Sharing Cities Consortium Meeting and SCC01 Conference
10 – 12 April 2018, Lisbon
Meeting Record (Deliverable 1.12)

_____

CONTENTS

1   ATTENDEES

The list below are individuals that participated in either some or all activities during the Consortium Meeting and SCC01 conference:

Name	Organisation
Alessandro Bartolini	A2A Smart
Alessandro Filini	A2A Smart
Alexander Rice	Stripe Partners
Andre Dias	CEIIA
Andrea Canevazzi	Comune di Milano - AMAT
Andrea Temporelli	RSE
Anthony Colclough	EUROCITIES
Bernadett Degrendele	EUROCITIES
Bogdan Czarnecui	Warsaw
Briere Jules	LAA
Bushra Khan	GLA / Sharing Cities PMO
Carlos Silva	Instituto Superior Técnico
Carolina Carli	CEiiA
Caroline Vanttemel	USI/IRIS
Catarina Rolim	Instituto Superior Técnico
Caterina Benvenuto	Legambiente
Cecilia Hugony	Teicos
Christophe Colinet	Bordeaux
Daniel Glaser	City of Vienna
Daniela Aleksieva	Burgas Municipality
David Grisalena	VISESA
Demis Lorenzi	Politecnico di Milano – Fondazione Politecnico
Diana Henriques	Lisboa E-Nova
Drik Van Brederode	City of Hague
Emmy Van Gennip	Rotterdam
Eduardo Silva	Lisboa E-Nova
Elisabeth Jorge	REPLICATE project
Ernest Faubel	Valencia/MatchUp
Federico Lia	Poliedra
Francesco Causone	Politecnico di Milano
Francesco Marchet	Future Cities Catapult
Francesco Papa	UrbanDNA
Francesco Pardo	ESADE
Francesco Romanazzi	Kiunsys
Franziska Meier	Munich
Gabriel Jacqmin	EUROCITIES
Giovanni Accetta	A2A
Graham Colclough	UrbanDNA
Giuseppe Salvia	Politecnico di Milano
Harry Hobson	Stripe Partners
Haye Folkertsma	Utrecht/IRISS
Ioannis Anastasakis	City of Heralkion
Jana Koleva	Burgas
Jason Warwick	Urban DNA

Jem McKenna-Percy	GLA / Sharing Cities PMO
Jemma Hoare	Greenwich
Jems Bartholmes	EU commission DG energy
Joana Cruz	EUROCITIES
John Polak	Imperial College London
Jonas Boehm	University of St Gallen, Smarter together
Karin Borst	City of Amsterdam
Karolina Jasinska	City of Warsaw
Kelly Cotel	ICLEI
Lara Mabe	TECNALIA
Laurynas	RBG
Leszek Drogosz	City of Warsaw- Director of Infrastructure
Lisa Enarsson	City of Stockholm
Luís Tiago Brandão Ferreira	EDP Distribuição
Madelana Seabra	Reabilita
Malia Nela	EDP
Malischewski Patrick	Bordeaux
Marcel Van Oosterhout	Erasmus Univeristy of Rotterdam/Ruggedised
Marcin Wróblewski	Warsaw
Maria Canieras	CML
Maria Nela	EDP
Marta Bugay	City of Warsaw
Martin Brynskov	OASC
Matthew Grosjean	Steinbefs- Europa- Zentrum
Maurillo Zuccalà	Cefriel
Michelle Warbis	FCC
Miguel Garcia	CARTIF
Mircea Bucur	Kiwi Power
Nathan Pierce	GLA / Sharing Cities PMO
Nicolas Himmer	City of Namur
Nikita Shetty	Triangulum
Nikolaos Kontinakis	EUROCITIES
Nora Mendoza	REPLICATE project
Nuno Lopes	University of united nations
Nuno Sardinha	Empresa Municipal de Mobilidade e Estacionamento de Lisboa
Nuno Xavier	CML
Paola Ponticelli	Kinunsys
Paulo Chainho	Altice Labs
Philippe Fournand	Smarter together
Piero Pelizzaro	Milan Municipality
Raimond Tamm	Tartu city/ SmartEn City project
Roberto Moreira	Imperial College
Ruben Garcia	CARTIF
Ruska Boyadzhieva	Burgas
Sandeep Duggal	GLA / Sharing Cities PMO
Sara Filipponi	Siemens IT
Sarah Butler	The Royal Borough of Greenwich
Sergio Diaz	CENER
Shaun Gibbons	GLA Environment Team

