Reflections related to FUSILLI. WP1 & WP2 Workshop.

Tuesday 7th June 2022.

Location: Oslo Metropolitan University (OsloMet/OMU).

Address: **Pilestredet 35.**

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Participants reception & coffe, (08:30-09:00), Ground Floor</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">OPENING SESSION (09:00-09:50), Third Floor: PH 322</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">(1) Managing unpredictability: Living Lab activities under a war (Olena Muradyan, Olga Filipova and Oleksandra Deineko, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University).</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">PAPER SESSION 1 (10:00-12:30) Max. 20 minutes presentation of each paper</td></tr>
<tr><td>Panel A: DEVELOPING LIVING LABS (3rd floor PH 322)

(2) The role of science and scientists in the establishment of Living Labs. (Anders Eika, OMU). (2)
(3) Food Living Lab Business Modeling. Case TAMK Catering Studio Living Lab of Food & Sustainability. (Mikael Lindell et al, Tampere University of Applied Sciences/TAMK).
(4) Types of knowledge to be mobilised in a Living Lab. A conceptual note. (Svein Ole Borgen, Oslo Metropolitan University/OMU).</td><td>Panel B: TRANSFORMING URBAN FOOD SYSTEMS (3rd floor PH 330)

(5) Living Labs contributing to Food System Sustainability Transition – Future Food Service Approach. (Sanna Luoyo et al., Tampere University of Applied Sciences/TAMK).
(6) The Concept of Urban Agriculture in an Urban Food System. (Ouiam Fatiha Boukharta, Daria Yashkina and Leticia Chico Santamarta, University of Valladolid/UVA).
(7) Community Gardens as a locus for change-making. (Danielle Wilde and Maria Karyda, Southern Denmark University /SDU).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Group discussions (11:00-12:30), 2nd Floor
PI 243, PI 246, PI 248</td><td>Group discussions (11:00-12:30), 6th Floor
PI 649, PI 653, PI 658</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">PAPER SESSION 2 (13:30-16:00) Max. 20 minutes presentation of each paper</td></tr>
<tr><td>Panel C: THE MUNICIPALITY IN FOCUS, (3rd floor PH322)

(8) How do the cities shape their co-creation processes in the visioning phase of the FUSILLI project? (Marjoleine van der Meij, VU).
(9) The gridlock of the collaborative governance of food in Turin. (Federico Cuomo,Egidio Dansero and Stefania Ravazzi, University of Turin /UNITO).
(10) Top-down initiated transition management practices: the role of municipal civil servants coordinating Living Labs for urban food system transformations. (Jonathan Luger et al, VU).</td><td>Panel D: THE CITIZENS IN FOCUS, (3rd floor PH330)

(11) Urban food system transitions through participatory actions: The case of Nilüfer Citizen Council. (Emel Karakaya Ayalp with Mehmet Can Yılmaz, IDU).
(12) Priorities of a Food Policy Council for Luxembourg for a Just, Diversified and Sustainable Food System (Rachel Reckinger, UoL).
(13) What should be the role of Food Policy Councils vis-à-vis Food Commissions, Living Labs, Local Governments? (Einar Braathen, OMU, and Ellen Marie Forsberg, CGOV).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Group discussions (14:30-16:00) 2nd Floor
PI 243, PI 246, PI 248</td><td>Group discussions (14:30-16:00), 6th Floor
PI 649, PI653, PI 658</td></tr>
</table>

ABSTRACTS

Opening Session, 3rd Floor PH 322

(1) Managing unpredictability: Living Lab activities under a war

Olena Muradyan, Olga Filipova and Oleksandra Deineko (V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University)

Russian military invasion of Ukraine caused harmful economic downturn, humanitarian and economic catastrophe in the country, dramatically changed food sustainability and everyday people's life. Under the war conditions Kharkiv living lab has transformed its concept and streams of activity, gaining three core principles – transnationality, reactionary and volunteering. Transnationality means holding activities from different physical places; reactionary – fast living lab participants' reactions on the current needs; volunteering – how local actors contribute to maintain social sustainability under the warfare. In the focus of LL is a new quality of cooperation between local authorities, local business and NGOs. We reflect on the war influence on food and social sustainability of the city food system. The concept of living lab under the war brings new understanding of social cohesion between local actors and civil participation oriented on common goal achievement.

