


# **D.T4.2.2**

## **Feedback reports on Co-Creation workshops**

### **Project region**



Biz-Up  
08/ 2022

### Project Information

Project Title: GoDanuBio - 'Participative Ecosystems for fostering the revitalization of rural-urban cooperation through governing Danube Circular Bioeconomy'

Project code: DTP3-471-4.1

Lead partner: BIOPRO Baden-Württemberg GmbH

Start of the project: 01/07/2020

Duration: 30 months

<http://www.interreg-danube.eu/approved-projects/godanubio>

### Deliverable Information

Author/-s: *Biz-Up*

Deliverable no.: D.T4.2.2.

Submission date: 25/28/2022

Dissemination level: Public

Version	Date	Content	Elaborated by	Reviewed by
0.1	22/03/2022	Template for feedback reports on Co-Creation workshops	Biz-up	BIOPRO
0.2	25/08/2022	Feedback report on 3rd co-creation WS Upper Austria	Biz-up	

## Table of content

1. General information about the co-creation workshop.....	4
2. Objective of the workshop .....	4
3. Initial situation of your region .....	5
4. Methods used within the workshop .....	5
5. Lessons learned for next upcoming workshops .....	5
6. What did the local or/and regional administration and the citizens expect from the process of participative governance? .....	5
7. Outcome of the co-creation workshops.....	6
8. Innovation potential for your region.....	8
9. Strengths and weaknesses of the process of participative governance .....	8
10. Do you plan to use the process of participative governance also in future?.....	9
11. Identified opportunities for rural development in your region .....	9
12. Annexes .....	10

### *Disclaimer:*

*The information and perspectives set out in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use that may be made of the information contained therein.*

## 1. General information about the co-creation workshop

Date of the workshop	14/07/2022
Topic of the workshop	Mobility solutions for bicycles and pedestrians in Freistadt to strengthen the rural areas
Format of the workshop	Physically: Rathaus Freistadt
Region/Adress	Stadtgemeinde Freistadt Hauptplatz 1 4240 Freistadt
Project partner(s) involved	Biz-Up
Guiding question/theme of the workshop	Summary, Results & Development of Alternative courses of action - prioritization and Clarification of further steps
Number of participants	12
Type of participants (Target groups) <sup>1</sup> and name of institutions	Members of the city council
Cooperation with experts (i.e. speakers, external moderators, politician...)	Mmag. Dr. Edith Öller

## 2. Objective of the workshop

Describe your objective of the workshop in detail. What outputs did you expect? Why did you follow this objective? Did you rather want to strengthen your local / regional circular (bio)economy? Did the event have a specific focus on rural areas, or on rural-urban cooperation? Did you do your best to engage representatives of local and regional administration in the workshop?

---

<sup>1</sup> Please group the target groups according to the ones listed in page 42 of the Application Form

Presentation of the ideas from the Workshop with Citizen participation on mobility solutions for bicycles and pedestrians in Freistadt. Possibly further clustering/prioritization or supplementation of the topics. Development of further steps and action alternatives.

### **3. Initial situation of your region**

(If you do have three consecutive workshops dealing on the same topic, this chapter can be filled out only once for all workshops)

What was the starting situation of your region and why did you choose this topic for your co-creation workshop(s)? How high was the pressure of the stakeholders for change? Describe the framework conditions in your region and what you expect from the co-creation workshop(s)?

### **4. Methods used within the workshop**

Explain in detail which method(s) you used within the workshops. How did it work? Why did you choose this method(s)? What was the output of the method(s)? Would you recommend this method(s) and why/why not?

Most of the workshop was spent working in small groups. All ideas from the second workshop were prioritized. This prioritization was done according to whether the project is easy or difficult to implement and whether the project benefits many or few people. Thus, it can be seen at a glance which projects should and can be implemented most quickly. Following this prioritization, a few projects were selected, which were immediately assigned to responsible persons and which concrete steps must be taken for implementation.

### **5. Lessons learned for next upcoming workshops**

The lessons learned will be assessed and considered for the next workshop round.

### **6. What did the local or/and regional administration and the citizens expect from the process of participative governance?**

(If you do have three consecutive workshops dealing on the same topic, this chapter is to be filled out once at the end of all workshops)

What did the local and/or regional administration expect from your workshop(s) (according to your discussions beforehand and in the workshops) and could you fulfill these expectations? What did the citizens (if you do had workshops with citizens) expect from the workshop as far as you could

Regional administrations: this target group expected to gain knowledge about citizen participation and to be able to participate in such a process themselves. Likewise, the goal was to promote cycling and walking in Freistadt and to involve citizens in this process.

Project co-funded by the European Union Funds (ERDF and IPA)

Citizens: since the people who participated in the workshop are all enthusiastic cyclists and walkers, they expected to be able to communicate their concerns to the municipal staff and to be heard. They also wanted to be able to help decide which suggestions for improvement would be implemented most quickly.

## 7. Outcome of the co-creation workshops

(If you do have three consecutive workshops dealing on the same topic, this chapter is to be filled out once at the end of all workshops)

What are the outcomes of the workshop(s)? Please describe if all the participants were satisfied with the outcome of the workshops. Please specify the outcomes in the table. Do you think the workshop(s) lead to an increase of institutional capacity for local/regional administration?

Fulfill this table with the outcomes (you can add columns if you need)

<b>Outcome:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Stakeholder involved:</b>	<b>Expected duration:</b>	<b>Field of action (bioeconomy in general /rural development/urban rural cooperation)</b>
Initiative	Rest areas and trees / more trees at rest areas	Traffic board of the city council	Ongoing	Rural development
Initiative	Joint activities - e.g. meetings and joint rides		Ongoing	Rural development
Initiative	Establish a reporting point or platform for "danger spots" in active traffic	Traffic board of the city council	Ongoing	Rural development
Initiative	Info to citizens via service station	Traffic board of the city council	Ongoing	Rural development
Project				

Project idea				
Network	Networking with schools	Traffic board of the city council	Ongoing	
Other (please specify)				

Explain your outcomes (initiatives/ideas/projects etc.) in detail.