Simon Burgess	Siemens
Sónia Cunha	Instituto Superior Técnico
Stephan Harmann	City of Vienna
Stylianos Mikrakis	City of Heralkion
Tania Molteni	Bocconi University-IEFE
Telma Mota	Altice Labs
Tom White	Future Cities Catapult
Trevor Dorling	The Royal Borough of Greenwich
Valerie Bahr	Steinbeis 2i GmbH
Valerio Siniscalco	NHP
Vera Nunes	EDP Distribuição
Zoe Lejeune	Seraing, REMOURBAN

2   OUTLINE OF AGENDA

Day 1	Day 2
1. Welcome and Introduction 2. City and Work Package updates 3. Work Package Meetings 4. Discussion groups of cross-cutting / programme-wide issues	1. Portugal Smart Cities Conference 2. SCC01 Workshops 　　a. Packaging – social housing retrofit 　　b. Packaging – smart lampposts 　　c. Lighthouse branding 3. Study Tours

3   SUMMARY

This was the fourth Consortium Meeting of the Sharing Cities programme, hosted by the lighthouse city of Lisbon at a municipality office located in the city centre. The content of the event was co-produced by the transversal PMO, the Lisbon team and members of Design Forum.

As the Sharing Cities programme is currently progressing through its implementation phase, the theme of the first day was 'quality' – are the measures being delivered to a high quality? Are they good enough to be replicated? What more can be done to ensure excellence? The structure of the first day was in two parts, the first half being an update from city and work package leads in plenary, and the second part specific WP catch ups followed by discussion of cross-cutting / programme-wide issues in the areas of packaging, data and the USP, and digital social market implementation across cities.

Overall the objectives of the meeting were to:

- Restate global programme objectives
- Engage with Lighthouse projects around packaging and marketing
- Assess the quality of the measures being delivered and explore ways to improve the quality
- Identify where collaboration with other partners can improve quality and implementation
- Address technical challenges in the implementation of measures
- Continue to map and identify interdependencies

The second day of the Consortium Meeting saw Sharing Cities partners joined by colleagues from across the Lighthouse programmes to participate in the Portugal Smart Cities Conference as the morning session was curated by Sharing Cities. The rest of the day included workshops that considered packaging for both social housing retrofit and smart lighting, and on Lighthouse branding. Following feedback sessions for the workshops, Sharing Cities and SCC01 partners joined study tours of smart cities activities in Lisbon.

4   DAY ONE – WEDNESDAY 11 APRIL (SC PARTNERS ONLY)

The meeting was opened with a welcome from Rui Franco, the Lisbon city lead, followed by a presentation of the agenda for the two day meeting and a strategic overview of progress by Nathan Pierce, Programme Director of Sharing Cities and SRO.

4.1   WORK PACKAGE AND CITY UPDATES

Work Package Leads presented updates to partners that included reminders of forthcoming deliverables within their respective WPs, information about current areas of focus and on forthcoming developments.

City Leads also provided an overview of recent progress, and on the developments due to take place in cities between now and the next Consortium Meeting in October 2018.

The content of these presentations is available on the Sharing Cities Google Drive: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1tcbeSX8agbnUPLWESX_X0ZrK4B_csr0d

4.2   WORK PACKAGE SPECIFIC MEETINGS

After lunch partners split out into dedicated work package meetings and discussed the following:

- WP2: Citizen Engagement (discussion included issues, progress and next steps with key partners)
- WP3: Building Retrofit (discussion included the revised implementation timeline and next steps)
- WP3: SEMS (discussion included plans for the next related deliverable: D3.5 Documented technical, uses cases and financial architecture of the systems for each district and evaluation of the relative merits - part 1)
- WP3: Smart Lampposts (discussion around implementation numbers in bid and way forward)
- WP3: Mobility (discussion included whether we are on target, implementation numbers in the bid and way forward)
- WP4: USP (discussion included issues, progress and next steps with key partners)
- WP7 and WP5 (discussion included alignment for packaging: handbooks and toolkits)
- WP8: Monitoring & Evaluation (discussion of issues, progress and next steps with key partners)

4.3   DISCUSSION GROUPS OF CROSS-CUTTING / PROGRAMME-WIDE ISSUES

As part of this session Sharing Cities partners opted to either continue WP specific discussions where needed, or to come together to discuss one of the following topics:

4.3.1   PACKAGING FOR SCALE – MAPPING DELIVERABLES AGAINST THE 10 MEASURES AND 10 TOOLS

This session was moderated by WP7 lead Graham Colclough and included a workshop exercise involving work package leads and cities to map relevant deliverables against packaging materials. The objective was to foster further engagement with the packaging concept, consolidate deliverables and explore opportunities for joint collaboration in the writing up of future deliverables. The group successfully mapped around 20 deliverables against the packaging materials list and identified a number of synergies with the eMobility measures.

