



EUROPEAN
CULTURAL
FOUNDATION

- Culture 2 Commons • Les Têtes de l'Art • Oberliht
- Platoniq • Krytyka Polityczna • Subtopia

Connected Action for the Commons

INTERIM (E)VALUATION REPORT (2014-2015)

SUMMARY

Internationalisation



Interim (E)valuation Report (2014-2015) – SUMMARY

Introduction

The *Networked Programme* (NP), which since 2015 has been known as [Connected Action for the Commons](#) (CA), is a flagship ECF programme that will run for four years, between 2014-2017. The programme was specifically designed to contribute to ECF's strategic goals as laid down in our multiannual Strategic Plan (2013-2016) entitled *Connecting Culture, Communities and Democracy* and in particular: "...to bridge the gap, to reconnect people and re-invigorate our democracies by identifying, connecting, nourishing and illuminating a network of local cultural change-makers. This will enable a European-wide community of practice to emerge, a group that evolves naturally, based on common interest and enables members to learn from each other and collectively develop their ideas, skills and expertise."¹

The programme aims to connect and mobilise *cultural change-makers* across Europe – together with their communities – to explore alternative approaches to restoring the democratic deficit in their countries, cities, as well as at European level. The programme was developed using a new grant-giving approach for ECF – *catalytic philanthropy* – whereby ECF would assume the role of a catalyst for social change, addressing complex challenges, engaging a number of stakeholders, sharing responsibilities with them, and mobilising all its tools for achieving stronger impact.² Through a restricted call, by the end of 2013 six organisations have been selected to take part in the [then called] *Networked Programme*: Culture 2 Commons (Croatia), [Krytyka Polityczna](#) (Poland), [Oberliht](#) (Moldova), [Platonig](#) (Spain), [Subtopia](#) (Sweden) and [Les Têtes de L'Art](#) (France). From the outset, ECF has embedded in this framework an **R&D grants scheme** and an annual Idea (+ Advocacy camp).

One of the initial aims of this programme is to invest in **scaling up and out** the core activities of the selected agents (aka 'hubs'). Under **scaling out**, the goal is to expand the outreach of each organisation's networks and engage broader communities. Under **scaling up**, it aims to influence systemic change (in policies, legislation, the environment) for which scaling out can be the first stage.³

The **(E)valuation tool** aims to support the development and management of the Networked Programme. It puts in place *the Value-Based Approach* principles and was jointly instigated by the ECF team and the hubs as an *ongoing* and *ex-post* evaluation.⁴ We hope the (E)valuation tool will evolve and improve during the course of the programme. Its focus is on the impact, therefore this *Interim (E)valuation Report* cannot provide strong evidence at this stage about the overall impact, but only about key (short- and mid-term) outcomes and outputs from Year 1 and 2 of the programme. It concludes with the main challenges and learnings, as well as presenting some ideas about how to improve the process in the future. It focuses on values, milestones, activities, indicators set forth by the programme hubs and ECF, in order to systemise the process of change. The (E)valuation Matrix (Figure 1) focuses on three levels:

- **Network level** (Column I)
- **Stakeholders' level** (Column II) and
- **ECF's internal level** (Column III).

The first two levels are evaluated together by ECF and the *Connected Action for the Commons* hubs. Column III is evaluated internally at the organisation (ECF). In addition, this interim report assesses the progress on the core values, laid down at the beginning of the programme – as a part of the Value-Based Approach: **Trust, Inclusiveness, Care, Openness for Change, Interest in the others etc.**

¹ ECF's Strategic Plan Culture, Communities and Democracy (2013-2016).

² The pilot attempt to work with partner 'hub' organisations was Doc Next Network (2010-2014).

³ Description as per Innoveave. Practical tool for social innovation <http://www.innoweave.ca/en/modules/scaling-impact>.

⁴ The (E)valuation tool was developed in 2015 by Lyudmila Petrova (ECF, R&D & Erasmus University), using the Value-Based Approach, developed by Prof. Dr Arjo Klamer, Erasmus University, Rotterdam.

