

EVENT DESCRIPTION SHEET

(To be filled in and uploaded as deliverable in the Portal Grant Management System, at the due date foreseen in the system.)

! *Please provide one sheet per event (one event = one workpackage = one lump sum)*

PROJECT	
Participant:	[N1 - [Metropolitan City of Milan (CMM)]]
PIC number:	1011387115
Project name and acronym:	Social Post Covid Urban Revitalization – SPUR

EVENT DESCRIPTION	
Event number:	3
Event name:	Second International Event
Type:	Meetings, workshops, conference
In situ/online:	<i>[in-situ]</i>
Location:	[ITALY], [Milan]
Date(s):	[30/10/24] [31/10/24]
Website(s) (if any):	https://www.alda-europe.eu/spur/
Participants	
Female:	34
Male:	23
Non-binary:	//
From country 1 [BELGIUM]:	3
From country 2 [CROATIA]:	2
From country 3 [FRANCE]:	1
From country 4 [ITALY]:	47
From country 5 [PORTUGAL]:	1
From country 6 [ROMANIA]:	2
From country 7 [SPAIN]:	1
Total number of participants:	57
From total number of countries:	7

Description

Provide a short description of the event and its activities.

The second international event that took place in Milan was focused on presenting the Need's Analyses locally collected by the SPUR partners and on exchanging practices and strategies to implement civil participation.

The agenda, provided here below in the annexes, implied 2 days of work, from the noon of October 30th until the end of 31st.

[First day - October 30th - afternoon]

The first day, 30th October, was centered on the presentation of the Needs Analyses results. The partners all shared their experiences, providing a thoughtful analysis of enabling factors and obstacles that they faced when organizing Focus Groups and the consultation activities realised from August to October 2024.

***Etterbeek (BELGIUM)** faced communication issues in terms of language walls. Most of the people involved in the Focus Group did not speak French, Dutch or English, so the Municipality decided to print flyers in six different languages. Amongst the enabling factors, on the other hand, they listed the **chance to create a community**, mentioning that, for example, they were able to reach the Polish community within Etterbeek starting from one Polish contact they had. One interesting aspect that emerged, concerns the reluctance that focus group leaders faced when trying to open a discussion themed on Covid. Most people did not want to speak about it.*

***Harghita County (ROMANIA)** faced a similar issue. Most people involved did not want to talk about it, like it was something they preferred to keep in the past. This behavior was not due to a traumatic reminiscence of the pandemics, but to a different and renewed attitude towards life. The majority of people interviewed declared they are satisfied with their current life, that they are focusing on their future, and that Covid is something that dwells in the past. Amongst the obstacles, Harghita reports: **engaging people**. Amongst local best practices, they did not find any particular change before and after Covid- 19. People kept their main interests (sports, cultural events, family).*

*While interviewing people, **Fondazione Comunitaria di Agrigento e Trapani (AGRIGENTO, ITALY)** noticed a declining sense of trust in institutions, but, like Etterbeek, found the collaborative network in the community as an enabling factor. Amongst local best practices they listed the birth of a social library which took place in a context of **revitalization** of an abandoned space. Additionally, the presence and cooperation of the Catholic Church has been vital in this context; focus group leaders could find people to interview thanks to the work of a local priest who was able to connect with the community.*

*The same feeling of distrust was felt during the Focus Groups held by **MCM (Metropolitan City of Milan, ITALY)**, which included that amongst the Obstacles. The main result brought by MCM concerned the subjection to Covid-19, which was major for lower income people; while higher income people experienced lesser consequences, both from a psychological and economic point of view.*

*Finally, **Vila do Conde (PORTUGAL)** and **Grad-Vodnjan (CROATIA)** noticed that significant Obstacles were the lack of stakeholders willing to work with older people, who were predominantly involved in Vila do Conde's survey and focus group; and the closedness of people, which was reported in Vodnjan experience.*

On the other side, Vila do Conde's programs for elderly people revealed themselves quite useful to strengthen relationships within the neighborhoods.

***In conclusion**, Municipalities faced similar Obstacles, such as the difficulty of engaging people, above all seniors. Communication was an issue both from a linguistic and institutional point of view, which leads to the necessity of better institutional communication, tailored to the target people. On the other side, it appears that most of the people involved, regardless of the country they were from, needed just a bit of time to soften, and once that happened, they felt they could speak freely in a safe environment. So more or less every Municipality was able to create a safe space where people were able to share their thoughts.*

[Second day - October 31st - morning]

*On the 31st October morning session ALDA delivered on training on participatory processes and a workshop on identifying prospective local pilot actions for social cohesion in the neighborhoods, either already used by the partners or resulted from a foreign experience. Later, with ALDA managers as leading figures, partners shared ideas about how to better engage between themselves and ALDA, and how to implement successful participatory strategies, by using the **World Cafè** tool as a learning experience of this participatory technique. Interesting ideas emerged: such as the proposal to stay in touch more often (e.g. once a month), or to share*

possible failures while experimenting options. Partners also discussed incentives for integration, concluding that either inviting citizens personally, via mail or newsletter, or creating some kind of “bait” (e.g. lunch, music, movies) to mix societal and cultural with politics, would be a good idea. They also agreed that the concrete space chosen for any activity should be open and safe, and that it would be good to choose one where people already congregate. Finally, they discussed the needed resources, listing human ones (e.g. **civic activists** or facilitators, whose aim is to engage people with social issues), economic, logistical and legislative ones.

[Second day - October 31st - afternoon]

The second half of the 31st October focused on a public conference centered on **social resilience and intergenerational solidarity**, and it represented a chance to share experiences from the European cities involved in the SPUR Project, but also from other urban realities represented by the relevant network of [Metropolis](#).

The main concepts that emerged are how to re-engage people, how to bring them back together for stronger and inclusive societies, and what tools can be of support, including any digital platforms to encourage participation. Within this conceptual framework, Is it possible to transform the crises we face (as the pandemic) into opportunities for change?

Many speakers representing the municipalities agreed to that. Flexibility, shift in priorities, rediscovery of one’s neighborhood, seemed to be the main changes. It represented a chance for people to think about what really matters, to focus on more important things, to re-evaluate their connections with their loved ones and the community.

HISTORY OF CHANGES		
VERSION	PUBLICATION DATE	CHANGE
1.0	01.04.2022	Initial version (new MFF).