Next Steps

- To evolve this work through the creation of a spreadsheet deliverable listing spreadsheet and mark the one related to packaging
- Clarify measures that can be packaged together such as eMobility and other measures that need a separate treatment.

4.3.2   ISSUES AROUND USP AND DATA SHARING

This session was moderated by WP4 lead Jason Warwick and included discussion of progress within WP4, issues around data sharing and related forward plans.

Replication to Burgas

- Some cities have waste management systems which would like integrated into a city platform
- Have been free use of SAP HANA for Smart cities.

- Lisbon already has a waste management system integrated which could be of interest

Plan for Burgas

- Define Use Cases
  - Waste
  - Other use cases (WP3 measures planned)
  - Wider platform

- Map to Sharing Cities use cases
- Altice Labs to provide Sharing Template
- Map to USP architecture
- Identify matching USP components
- Lisbon partner Altice Labs offered to make some USP components available to fellow cities (Telma to outline platform offer to fellow cities by fill in Sharing TemplateDoc)
- Explore business models post H2020 funding

USP Replication Overview

What can USP provide to fellow cities

- How to guide to utilising the USP deliverables.
- USP Deliverables package inc:
  - Architecture
  - Requirements (Use Case Data Matrix)
  - Design examples
  - Operational lessons learnt

- Sharing offers eg Altice Labs, Milan API manager, London DataStore
- Approved platform solutions, experience

5 DAY TWO – THURSDAY 12 APRIL (SC PARTNERS & SCC01 COLLEAGUES)

5.1 PORTUGAL SMART CITIES CONFERENCE

On day two, Sharing Cities partners and colleagues from across the SCC01 Lighthouse projects participated in the morning session of the Portugal Smart Cities Conference. The audience for this event included representatives from across city administrations, business and academia, coming together to discuss a variety of smart cities topics. Through our team in Lisbon, the Sharing Cities programme was asked to curate the session and content included high level remarks from the Vice Mayor of Lisbon Municipality Duarte Cordeiro and a panel session exploring Lisbon's innovation scene involving three Lisbon-based Sharing Cities partners discussing key progress and challenges on smart cities from their perspectives. Colleagues from the European Commission (EC), the Innovation & Networks Executive Agency (INEA) and EUROCITIES also spoke on related topics and the session itself was attended by several hundred people.

5.2 WORKSHOPS

Following the conference Sharing Cities and SCC01 partners split up into three workshops with the aim of coming together to make significant strategic progress on 'packaging' in regard to social housing retrofit and smart lampposts, and to participate in a Lighthouse branding exercise. In order to properly replicate and scale up all the parts of the work we are doing need to be 'packaged' in such a way that is appealing and useful to cities. Facilitators took their respective group through a packaging exercise

on building retrofit, looking at business models, use cases, case studies and technical specifications in order to generate practical, tangible outputs that are outlined below.

The objectives were to:

- Achieve overall buy-in to the concept the 'what' do we mean by packaging
- Workshop the detail (for 2 measures) sufficient to collectively understand the 'how'
- Capture initial information on which SCC01s can offer what to support the process
- Agree some basic milestones; an outline plan; and resource implications

The desired outputs were:

- Improved measure packages
- A list of inputs from SCC01s
- A list of issues and Challenges to address
- A list of people that can help
- An outline forward plan

The branding exercise enlisted the support of branding strategy specialists Stripe Partners, who guided the group through the strategic needs of branding and sought to establish an agreed approach on next steps. Attendees included communications leads from across the Lighthouse programmes.