Figure 1: (E)valuation Matrix

	I. NETWORK (hubs and ECF internal team)	II. STAKEHOLDERS (external)	III. ECF internal team (and organisation)
Output / Process	<p>1. How participants are involved in the NP?</p> <p>To assess the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • engagement • ownership • collaboration/co-creation. 	<p>4. How the stakeholders are involved in the NP?</p> <p>To assess the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation (rate and diversity). 	<p>7. How the programme is developed?</p> <p>To assess the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ownership (responsibilities); • coordination; • facilitation/support.
Outcome Medium term	<p>2. What happens to or for the participants through the first year of the NP?</p> <p>To assess the level of synergy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • engagement; • mutuality; ownership • collaboration/co-creation. <p>To detect changes in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the shared values; • new learning experience. 	<p>5. What happens to or for the stakeholders through the first year of the NP?</p> <p>To assess the level of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understanding, appreciation; • access; • new partnerships. 	<p>8. What happens as a result of the NP project?</p> <p>To assess the level of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organisational changes; • competence enhancement; • spillovers to other ECF programmes/projects; • new learning experience.
Impact Long term	<p>3. What happens to or for the participants in the long run as a result of the NP?</p> <p>NP grown and (self-) empowered network enabled to promote new tools for democratic engagement through culture (tentative).</p>	<p>6. What happens to or for the stakeholders (by various groups) in the long run as a result of the NP?</p> <p>Stakeholders are part of a Pan European Public Cultural Space which is dealing beyond local and beyond particular topics and brings structural changes for democratic engagement through culture (tentative).</p>	<p>9. What happens to or for ECF as an organisation in long run as a result of the NP?</p> <p>ECF becomes a leading learning foundation in Europe</p>

The initial matrix was developed further by ECF team and the hubs, according to their 2015 work plans.

Findings

The findings focus on **the outcomes** available at this interim project stage at the **Network level (I)** – reflecting the building up of trust, synergy and collaboration between the six hubs and ECF.⁵ They also focus on **Stakeholders' level (II)** – outcomes of the programme activities externally – engagement of peers, new contacts, partnerships, follow up actions, effect on broader communities. Level III – the effect on ECF internally is also included, not extensively, based on preliminary feedback.

I. NETWORK Level

Connected Action – investment in process (not in 'product' or 'service')

In the first two years of the programme, the key effort of ECF's team, as well as the hubs, was focused on the process of aligning the hubs' understanding, expectations and vocabulary, as well as defining the network's common goals and starting to deliver actions around these goals together.

- **Year 1 (2014)** was considered as 'setting the stage' for collaboration, synergies, for intensifying the interaction and collaborations among the programme partners (hubs), including defining a common 'cause' or area of action.
- **Year 2 (2015)** was dedicated to engaging in common messaging and shared goals, developing concrete actions together.
- **Year 3 (2016)** is now focused on stronger **synergy** among all programme components, co-working and **positioning** the *Connected Action for the Commons* as an important player in the area of commons at different levels, including the European level. In addition, the hubs will work on a sustainability strategy beyond 2017.

The first two programme years resulted in increased synergy and co-creation, as well as testing against other stakeholders: the Idea Makers, foundations (IC15) and experts. They also resulted in increased **responsibility** and **ownership** assumed by the hubs on the programme.

Fundraising efforts have intensified – both as the *Connected Action for the Commons*, as well as individually: e.g. Culture 2 Commons, Oberliht, Subtopia, Les Têtes de L'Art had an increase in fundraising for their key activities, for their constituencies, as well as positioning their work in their cities and countries.

Collaboration and (potential) partnerships among the hubs => Engagement & co-creation

Hub visits are cited by all hubs as an important step towards getting to know each other's contexts, cause and work. More than 12 hub visits took place over Year 1 and Year 2 (enabled by the ECF annual grant attributed to each hub). Their frequency and reciprocity was going at different speeds but almost all of them influenced the programme's short- and mid-term development.

Hub meetings (eight for the period March 2014-March 2016, including the kick-off meeting) were the key milestones for progressing on the network's consolidation, operationalisation and alignment with its core objectives, setting its priorities and positioning.

Clear **progress** towards the programme's goals is the commitment of all the hubs to a **shared action plan and budget for 2016-2017**. Compared with the approach in Years 1 & 2 (individual activity plans and reporting), this adds complexity to the process. However, the hubs are motivated to synergise and consolidate further their work on the common programme goals. In addition, they undertook to work together (in 2016) on a **sustainability strategy** for the *Connected Action for the Commons*, envisioning beyond 2017.