Questions for the discussion:

1. What are the main challenges during managing unpredictability?
2. How do you see the concept of Living Lab after the war?
3. How transnational and local are combined in the concept of Living Lab under the war? Is volunteering a practice of living lab under war conditions or it will be a regular practice for any living lab?

Panel A: DEVELOPING LIVING LABS (3rd floor PH 322)

(2) The role of science and scientists in the development of Living Labs.

Anders Eika (Oslo Metropolitan University/OMU).

One of the defining traits of a living lab is that it is composed of members from several or all the following: Private citizens, the municipality and other public bodies, NGOs, commercial interests and particularly small and medium enterprises (SMEs), and researchers. We argue that in this mix, researchers can have an important role in providing consistency and mediation over the course of the lab. Living lab activities creating innovation often provide indirect benefits and/or benefits that take a substantial amount of time to develop. Citizens in particular but also NGOs and SMEs will often be hesitant to commit to the project over time when the immediate benefit is unclear, or if they simply lose interest. Depending on the institutions surrounding the lab, changes in the political landscape can greatly alter the involvement from the municipality and other public bodies. A new

political leadership might have different interests and priorities, and in some cases a new leadership will want to distance themselves from any programme initialised by the previous leadership.

Considering this, researchers might be the individuals we can expect to be involved in a living lab most consistently. Depending on the topic of the lab, the various participants can also have conflicting interests which needs to be managed, even in labs working on virtually universally acclaimed causes such as food system sustainability. The interest of the researcher in creating labs with rigorous scientific methodologies to create valid results is also prone to conflict with the interest of other lab partners: For the researcher it will be more important to accurately determine *why* something works or fails, than *whether* it works. Despite this, we hypothesise that the interests of researchers in the lab will tend to contrast less with other interests, than the interests of citizens, public bodies, and commercial interests respectively. In setting up and running a living lab the conflicting interests must be managed, as the partners must feel like the lab provides some sort of benefit. Researchers are a plausible participant to take up this mantle, also because they can be expected to remain with the project with greater consistency.

Questions for the discussion:

4. Is there a problem with consistency of participation and conflicts of interests within the living lab(s) you have experience with?
5. Thinking of one or a few specific labs you have experience with: how can researchers help them run more efficiently?

(3) Food Living Lab Business Modeling.Case TAMK Catering Studio Living Lab of Food & Sustainability

Mikael Lindell et al (Tampere University of Applied Sciences/TAMK).

Living Lab (LL) is an open innovation ecosystem. The core of the ecosystem is action itself. However, defining the methodology and fundaments of LL form basis and meaning for concrete doing and implementation. This process includes defining a clear vision, mission, aims and values to create and foster a winning culture. The value proposition for the stakeholders has also to be defined. The fundaments and strong sustainability approach of LL can be crystallized and visualized by various tools and canvases, like Quadruple (Quintuple) Helix Model and Sustainable Business Model Canvas. In TAMK we started the business modeling process in autumn 2021 to establish TAMK Catering Studio Living Lab of Food & Sustainability. In this short paper presentation we'll reveal the process, challenges, outcomes and key learnings so far.

Questions

6. Have you formulated LL fundaments in your Living Lab?
7. What is the importance of having a business model formulated when establishing LL?
8. What are the challenges when creating & formulating LL fundaments?

(4) Types of knowledge to be mobilized in a Living Lab. A conceptual note

Svein Borgen (OMU)

Co-production of knowledge is one of three definitional characteristics of Living Labs. It`s important to clarify exactly what types of knowledge we are talking about as well as the process(es) by which co-production of knowledge could be practiced in Living Labs. The approach in this preliminary conceptual note is to build on studies of innovation in other empirical fields, in particular regional innovation, and translate relevant insights from these fields into the world of living labs. The ideal-typical bases of knowledge in question are synthetic (instrumentally solving problems), analytical (theoretically understanding) and symbolic (culturally creating meanings) referred to as the SAS-taxonomy. Practical implications for living labs are discussed.