5.2.1 PACKAGING WORKSHOP – SOCIAL HOUSING RETROFIT

Attendees:

Cities		Role split
Milan	Pamplona	6 coordinators
Burgas	Stockholm	11 measures lead or team
London	Seraing	5 business models or financing lead
Lisbon	Tartu	11 city officers
Warsaw	Vitoria Gasteiz	1 industry
Vienna	Valladolid	
Valencia	Heraklion	
San Sebastian		
Amsterdam		

The working session broke into four working groups:

1. Business Models group discussion led by Angelo Giordano
2. Technical Actions discussion led by Daniel Glaser from Vienna
3. Common Outcomes & Cities collaboration discussion led by Lisa Enarsson from Stockholm
4. Citizen Engagement discussion led by David Grisdlena from VISESA and Cecilia Hugony from Teicos (Milan)

5.2.1.1 Business Models
This session defined each measure according to a different metric to improve a business model. It established that there are different local variables in play (e.g. energy price, legislation and bills) and eV constraints (e.g. state aid or blue growth), and different inputs including public funds and citizen contribution. Furthermore, it established that there are differences in assumptions, implications for the environment (e.g. mandatory changes, cultural gaps) and that it is important to understand and integrate the value chain concept into the business model.

5.2.1.2 Technical Actions

This session discussed influences on the technical aspects on both public and private buildings including climate, regulation and ownership. It also looked at how to understand the type of ownership (single/multiple/mixed ownership) according to building type and social profile. It was felt a package would work for best and worst case scenarios and the group suggested prioritising some parameters based on cost and impacts which included the baseline, reduce energy demand, improving efficiency of supply and additional smart elements to improve EE further.

5.2.1.3 Common Outcomes / Cities collaboration

This session discussed how to encourage collaboration between citizens and cities to improve measures and packaging.

Key barriers to common approaches and collaboration:

- Lacking political motivation or wrong direction
- Political changes
- Regulations
- Procurement process
- Silos in cities
- Non-motivated house owners
- Tenants' opinion
- Knowledge transfer --> pilot to standard practice

Process by which to approach collaboration:

- Baseline, including experiences from tenants
- Analyse needs and opportunities with tenants
- Define business model with tenants
  (rent / finance subsidiaries / decisions on solutions to include)
- Procurement process
- Implementation phase
- Monitoring --> learning

Preconditions	Incentives & Opportunities
Time to do a complete process	CO_2 tax
Political motivation	Regulations
City context	Increasing consent
Motivated house owners	
Cooperation between departments in cities	
Clear targets and commitments	
If the city owns land it is possible to achieve highest quality / ambitious targets through contracts (new buildings)	
Regulations	

Proposed next steps

- Policy document – to become smart and sustainable cities (SCCO1 collaboration 36 cities)
- Map out each city's barriers and incentives to connect with relevant solutions

5.2.1.4 Citizen Engagement

This focused on the importance of engaging citizens before and after the process.

Pre Engagement	Post Engagement	KPIs	Tools to encourage engagement
Co-Design	Effective Use Feedback	Motivation Baseline	Digital e.g. common place platform Traditional e.g. door to door

5.2.1.5 Conclusions

Building retrofit measures cannot be packaged as easily as lampposts as each building varies to such an extent between different cities. The packaging for building retrofit could focus on the actions required to enable the technical process (e.g. citizen engagement, revolving funds / other methods of funding, monitoring and verification etc). it may be appropriate that the technical process and specifications could be left to local teams and not packaged. Even though building retrofit measures are complex to replicate however they have the greatest potential to have the greatest impact at across Europe in terms of scale on energy, cost, environment and safety.

It was noted that Vienna as a leader in building retrofit could be a potential measures co-lead.

5.2.2 PACKAGING WORKSHOP – HUMBLE LAMPPOSTS

Attendees:

Cities	Interest	Role split
Milan London Lisbon Namur Bordeaux Heraklion Munich Warsaw Burgas	Packaging concept Business models Smart Cities in Europe Monitoring Exploitation Smart Lamppost	3 coordinators 3 measures lead or team 2 business models or financing lead 12 city officers 7 Industry 5 PMO 6 Academia

The working session broke into four working groups:

1. Technical specifications 'cities common standard' group discussion led by Alessandro Filini from A2A (Milan)
2. City views and needs group discussion led by Ioannis Anastasakis from Heralkion
3. Business models and financing group discussion led by Dirk Van Brederode from The Hague
4. EU level influence and scale up market group discussion led by Graham Colclough from UrbanDNA (London)

5.2.2.1 Technical Specifications

The aim of this discussion was to understand the commonality between cities around the technical specifications of the smart lamppost in order to focus on specific technical aspects to speed up the process for scaling this measure across all SCC01s.