Who is connecting/coordinating these different outputs? What are the next steps? Who is going to finance the following steps?

- Rest areas and trees / more trees at rest areas: Cycling and walking should be made more attractive by creating rest areas throughout the city. these should also be equipped with trees to provide shade on hot days. the next step is for the traffic committee to consider where such rest areas could be located and how exactly they should be designed.
- Joint activities - e.g. meetings and joint rides: In the future, there will be more joint bicycle rides to increase the visibility of cycling. The city's bicycle representatives are responsible for the implementation of this measure.
- Establish a reporting point or platform for "danger spots" in active traffic: the citizens would like to have a platform where they can report danger spots at any time. Especially at the second workshop, it was noticeable that the citizens made many suggestions for improvement, and the citizens were pleased to have a possibility to make these suggestions.
- Info to citizens via service station: There are several freely accessible service stations for bicycles in the city, where bicycles can be pumped up or repaired. This possibility is not very well known among the citizens and should therefore be better communicated in the future.
- Networking with schools: Awareness raising, especially among schoolchildren, was perceived as very important by the citizens. Therefore, there should be cooperation and a network with the schools in the city. Here, cooperation is also planned on the topic of safe routes to school.

## **8. Innovation potential for your region**

(If you do have three consecutive workshops dealing on the same topic, this chapter is to be filled out once at the end of all workshops)

Provide the big picture of the innovation potential in your region by interconnecting ideas/initiatives/projects identified via the co-creation workshops. How could the innovative power of the region be increased through participative governance? Were future scenarios identified and strategies developed to increase the attractiveness of rural areas? Were future cooperations and strategies for urban-rural cooperation developed?

Citizen participation has certainly strengthened the innovation potential of the region. Those citizens who have participated in the process are familiar with the topic at hand and know about it better than local administrations. Thus, more and more innovative ideas are generated when citizens are involved. In terms of improved cycling and walking, the innovation potential of the region could certainly be raised. Likewise, cooperation with other municipalities was sought in order to better connect these municipalities for cyclists. Strategies and scenarios were certainly developed that strengthen the attractiveness of rural areas.

## **9. Strengths and weaknesses of the process of participative governance**

(If you do have three consecutive workshops dealing on the same topic, this chapter is to be filled out once at the end of all workshops)

Describe your experiences: What are the strengths of participative governance in a decision-making process of the appointed topic/region? What were your problems in involving different people and stakeholders in the process of finding solutions? Does the workshop improve the skills of the local and/or regional administration, in regards to institutional capacity?

Strengths: by involving citizens, people can take part in the process and decisions who live the topic being worked on every day in practice and in everyday life and are therefore very familiar with it. Likewise, the more people involved, the more ideas are contributed.

Problems: the limits of the citizen participation process must be clearly communicated from the beginning. In this case, it had to be made clear that not all concerns and ideas can be implemented. If this is not communicated or is communicated incorrectly, false hopes and expectations can be raised among the citizens involved. Likewise, it was not clear to the administrators at the beginning that only a small selection of ideas would be feasible or could be implemented. Thus they were surprised at the beginning, how many or also in the conversion expensive ideas came from the citizens. However, it was made clear that in the second workshop as many ideas as possible would be developed and then the third workshop would be used for prioritization and testing for feasibility.

## **10. Do you plan to use the process of participative governance also in future?**

(If you do have three consecutive workshops dealing on the same topic, this chapter is to be filled out once at the end of all workshops)

Do you already have concrete plans on how and when you are going to use participative governance in your region? In which topics do you plan to involve the general public in future? Are you willing to motivate policy makers to further use participatory governance and the presented methods?

For public bodies (Ministries,...): Are you planning to regularly involve the public in decision making in your region?

In any case, it is planned that citizen participation will also be used in the future. Therefore, this workshop series served as a start to get in touch with the topic of citizen participation and how it can be implemented. There are still no concrete topics where citizen participation should be used. However, it is very important to the administration to implement this more often in the future.

## **11. Identified opportunities for rural development in your region**

(If you do have three consecutive workshops dealing on the same topic, this chapter is to be filled out once at the end of all workshops)

What opportunities did you identify to tackle demographic change? What opportunities did you identify for rural development in your region? How could urban-rural cooperation work according to your experiences in the workshops? Did the workshop empower lively rural areas in your region? If not, what was missing? What need to be done?

By implementing the ideas developed, it is possible to improve the infrastructure for cycling and walking. More and more people want to do without the car and therefore a good and safe infrastructure is indispensable. Especially for young families, topics like safe cycling and walking are enormously important and a reason why people decide for or against a place to live. If some of the solutions developed are implemented, this will certainly contribute to increasing the attractiveness. Ideas were also brought forward on how to connect Freistadt with other communities through bike paths. An implementation can also increase the attractiveness of the surrounding smaller communities, as it would then also be possible to reach Freistadt for shopping by bike.

## 12. Annexes

Agenda of the co-creation workshop, invitation of the workshop

01 PRESENTATION of results Workshop 2

02 CLUSTER & DEEPEN the topics

03 EVALUATE & PRIORITIZE the ideas

04 CLARIFY NEXT STEPS

...where do we want to go?

...what do we need?

...who do we need?

05 OUTLOOK...timeline and responsibilities

Pictures of the workshop