Questions:

9. Do you think the SAS-taxonomy can be helpful for understanding the creation, sharing and dissemination of knowledge in your living lab?
10.1 If yes – what is the added value of this approach as compared to the approaches you have used so far when setting up the group of stakeholders?
10.2 If no – why do you think this SAS-taxonomy is not appropriate for Living labs?

Panel B: TRANSFORMING URBAN FOOD SYSTEMS (3rd floor PH 330)

(5) Living Labs contributing in Food System Sustainability Transition – Future Food Service Approach

Sanna Luoyo et al. (Tampere University of Applied Sciences /TAMK)

Understanding of food system living labs requires broadening the perspective from agri-food context towards consumers and citizens, their food choices, preferences and eating experience. Food consumption patterns, food culture and acceptance of new foods are limiting factors when adopting sustainable diets. Due to volume of business and daily served meals, food service sector is critical in terms of impact and justice in the food system transformation. The action study to be conducted aims to describe and explain how living labs can contribute to food system transition together with food service sector. Moreover, we'll seek a transformational change among collaboration and co-innovation in this context. The first stage of the project pursues a design process by discovering and defining challenges in the 'Food Living Labs' and adjacent user-centred prototype development, testing and evaluation. The result of the larger entity is to develop a co-innovation process which can be applied and scaled at living labs regarding food & sustainability problem-solving.

Questions

11. We are interested in getting touch with Catering and Hospitality Industry related Living Labs. Do have connections in your networks, which might be helpful for us?
12. Which open access journals would you' recommend us to consider for publication plan?
13. How would you recommend to communicate about Living Lab (concept and methodology) for (business) partners who might not be familiar with the concept? How to encourage them to participate co-innovation process?

(6) The Concept of Urban Agriculture in an Urban Food System.

Ouiam Fatiha Boukharta, Daria Yashkina and Leticia Chico Santamarta, (University of Valladolid/UVA)

As the world faces a rapidly growing population, food is a major concern that must be addressed [1,2]. Indeed, urban agriculture is one of the ways to address food security in cities, since it refers to food production in urban spaces [3]. This work focuses on urban agriculture and its insertion in the food sector, as well as on the main lines of thought that have been proposed and defended in recent years, considering the effect of the new COVID-19 virus on the implementation of projects, their application and communication to the public [4]. Within the framework of this work, two cases of the implementation of urban agriculture have been analyzed through interviews to main actors involved: Alimenta Concienca in Segovia (Spain) and Green for you in Kharkiv (Ukraine), as well as a survey that was developed and distributed to a worldwide community to get their ideas and opinions on these two concepts. In fact, case studies provide an opportunity to try to highlight the factors that contribute to the effective implementation of urban agriculture - especially with the COVID pandemic and the wartime in Ukraine, where urban food problems increased.

The case studies and interviews provide an opportunity to highlight the factors that contribute to the effective implementation of urban agriculture. Also, this paper considers another important aspect for the implementation of urban agriculture - the attitude of the public to the phenomenon of urban agriculture (which includes the level of knowledge, involvement, and interest in urban agriculture). To do this, a pilot survey of different population groups was conducted with an emphasis on young people as the main subject of implementation.

Footnotes:

[1] Hasse, J. E., & Lathrop, R. G. (2003). Land resource impact indicators of urban sprawl. Applied geography, 23(2-3), 159-175.
[2] Martellozzo, F., & Clarke, K.C. (2013). Urban Sprawl and the Quantification of Spatial Dispersion.
[3] Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2018 D. Nandwani (ed.), Urban Horticulture, Sustainable Development and Biodiversity 18, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67017-1_5
[4] Mehmood, A., & Imran, M. (2021). Digital social innovation and civic PARTICIPATION: Toward responsible and inclusive transport planning. European Planning Studies, 1-16. doi:10.1080/09654313.2021.1882946.