⁵ The findings in both Interim (E)valuation Report and this summary are based on facts reported by hubs (Final Reports Year 2) by May 2016.

Idea Camp – a test, a catalyst and an opportunity

The **Idea Camp** in Year 1 (2014) was the first joint action for all hubs and ECF where their capacity for collaboration has been tested fundamentally and important learnings have been acquired.⁶ ECF has been taking a lead on the development, implementation and administration of the calls for ideas and the R&D grants scheme, advised by the hubs and the advisors. Co-organising the two Idea Camps (2014 & 2015) around topics proposed by the hubs, has been a **catalyst for increased responsibilities and ownership** of all the hubs on the programme. The strong motivation of the hosting hubs (Les Têtes de l'Art and Subtopia) has been a test for their capacity to produce large events with a number of technical and content requirements, as well as to position themselves and the *Connected Action for the Commons* among local stakeholders and communities.

The hubs experienced **co-creation** along the Idea Camp's value chain: consulting the call for ideas, co-creating the programme and the methodology of the Idea Camp, co-developing the 2015 reader (Build the City), engaging in the Idea Camp follow-up activities with Idea Makers and R&D grantees, facilitating 'residencies' for R&D grantees at Subtopia and Medialab-Prado, etc.

The Idea Camps (2014 & 2015) **have increased the commitment of all hubs to the common cause**. Interacting with an extended group of stakeholders and peers (Idea Makers, experts, facilitators, foundations and local community) was a step towards building, **trust and ownership**, as well as for expanding and communicating the message in a different context.

ECF's position as the initiator and main funding body of the two Idea Camps has outbalanced the hubs' ownership, in particular in its key role in convening the event, managing the call for ideas, the production and budget implementation, as well as dedicated human resources. Experiences of Idea Camp 2014 nurtured the development of the 2015 Idea Camp programme. Those from 2015 resulted in even more initiative and ownership and leadership of Platoniq over the third Idea Camp (2017). As a result, together the hubs and ECF have laid down the **foundations of a network open to self-empowerment**.

New learning experiences & knowledge sharing

Engaging in common activities, and getting involved in each other's work in manifold ways, was essential for triggering **new learning and knowledge within the hubs**. This even **led to a perception change** in some of the hubs towards the topics of the commons, the scope of their work or the usability of their knowledge by others.

Transfer of knowledge and skills was achieved among the hubs, and transcended further to their communities (through dedicated actions such as workshops, awareness raising, Idea Camps).

For example, the specific know-how of Platoniq on crowdfunding platforms have been transferred and demanded by the other hubs; Perceptions and knowledge about influencing policy making related to public space, have been shared across; Developing new content (articles, opinions) on the commons in the public space (Build the City) was the "glue" for shaping up the hub's new discourses (KP) and advocacy priorities (Subtopia).

Action research: mapping participatory governance practices, which was set forth as a priority collaborative action in the year 2015 work plans, has not been achieved to the level aspired to. This was due to the unsuccessful application to Europe for Citizens in 2015. However, the hubs and ECF have mapped out and described a number of relevant practices from their local contexts driven by the Build the City reader and manifesto, as well as for different occasions, also mobilising R&D grantees.

The **R&D grants scheme** provides the Connected Action programme with a mechanism to map out and seed outstanding ideas and contributes to knowledge and understanding about new trends underlying cultural developments in Europe, as they emerge. Hence, further synergising the R&D grants process (ECF-coordinated) with the work of the Connected Action hubs should be reviewed and better integrated.

⁶ See Idea Camp Evaluation report (2016).