5.2.2.2 Actions Assigned

- Each city to validate the estimated ratios by locality (one validation per city)
- The ratio and city smart lamppost numbers can then be used to give an estimate of demand for each feature (e.g. the number of air quality monitors in Greenwich)
- The table subsequently be issued in draft form to all cities interested to be validated and built on

5.2.2.3 City Views
- General guidance from regional or national level has been produced by a well-known research institution (benefits / available solutions / relates to national goals) --> 4 page motivation tool
- Noted the importance of situational analysis funded by a central or regional source
- Noted the importance of strategy
- Taking into account regulatory and policy issues scenarios need to be presented with road map
- Look at crowdsource options

5.2.2.4 Business Models and Financing

<u>Discussion Objectives</u>

To clarify the different interpretation and concept of a business case and understand what is a viable business case for society – financial value or sustainability value. A question on data was raised around ownership issues which make the business case around packaging complex. Cities need to decouple business cases around risks and potential rewards. The discussion also identified the distinction between hard (technical physical side) and soft (leadership, IT, intangible asset) and cities need to work on integrating both concept especially the soft elements, important for packaging.

<u>Business case</u>

The complex challenge is to keep it simple:

- Sustainability value is proof already
- Regulatory framework has still to be proven
- Financial value has still to be proven

<u>Actions Assigned</u>

- Draft a proposal about the packaging of BC, incorporating the following:
  - Decoupling and standardisation
  - What parts of the BC do we want to differentiate? At first abstract to ensure flexibility for cities to implement it
  - Undertake feedback round on the proposal
- A survey where we ask cities what kind of packages / functionality they would be interested in (NB: this is where the theory of the BC package is combined with the technical functionality)
- Discussions about the 'rules of the game' with external experts
- Find examples of existing BCs (such as Warna) and see how they compare to the proposal
- Check with other cities about what they think about a data exchange and on standards?
  - Are there functioning exchanges already? What are the experiences of these?
  - Otherwise start a small pilot with one of them?
- Start work on relationship between GDPR and Smart City Infrastructure
- Establish relationship between BC Packaging, Data Exchange and Urban platforms (Marcel)

5.2.2.5 EU Level and Scale up market
The aim of this discussion was to understand how to foster the process for scaling the smart lamppost measure across EU cities.

<u>Understanding the City views</u>
- Support political goals
- Retain local interest
- Capacity

- Increase confidence
- Support network

EU Objectives
- Maximise 500 million investment impact
- Influence broader market

EU Challenges
- Knowledge access
- Evidence base
- Effectiveness of programmes
- Education
- Influencing developing countries e.g. different challenges
- Transparency

Process/How to engage scale
- Address ownership / IP challenges
- Engaging leaders

Action Assigned
- Test and improve the package framework
- Emphasise the EU logo
- Indicators development
- "Adapt; Adopt; Create" simple principles
- Map deliverables from each SCC01 programme
- Funding request for collaboration work only
- Address the City Level and EU Level Gap
- Conduct a SWOT analysis

5.2.2.6 Conclusions

In order to maximise the process of replication through packaging it is important to prioritise the most relevant, most positive in terms of cost benefit analysis, and the most required features for cities and citizens in regard to the smart lamppost e.g. LED light bulbs, CMS. There is also the potential to create a data exchange institution where cities and industry trade data is gathered, and at an EU level to allocate funding in collaboration and knowledge sharing work cross SCC01s.

5.2.3 LIGHTHOUSE BRANDING WORKSHOP

Rotterdam is developing a branding strategy for the Lighthouse Programme and felt it was the right time to test this with SCC01 partners. The Lighthouse Programme Board of Coordinators group enlisted the support of branding strategy specialists Stripe Partners, who guided the group through the strategic needs for branding and sought to arrive at an agreed approach to the next steps. Attendees included communications leads from each programme and the workshop focused on 5 key areas that it was felt the SCC01 programmes could act on to deliver better results:

- Working proactively with large counter-parties (e.g. big suppliers, banks or the EC)
- Engaging with other cities, inspiring potential lighthouse cities, smaller EU cities and cities in other parts of the world
- Finding practical ways of keeping cities that are graduating out of their 5-year Consortium-lifecycle engaged and involved
- Pooling branding resources so that Lighthouse cities speak with one voice and share best practice

▪ Developing a long-term, strategic plan for the impact SCC will have over the next 20 years

A forward-looking and ambitious set of activities that could be enabled by the brand were established, that co-ordinators should discuss and prioritise:

▪ Transforming Lighthouse Cities from a funded-demonstrator project to a movement (based on quality and like-minded cities)
▪ Make the movement global, with reach and impact beyond the EU
▪ Creating a "kitemark" badge (like TUV) that other cities can affiliate with
▪ Plan how UK cities are best involved post-Brexit
▪ Establish Lighthouse cities as centres for training urban planners, building a skills base in Europe.
▪ A rich engagement with the global Green movement
▪ Establish a new way to liaise with Chinese cities…e.g. a "jumellage" scheme
▪ Engage with other major initiatives in the EC, e.g. the Juncker "future-mapping" scenarios
▪ Plan how to provide more political advantage or lobbying-capacity to the cities (e.g. helping them lobby the EC)

5.2.3.1 The brand values that will deliver for lighthouse

The workshop identified 3 values that the brand needs to embody in order to deliver these things. By operating on the basis of shared values rather than shared conception (funding sources), the Lighthouse brand has the power to become a mark of quality in the global smart cities movement that cities within and outside of Europe will hope to emulate and attain.

The brand should be:

- **Powerful and Influential**: with the ambition to wield global influence, define standards and work on a massive multi-city scale.

- **Secure and Long-term**: giving a sense of permanence to the work of city projects, a commitment that 'we're not going anywhere' and are determined to follow through. A brand that remains a constant throughout any changes to the nature of the EU.

- **Social and Citizen Responsible**: being open and proud about espousing the social values of SCC, data responsible, citizen engaged, diverse and culturally sustainable – the best of the values of the EU.

5.2.3.2 Potential organisational changes that could be required (for BOC to discuss)

A greater emphasis on cities as members of Lighthouse brand: The workshop made clear that in future, to be a successful, consortia will need to collaborate and integrate more often and coherently on branding. One potential action is a reconfiguration between cities and consortiums which could be rethought to place greater emphasis on membership of the Lighthouse brand as oppose to consortia. The Lighthouse group then forms their enduring (which outlasts a City's membership of a H2020-funded Consortium) and wider affiliation (able to include Cities that are not part of a Consortium) with the Lighthouse brand becoming the point at which their innovations, results and legacy are communicated. Smaller working groups within committees: It may also be necessary (as the number of consortia grows) to break off into smaller working groups to focus on specific aspect of branding. In the long-term it may be necessary to resource a Lighthouse branding team independent of consortia.

5.2.3.3 Recommendations and early thoughts on next-steps:

This section focused on best practice. The D&G Task Group and the Board of Coordinators need to continue with a series of decisions on branding:

1) Internal alignment around messaging and values (communication leads)
   a) Ensure all consortiums are aligned with the need for a strong Lighthouse brand and subscribe to the broad values of the brand. Sign off on these.
   b) Using the 3 'core values' outlined in this document, communication leads should produce a short document/presentation for internal city use. It should present a template for how to talk about the brand. This will ensure consortia deliver a coherent and effective message when talking about Lighthouse.

2) Decide on outward facing strategy (BOC need to discuss): A number of potential brand strategies and actions emerged from the workshop. SCC needs to agree on a clear branding strategy which considers external messaging and begins to design brand activations.

3) Executing the strategy and developing Lighthouse branding infrastructure: Commit, plan and resource a group to manage the execution of branding work. Brand activities and materials (e.g. films, events, endorsements etc) need to be planned and produced. Should engage as many projects in this process as possible and form workshops around the brand areas. During the event projects registered their areas of interest:

- Developing a kite mark (like TUV) that can act as a Lighthouse guarantee of quality: Smarter Together, Grow Smarter, Ruggedised, Replicate, Stardust, RemoUrban, SmartenCity, MySmartLife
- Engaging with cities outside of Europe: Growsmarter, Triangulum, MatchUp, SmartEnCity
- Developing a 'Lighthouse Prize' for best small medium and large cities: Sharing Cities, Replicate, MatchUp, Stardust, Triangulum
- Producing business cases that can be distributed: Ruggedised, MySmartLife
- Building Lighthouse cities as mechanisms and sites for training the next generation of urban planners and smart city professionals (especially from abroad): Sharing Cities, Replicate, SmartEnCity, Stardust, Smarter Together, Ruggedised

- This work is likely to be time consuming and require branding expertise. SCC may need to set up a separate body focused on working across Lighthouse interests to deliver this effectively. It also needs to be part of a wider conversation about future SCC01 governance.

6   STUDY TOURS

The day ended with a study tour in central Lisbon. The study tour allowed members to visit City Hall / Paços do Concelho where building retrofit and SEMS implementation is taking place. Members also visited the Sharing Cities shop, which demonstrated the mobility and e-bike system in Lisbon, and heard directly from local Lisbon Sharing Cities partners.

Location and date of next meeting: Warsaw, October 2018

_____