Questions:

14. In your opinion, how do you think it is possible to integrate and link food security to urban spaces?
15. How do you think we can increase the interest to urban agriculture on local levels?
16. Do you think it would be important to integrate these concepts of urban agriculture and food security within universities?

(7) Community Gardens as a locus for change-making.

Danielle Wilde and Maria Karyda (Southern Denmark University /SDU)

Urban food production can be a viable contributor to increasing food security and a nature-positive economy, building resilience and competitiveness, decreasing inequalities and empowering communities. In the FUSILLI project, we find a range of approaches to urban food production through the implementation of community gardens. These gardens have differing management structures, and range in size from small installations through to large plots of land with dwellings. Some exist due to citizen take-over of vacant land, or the placement of small (approved or unapproved) infrastructures in urban spaces. Others are large, multi-year initiatives driven by associations. Yet

others have been put in place by municipalities in response to citizen demand, or as a result of urban planning. Each approach affords agency, impacts quality of life of citizens and their access to food. We unpack these differences using examples from FUSILLI cities and reflect on the role of community gardens in change-making.

Questions:

17. How many different kinds of community gardens do you have in your city?
What role do the different kinds of gardens play in connecting citizens to the food system?
18. Do the community gardens in your city afford community-building?
If so, in what ways?
if not, why do you think this is the case?
19. What role/s (if any) do the gardens play in food system transformation in your city?
Do you see any evidence that suggests that community-members who participate in community gardens are aware of this potential?

(Paper Session 2) Panel C: THE MUNICIPALITY IN FOCUS (3rd floor PH 322)

(8) How do the cities shape their co-creation processes in the visioning phase of the FUSILLI project?

Marjoleine van der Meij (VU)

Decision-making processes in constructing policy are often treated as rational processes, wherein the best previously proven solutions are chosen (Alexander, 1982). However, implementing creative problem solving (e.g. Tassoul and Buijs, 2007) as a design method in policy construction processes can encourage finding innovative and attractive solutions (Martins & Terblanche, 2003). In addition, incorporating design into policy mixes can serve a demand for innovation (Pilat, 2010), which in case of local urban food system transformation is urgently needed due to complex interactions between political, societal, environmental and economic transformations (den Boer et al., 2021; Mangnus et al., 2019).

Therefore, it is not surprising that several initiatives emerge for experimentation with design thinking in policy (co-)construction, such as Living Labs and their multi-actor co-creation processes (Depine et al., 2018; Loorbach, Frantzeskaki, & Avelino, 2017). Scholarly research seems to focus on challenges of Living Labs, e.g. in running them and in creating impact with their co-creative processes (Kok et al., forthcoming). However, limited research seems done in how Living Labs experience barriers and facilitators in applying design thinking and/or creative methods in their experimentation. Given that the potential value of such approaches is high, this study aims to further unravel these perceived barriers and facilitators of co-creative processes in Living Labs, through the eyes of their coordinators, as to find angles for the further (co-)creative development of innovative (policy mixes and) solutions to persistent urban food system challenges and serve transformation in sustainable directions.

Questions

20. (a., b., c.) (?)

(9) The gridlock of the collaborative governance of food in Turin

Federico Cuomo,Egidio Dansero and Stefania Ravazzi (UNITO)

Food policy is attracting increasing interest in the community of policy analysts, not only because of its novelty, but also for its intrinsic multi-dimensionality (Lang et al. 2009; Steel 2009; Cretella and Buenger 2015; Morgan 2015). Indeed, although food policy can generically be considered as a set of decisions and non-decisions aimed at defining a spatial system of food production and distribution (Peters and Pierre 2014), it is usually attributed with ambitious goals pertaining health, environmental sustainability and fairness (Mayer and Knox 2006; Mendes 2008). Despite their strong commitment toward a systemic change of the local food policies, official urban food strategies are often accused of dying in the bud, leaving urban food policies still substantially fragmented and lacking the systemic approach that should build true local food systems marked by quality, sustainability and fairness. In our paper, four hypotheses will be tested through the preliminary findings of an ongoing research on a deviant case of Urban Food Strategy implementation, the case of the Turin UFS. The research is being conducted through semi-structured interviews and the first collected pieces of evidence have been screened applying probative causal inference tests.