Figure 2: Outputs and outcomes for the Connected Action Network (Column I)

Outputs

Knowledge exchange and interaction (as a result of hub meetings & hub visits)

- 6 hub meetings (2014-2015)
- About a dozen self-initiated mutual visits between the hubs (facilitated by the ECF grant)
- Participated in each other's planned activities (workshops, public space events, knowledge exchanges, etc.), contributed with knowledge, skills (e.g., crowdfunding workshops)
- Exchanges of good practices & knowledge among hubs => increased spin-off connections and practice exchanges with partners/members on relevant topics (e.g., incubators, crowdfunding)

Collaboration, co-creation, cross-pollination

- Co-organised 2 large-scale Idea Camps and the related co-developed methodologies (Ideas on Wheels & other Idea Camp programme components)
- *Build the City* reader & manifesto as collaborative process and output
- Communication and co-decisions between ECF and hubs about the *Connected Action* programme objectives, priorities and actions
- Follow-up activity with R&D grantees (2014)
- From individual work plans for each hub => Joint Work Plan in 2016
- Two joint EU applications (Europe for the Citizens) – 1 unsuccessful, 1 under assessment

Advocacy & positioning

- Positioning locally, nationally and internationally – reported by all hubs
- Improving/expanding knowledge on advocacy internally. Worked together on identifying urgencies and common advocacy actions – towards a joint manifesto
- Working (partly) on action research – on concrete occasions

Outcomes

1) New learning and knowledge sharing; Research & Development

- Increased awareness and knowledge about the other hubs, their way of working, their capacity to change, their mission and activities; their advocacy tools
- Discovering complementarity and uniqueness of each other's work and competence
- Improved local (and regional) reputation and influence (advocacy potential) of hubs (Subtopia, Oberliht, Les Têtes de l'Art, Culture 2 Commons) through common actions (Idea Camp and other)
- Knowledge transfer and opportunities for using source webs tools (Subtopia, Les Têtes de l'Art, Oberliht); improving knowledge on civil-public governance models of cultural infrastructure
- Improving open source webs tools of other hubs (Subtopia, Les Têtes de l'Art, Oberliht)
- Alignment around the common themes and shared lexicon
- Co-designing concrete activities – e.g., Idea Camps, and in particular Idea Camp 2015; *Build the City* reader; participation in each other's planned activities (workshops, public space actions, etc.)
- Assessment of concrete actions, assuming lessons learned, and co-deciding on the next steps, priorities and improvements in the programme process
- Setting the stage for common fundraising actions (at least two joint applications of all hubs & ECF)
- Identifying urgencies and common advocacy actions – towards a joint manifesto
- Improving local reputation building and knowledge exchange between hubs
- The beginning of a cross-sector transnational **community of practice** (to be captured, managed and expanded by the Connected Action, R&D grantees/Idea Makers and ECF).

2) New collaborations and co-creation

- Two Idea Camps, which led to co-development, testing, learnings and improvement of methodology for developing ideas
- Testing methodologies on crowdfunding; improving Ideas on Wheels
- Increased internationalisation of hubs' work (international participation, translation of websites/materials, etc.)
- Two Europe for Citizens applications (2015 & 2016) fostered collaborative actions between hubs
- Increased spin-off connections and practice exchanges with partners/members on relevant topics (e.g., incubators)
- Increased collaboration on concrete actions & the related cross-pollination (e.g., *Build the City* reader & manifesto; workshop Art in public space – Marseille, hosting crowdfunding workshops, participation/presenting at key hub events and more)
- Increased self-initiative by the hubs => towards common sustainability strategy (in 2016) and searching for new self-driven coordination model for the future.

3) Advocacy and positioning: successful campaigns and actions in Culture 2 Commons (referendum, ESF national operational programme in Croatia, etc.)

4) Improved outreach & visibility (of the Connected Action Network)

- Improved methods (evaluation, crowdfunding, advocacy)
- Scaling practices.

II. STAKEHOLDERS Level – Upscaling the network

Stakeholder groups that are important for each of the hubs in their work were already identified by them in autumn 2014, during the development of the (E)valuation tool.

Advocacy potential

After the successful experience with the *Build the City* reader and Idea Camp 2015, the next step, undertaken by ECF, in collaboration with Philippe Eynaud (correspondent of Les Têtes de l'Art) – and with contributions by the hubs, R&D grantees and other European networks – was the launch of the [Build the City manifesto](#) in February 2016. The manifesto is a discussion paper, open for contributions, which aims to inspire conversation and inform EU and national policy-makers about the existing participatory governance initiatives and solutions for cities.

What was started already in 2015 as a joint statement to position Connected Action for the Commons at EU policy level has not yet been accomplished. It was overruled by the urgent need to act locally (for the hubs) and to address the EU Urban Agenda (relevant for the Dutch Presidency of the EU in the first half of 2016).

