allows PMO and wider partnership to track and manage delivery against WP Work Plans

Reporting – External

- Reminder of reporting periods:
  - RP1: from month 1 to month 12
  - RP2: from month 13 to month 24
  - RP3: from month 25 to month 42
  - RP4: from month 43 to month 60

- PMO must submit periodic report within 60 days following the end of each reporting period

- The periodic report must include the following:
  - A 'periodic technical report' containing:
    - an explanation of the work carried out by the beneficiaries;
    - an overview of the progress towards the objectives of the action, including milestones and deliverables.
  - Periodic financial report
    - an 'individual financial statement' from each beneficiary and from each linked third party, for the reporting period concerned
    - an explanation of the use of resources

- Special Unit Costs/BEST tables

Internal Communications and Governance

The key governance mechanisms within the programme were outlined to partners with key points about their purpose, intended impact and how they would benefit partners. These included:

- Global Advisory Board
- Sponsors Group
- Programme Board
- City Boards / Forums
- Consortium Group
- Design Board

Less formal but very important internal communications channels that were either in operation or to be newly facilitated by the transversal PMO were also highlighted. These included:

- Fortnightly PMO calls
- Members area on Sharing Cities website
- Contacts database and distribution list
- Internal events calendar
- Monthly internal communications bulletins which will draw on City and WP reporting
- Highlighting and sharing good internal communications practice currently taking place

The PMO Programme Director then also presented on budget and resourcing within the programme, outlining the current budget review process and next steps.

6. Work Package updates (5 and 6)

The Work Package 5 and 6 lead presented updates to partners with a reminder of the main content and deliverables within the WPs as well as an update on general activity and within each city, and details of future plans.

These presentations are available on the Sharing Cities Google Drive https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B2UszkAxtoilcUg0SkYyUnJZOUE

Partners were asked to record any questions or comments and responses from the WP Lead will be fed back to partners in the first Sharing Cities internal communications bulletin.

7. City Perspectives

City Leads (or their representatives) were asked for their reflections on what had been discussed in Burgas and any key updates that they wished to share with the partnership.

7.1 ACTION: Programme Manger – Partnership Lead (PMO) to include city updates based on ABCD reporting in monthly internal communications bulletin which will be shared with partnership.

8. Burgas City Tour

The Sharing Cities Project Manager led the partnership on a tour of Burgas' integrated transport project and smart approach to mobility, building retrofit and waste management. Representatives of the host city introduced their new traffic management system, which serves both public and private transportation. Through a smart app, it also provides real-time traffic information to citizens and enables electronic ticketing, automatic vehicle control as as well as video surveillance on board vehicles and in bus stops.

Location and date of next meeting: Milan, January 2017 (date TBC)

Learning for Future Consortium Meetings

- Overall the meeting was productive with good attendance from partners and offers a strong foundation on which to build future Consortium Meetings.
- It was agreed that a forward plan for these meetings will be developed to enable the content to be tailored to key strategic points of the programme in order to maximise the value of the partnership coming together in this way.
- Sufficient time should always be given to allow group discussions to feedback and potentially a template for such feedback could be generated to ensure it is structured and captured.
- For every action it should be decided at the time who should be Responsible, Accountable, Consulted and Informed.
- In future meetings presentations from cities could be structured in a similar way to WPs.
- The Sharing Cities Communications Lead and the City Lead from the last city to host a Consortium Meeting should be included in the planning for the next meeting.
- It would be useful for all future host cities to block book rooms (and where possible negotiate lower rates) at local hotels so that as many partners as possible can be in the same place.
- The potential for Consortium Meetings to be over 3 days rather than 1.5 days should be explored (two days for general content and one day for technical meetings).
- The agenda should be circulated several weeks in advance where possible.
- Potentially WP1 issues should be discussed in plenary rather than in smaller groups.
- The PMO, host city and City Leads should actively encourage all partners to attend.

_____

Record submitted by: Jem McKenna-Percy, PMO Programme Manager – Partnership Lead
Approved by: Nathan Pierce, PMO Programme Director