Questions

21. (a., b., c.) (?)

(10) Top-down initiated transition management practices: the role of municipal civil servants coordinating Living Labs for urban food system transformations

Jonathan Luger et al. (VU)

In response to pervasive social and environmental problems in agri-food systems, transition management (TM) practices offer alternative pathways to more sustainable futures. While such practices are increasingly initiated top-down, there has been limited attention given to the new gatekeeping roles that local governments play in sustainability transitions, of agri-food systems in particular. This is especially salient in light of ongoing discussions around the democratic (il)legitimacy of TM. While recent contributions normatively explore democratic legitimacy in top-down initiated TM practices, we rather investigate how the role of municipal civil servants unfolds in practice, and aim to shed a different light on the discussions around democratic legitimacy in TM literature. This is done against a theoretical backdrop of structuration theory, arguing how perspectives of agents can point to performances of transformative social practices enacting both structure and agency.

The empirical focus of this paper is on municipal civil servants that are coordinating Living Labs, a key TM methodology, in 12 European cities, as part of the EU-funded FUSILLI project for urban food system transformation. As action-researchers part of this project, we used a novel transformative interviewing approach to reflexively investigate how local government actors influence and are influenced in driving local sustainability transitions. We found that in order to fulfil their leadership role, municipal civil servants morph, adapt and diffuse local Living Labs and what is considered ‘urban food system transformation’ to align as much as possible with local political contexts, begging the question what is left of the ‘radical’ or even ‘post-foundational democratic’ character of TM. On the

one hand, this supports previous findings on clashing norms and temporalities of TM practices and representative governments, and urges to pay attention to democratic legitimacy in top-down initiated TM practices. On the other, we argue that our findings underline the need to ask the political question of how to reshape our political institutions to foster sustainability transitions, building on discussions around the (post)political nature of TM. We conclude with practical recommendations for funding agencies, policy-makers and municipal civil servants.

Questions for the discussion:

22. The findings mainly point to the responsibility given to LL coordinators to drive urban food system transformation. This leadership role seems difficult to take, as in the interviews many outlined the great dependency of their employment on whether or not they can appease local politicians with the FUSILLI work. On the one hand, this trains civil servants to be skilled policy-lobbyists, but on the other this endangers the experimental and 'political' character of living labs and what 'urban food system transformation' in the context of FUSILLI means. In the rest of the work done under other WPs, how do you reflect on these findings? Is this supported? What are your (different) perspectives?

23. Rather than having a strong theoretical framework in this paper outlining how we define democratic legitimacy (e.g. input, throughput, output, etc.) (De Geus et al. 2022) or the specific transitions tasks/roles municipal civil servants can/should have to do their work democratically legitimate (Braams et al., 2020), the approach here is to be more inductive. In other words, instead of asking "How do municipal civil servants […] make sure that their work is democratically legitimate [according to a pre-defined definition]?" – we try to go about this question along the lines of: "What is the role of municipal civil servants […] in driving urban food system transformation?" – and then in the discussion section will try argue how their 'role' relates to the discussion around democratic legitimacy in the literature so far. What do you think of this approach overall? And how can we write this down without being too pre-conceived in our ideas?

(Paper Session 2) Panel D: THE CITIZENS IN FOCUS (3rd floor PH 330)

(11) Urban food system transitions through participatory actions: The case of Nilüfer Citizen Council.

Emel Karakaya Ayalp with Mehmet Can Yılmaz (IDU)

The recent concerns about societal challenges, food democracy, food inequalities, food sovereignty, ecological destruction created by agricultural production and consumption processes, public health impacts of unhealthy diets have forced communities, governments, and organizations for a significant transformation. Movements such as food democracy, voting with mouths, food citizenship and civic food are growing larger. As cities and municipalities are seen to be responsible for public health in which healthy foods and diets have been included, these bodies create participatory solutions and possibilities related to their role in urban food system transitions.
This presentation aims at narrating the self-governing Nilüfer Citizens Council as a participatory model that supports transitions of urban food system in a sustainable way. Composed of 64 elected neighborhood committees, the council follows a bottom-up model of which structure is vertically designated. Through participation and collaboration, the dynamics that shaped council gave outputs

such as youth, women, kids and elder participation to urban governance for a more sustainable food system. Also, the model let formation of environment councils, sub-councils and working groups for the needs of citizens in Nilüfer.