Figure 3: Outputs and outcomes for the external stakeholders (Column II)

Outputs
<p>From Idea Camp</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expanded network, new areas/sectors included – via Idea Makers /R&D grantees• Improved visibility of the raised topics• Increased capacities for advocacy and outreach – as a result of the knowledge exchange in and beyond the network• <i>Build the City</i> reader – reached out to several hundred recipients <p>Advocacy and positioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Joint statement on the Commons (not yet completed)• Testing structured dialogue tools (VoC) and dialogue on commoning practices at EU level (European Parliament and other)• Raising awareness about participatory governance practices at city level (during Dutch Presidency 2016)• Dedicated online space for the programme's content (hosted by Krytyka Polityczna)• Partnership (focal point on the Commons) with Eurozine (around 10 articles to be published from <i>Connected Action</i> & <i>Build the City</i> sources)• Correspondents' network – a tool for storytelling and a resource to be developed further
Outcomes
<p>1) New learning and knowledge sharing; Research & Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Investment in knowledge and exploratory practices through R&D grants; prototyping and testing <p>2) Expanded interaction and collaborations across communities/networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Idea Camp – a catalyst for creating and subsequently expanding the community of practice and a basis for an 'alumni' network• Improved ideas (for Idea Makers); expanded networks, new contacts and a potential for future collaborations <p>3) Advocacy and positioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Progress in local, national positioning for the hubs (Subtopia, Les Têtes de l'Art, Platoniq, and the others – indirectly)• Advocacy achievements (Culture 2 Commons)• Reach out to European Parliament (so far only a few attempts) <p>4) Improved outreach & visibility (of the <i>Connected Action</i> Network)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased awareness among international audience – <i>Connected Action</i> hubs reach out to broader communities through their improved communication tools (translation of websites, magazines, newsletters, printed materials)• Cross-pollination of the dissemination and communication tools => some new partnerships emerged (Krytyka Polityczna, Eurozine)• However, the identification of the <i>Connected Action</i> for a wider audience (beyond the closer circle of partners, Idea Makers, etc. was not very successful (positioning became the priority for 2016)• Connection to foundations with similar values and interest in the topic of commons• Online space dedicated to hosting the programme's content to be hosted by hub, Krytyka Polityczna

III. ECF internally

For ECF internally, implementing the programme has been related to staff re-organisation and re-positioning, creating new portfolios and modifying tasks several times along the process. In 2015 (**Year 2**) the optimised programme management structure and improved task-distribution reflected the pluralist nature of the programme better (set up of Cluster One for co-ordination with six hubs and distribution of horizontal responsibilities over the Idea Camp and R&D grants). Since 2015, ECF has a dedicated content coordinator for the Idea Camp. Through integrated project teams and horizontal work (across teams) the programme staff achieved better alignment with Knowledge Management, R&D and Advocacy and improved **learning about the new areas and topics** (such as the Commons, the participatory governance, advocacy and evaluation). The programme's communications lacked dedicated ECF staff and strategy in the second half of 2015 (except from the Idea Camp) – an issue resolved as of January 2016.

ECF's role in the *Connected Action* process has changed over time, from being perceived as the programme initiator, main funder, co-ordinator of the hub meetings, to a **facilitator** of a more self-driven and motivated network of hubs. This preliminary outcome meets the original expectations. ECF developed its own knowledge on the commons and consolidated its' participatory governance experiences into a new area – the the Urban agenda in the EU.

Most important outcomes for the hubs

During the evaluation session held on 14 March 2016, the representatives of all hubs brainstormed and pointed to up to three key outcomes and/or outputs that had the most important value for their work throughout the programme up to that moment. This validated to a great extent the overall findings and key trends detected by the (E)valuation.

Figure 4: The full list of input with explanatory notes

Subtopia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness – internally: about the topics, about what the rest of the world is doing; personal development; interaction & awareness about the other hubs • Idea Camp 2015 – great capacity builder & advocacy catalyst • Internationalisation (opened up to international audience: translated their website in English, Subtopia Magazine in English, Klumpology publication – bi-lingual edition; Open Walls in two languages)
Oberliht	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Space Days – progressing; got co-financing (recognition) by the Ministry of Culture for the next edition • Zaikin Park (developed and expanded the community; empowered network) • Zpace – fostered the concept of ‘hybrid institutions’, together with Culture 2 Commons and Krytyka Polityczna (knowledge on new participatory governance models)
Platoniq	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • API & Open data – once made available: used mainly for research and for artistic projects (so far) • Introducing and testing the role of ‘Match funders’ – testing the opportunities to match the crowdfunded amounts; advocacy opportunity • Idea Camp co-creation – a process of developing together and improving the methods
Culture 2 Commons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture 2 Commons stopped the concession on the national highway system • Successfully advocated €12 million in the national operational programme of the ESF in Croatia for social-cultural centres (first call is coming up within a few weeks) • We influenced the funding framework of CSO through open methods of financing with institutions
Krytyka Polityczna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Build the City reader</i> – as a collaborative action • Cziecsyn network meeting – involving more and more international stakeholders
Les Têtes de l’Art	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idea Camp 2014 – a test for their capacity to organise large-scale events • Internationalisation – improved communication and storytelling skills (in other languages) • Awareness – that there are other organisations out there, doing similar things, and we need to join forces

Progress on the key values

Trust

This value has been nurtured at multiple levels. It has been a key prerequisite for developing **Connected Action** as a grown and self-empowered network, driven by engagement, ownership & responsibility, and collaboration/co-creation. In comparison to Year 1, the level of trust has increased by the self-driven initiatives between the hubs included in their activity plans for Year 2, and their growing commitment to the joint actions and causes, e.g., Idea Camp.

Openness (for knowledge and change)

Knowledge building and exchange, as well as scaling it out and up, is an essential component of the programme's mid-term and long-term objectives. Developing conditions and tools for **community of practice** is clearly an outcome that contributes directly to the core of the programme. Idea Camp and the follow-up *Build the City* publication and manifesto, ECF Labs, R&D grantees' monitoring and promotion, etc.

Ownership

"Obviously enough, this event [Idea Camp] helped us and our stakeholders to make this Idea Camp our 'own'."
- Les Têtes de l'Art

There is sufficient evidence from all the hubs that through commonly developed and carried out activities they have created ownership regarding the process. Idea Camps in Marseille and Botkyrka have surely contributed to consolidating the network of hubs. ECF served the focus and objectives of the programme, and scaled up to some extent the knowledge and awareness about the topics of Commons and Public Space. The publication of *Build the City* (and translation of that into the manifesto), crowdfunding campaigns in partnership and transfer of workshop exchange in each other's communities.

Inclusiveness

This value was set up on the level of **stakeholders** (in the (E)valuation tool) from the start. It has been addressed more strongly through Idea Camp 2014 through the engagement of the local community in the flagship activity. The evaluation has shown that both **inclusion** and **diversity** are important values for the programme that have not been sufficiently pursued up to now. More practically, regarding the Idea Camp, some concerns were shared regarding non-representation of minority and/or underprivileged groups, as well as greater ethnic/racial diversity.

Innovation was originally outlined among the programme's core values but has not been defined yet by the hubs and ECF. Should it tackle new forms of public governance (e.g., civil-public), new social innovation practices, new tools for citizen participation or new civil movements? As well as defining the scope of the 'innovation', it should be also decided which assessment and validation tools to use for addressing this value.

Preliminary conclusions

Through the common work over the last two years, the *Connected Action* programme has managed to experiment with the potential and the capacity of the six hubs as **centres of knowledge** in different areas of competences: in the areas of civil-public partnerships and governance practices, in exploring aspects of the commons and 'commoning' activities in public space and urban development, etc.

Positioning of the hubs at local and national policies level have been reported among the most successful achievements by the hubs in Year 1 and Year 2 (**scaling up**). Yet the *Connected Action* has not reached a self-standing 'network identification', but it has worked well as a **contributor to** and as a transmitter of **the values of the commons** and their manifestation in the public space. The quantitative aspect of scaling up though is not yet easy to assess, due to insufficient or incompatible data on their outcomes on their constituencies.

The *Connected Action for the Commons* has not managed to position itself yet as a 'pan-European network' for the commons at the EU policy level. Therefore Year 3 (until June 2017) will focus on a dedicated **positioning strategy** for the network and related tools for dissemination and promotion. This strategy also tackles the outreach to new audiences and communities.