Questions

24. In terms of niche-regime terminology of sustainability transitions literature, is the Nilüfer Citizen Council a niche emerged in the regime?
25. Does it have the potential to affect socio-technical regime?

(12) Priorities of a Food Policy Council for Luxembourg for a Just, Diversified and Sustainable Food System: Two Surveys with Citizens and Food System Professionals.

Rachel Reckinger (University of Luxembourg /UoL)

Transitioning towards food sovereignty within planetary boundaries in a just, sustainable and diversified way is gaining public momentum. Participative tools such as Food Policy Councils play a key role in an ethical reconfiguration of shared governance, by combining legislative action with market initiatives, innovations from civil society and research. Collective commitment, also including citizens, can initiate concrete projects for a systemic food system change and implement food democracy.

I will interpret two surveys conducted with both food system professionals and citizens (2019 and 2021) on the establishment of a national-scale Food Policy Council in Luxembourg. This empirically documented insight focuses on what Luxembourgish citizens and professionalswould like to see a national-scale Food Policy Council accomplish and avoid, and which goals and topics it should address.

It transpires that specific, concrete, and ambitious sustainability projects around food Systems rate very high on professionals' and citizens' priorities for a just transition of the food system, especially if they are embedded in compelling projections of realistic diversification and societal participation initiatives. This opportunity should be seized, to build multistakeholder-led effective food policies; cooperatively shorten sustainable supply circuits; and encourage innovation, diversification, and collective learning. Luxembourg can use its political and economic international weight to push best practices for food sovereignty forward, underpinned by systemic ethics.

Questions

26. (a., b., c.) (?)

(13) What should be the role of Food Policy Councils vis-à-vis Food Commissions, Living Labs, Local Governments?

Einar Braathen (OMU) and Ellen Marie Forsberg (County Governor of Oslo and Viken/CGOV)

Food Policy Councils (FPCs) should emerge from civil society initiatives, as an expression of a special type of social movements – Food Movements. The paper discusses why this should be the case and describes this type of processes in Cologne (Köln) and other German cities.

Next, the paper discusses other important forces, as well as possible sequences and interactive relationships, in the transformation of urban food systems. The paper suggests that policy making bodies resulting from initiatives from the (local) government should be defined as Food Commissions, for instance in the development of the city plan for food system transformation (cfr. WP3 of FUSILLI). Due to interaction with civil society and/or private sector initiatives, a Food Commission could be developed into a more independent FPC. Regardless of who takes the initiative, the constructive and co-creative role of the FPC can best be sustained if it is both independent and enjoy a clear political, administrative and material (not necessarily financial) support from the Municipality and/or other government or local authorities.

Living Labs initiated by a project such as FUSILLI should operate independently but in communication with any Food Commission or FPC. Living Labs initiated by projects such as FUSILLI plays a complementary role. It should operate independently from any Food Commission or FPC. The Living Labs should experiment with solutions to key challenges in the urban food transformation and pilot the co-creative collaboration between different actors in the food system. The FUSILLI Living Labs should survive the FUSILLI project itself and become a body of activists, a type of collective 'organic intellectuals', that vitalize, influence and 'watch' the Food Policy Council and/or Food Commission. The Food 2030 Living Lab should help the city be committed to the European 'Food 2030' process and part of international networks for urban food transformation.

Questions

27. How far are you in the process of establishing a Food Policy Council in your city/region, and from where will/does the initiative come ?
28. Which roles would you suggest for the Food 2030 Living Lab, Food Commisssion and Food Policy Council, respectively, in 2022-23 and afterwards?