The two Idea Camps have proven to be catalysts for **scaling up**: connectivity, networking, engaging with Idea Makers from different fields, backgrounds, cities and countries, as well as for **scaling out**: raising awareness and positioning for the hubs (in their local/national contexts).

Idea Camps' experiences laid down the foundations of a **community of practice** among Idea Makers and hubs and developed opportunities for the future. There is a need to synergise further the work of the *Connected Action* hubs with one of the R&D grantees & Idea Makers, to encourage more self-initiative in knowledge exchange and interaction among them through various tools (including ECF Labs).

Implementing the horizontal integrated teams approach (in the organisation) was reported to be beneficial for Cluster One as it stands now, in terms of opportunities to acquire new skills and competences, experience new modes of working on the programme development, together with the external partners. Optimisation has taken place from the project launch until 2016, in terms of improving, simplifying the procedures and working in a more transparent and open way.

The word cloud at the end of this summary shows the most valued outcomes and outputs for the hubs: **the Idea Camps, advocacy opportunities** (also related to positioning) and the **opportunity for internationalisation** (both internally and externally).

Potentials and future opportunities

In the light of ECF's 2017-2020 Strategy, we shall take stock of the most important achievements and learnings of the *Connected Action for the Commons* programme. **It should be noted, however, that this is being done before the real impact of this programme had been deployed.** The prerequisite of having no dedicated funding for the six hubs after mid-2017 poses the challenge of sustainability for this initiative.

During the hub meeting in March 2016, the sustainability challenge was discussed and the hubs will commit time in 2016 to reflection on sustainable models for continuing this journey together.

NEXT STEPS

- **Sustainability models** are being proposed and will be discussed further in 2016 between the hubs and ECF. Culture 2 Commons came up with a proposal for an **advanced coordination model** where key interested foundations could target their resources to selected actions, and an 'action-lab model of mutual support and knowledge exchange' could be put in place.⁷
- **A fundraising strategy** for diversifying the sources of funding will be essential. However, it has been proven through practice that fundraising for the entire Connected Action package was not easy to do. Funds should be raised separately for the Idea Camp value chain, and in particular for the event (which costs in total more than the Connected Action annual grants).
- **Urgent action to take stock of the knowledge and potential of the network** should be built up. Whereas ECF would unavoidably continue monitoring the work of R&D grantees and assess the impact on Idea Makers (as grant maker), the Connected Action hubs should take more initiative in expanding the community of practice around the topics and knowledge they have raised, explored, shared, etc. Developing the 2017 Idea Camp as a **knowledge platform** with a complete 'value chain' should include not only an 'archive' of it, but a **living and sustainable knowledge exchange digital space**. Whether this space is the new Connected Action online space, the ECF Labs or a multitude of bottom-up initiated platforms by Idea Makers should be decided (and possibly tested) prior to the Idea Camp.
- **Exploring the opportunities of the expanded network of stakeholders**. It has been made clear that the larger group of Idea Makers (about 100) is a valuable resource to look into (not only those awarded R&D grants) in terms of knowledge and experiences, but also to engage in further activities. Monitoring of their further trajectories after Idea Camp (2014, 2015) is to be considered (based on the quantitative database set up by ECF, and on qualitative surveys). A specific **Network and connectivity visualisation tool** will be developed and tested in 2016, as a contribution to Knowledge Management and (E)valuation.
- The **(E)valuation process** adapted to the programme development and a review of the detailed indicator's (E)valuation Grid should expand to the entire R&D grants value chain and develop indicators for the outputs/outcomes reflecting the developments and synergies between the hubs and Idea Makers/R&D grantees. A stronger focus on the impact on the communities (STAKEHOLDERS Level), to be backed up with a **common synergized data collection** system (both quantitative and qualitative), should be filled in by the hubs.
- The evaluation could offer improved tools for ongoing monitoring and reporting in addition to relying only on one progress report and one final report submitted by the hubs. The ambition to develop an original **Participatory (E)valuation** tool and a **Network visualisation tool** that could be used also by other networks and peers should be pursued strongly here.

Links:

<http://www.culturalfoundation.eu/connected-action/>
<http://politicalcritique.org/connected-action/>

⁷ Culture 2 Commons final narrative report 2016.