



[26] Guimarães 26
European Green Capital

How can cities use the latest science to visualise and explore the potential impacts of policy options with citizens?

Parallel workshop 1 as part of EEF 2026

Wednesday 4 November 2026 | 13:45–15:15

Cities are increasingly seeking evidence-based ways to engage citizens in shaping the future of their neighbourhoods and urban environments. This interactive workshop introduces FutureBEEing, which brings cities, academic partners and SMEs together to develop Quartera, a digital visualisation and decision-support tool. An illustrative comparison of renovation and rebuilding in a Hengelo social housing area will showcase how scenarios can help people explore potential impacts, understand assumptions and discuss different policy options. The presentation will explain the contribution of academic partners, the data behind, and the tool's current capabilities and limitations.

Quartera provides a starting point for a broader exchange about evidence-based policymaking across cities and departments. The workshop first explores potential applications, incentives and technical, political, organisational and economic barriers, including transparency and trust in the evidence. The second discussion considers evidence and indicator gaps, access to data, the relationship with existing tools, and opportunities for collaboration with academia. Members can contribute general perspectives, experiences and examples where available; the discussions accommodate different levels of technical familiarity.

Purpose: To explore how scientific evidence and scenario visualisation tools can support city planning and citizen engagement, and identify the incentives, barriers and conditions that shape their use across different city contexts. The discussion includes academic collaboration and how these tools can complement existing methods.

Expected results: A shared overview of promising applications, incentives and barriers; evidence, data and indicator gaps; and opportunities for research, collaboration or practical support. Three concise messages will summarise the discussion for the later plenary and final EEF booklet, supported by a record of the groups' findings and outstanding questions.

Moderators: Arya Arabshahi, Valentin Roth, in collaboration with FutureBEEing | Expected participation: 20 - 25 city members.

Room set-up and materials: Three (or four) tables of seven (or six) city members, with a useful mix of cities and departments. The same groups continue across both rounds. A facilitator at each table supports the exchange, with roles to be finalised. Proposed materials include A1 discussion sheets or

flipcharts, pens and post-its, and A4 indicator/data references. A screen supports the video. Sound equipment should be brought on the day.

Programme

Wednesday 4 November 2026 13:45–15:15 Venue: Palácio Vila Flor, Room S2 (to be confirmed)	
13:45–13:50 (5 min)	• Eurocities introduction • The introduction sets out the purpose and expected results, connecting City-Science, Pulse and NetZeroCities perspectives in one short narrative, with contributions agreed in advance. • It frames Quartera as one tool cities could use and introduces the questions of trust, transparency and collaboration with academia.
13:50–14:10 (20 min)	• FutureBEEing / Quartera presentation and video • The partners explain their collaboration with academia and SMEs, data sources, and the methods behind selected outputs. The video compares renovation and rebuilding in the same Hengelo social housing area using comparable assumptions. • The presentation distinguishes implemented, experimental, planned and illustrative elements, including whether the example concerns a live planning decision or a workshop demonstration. It considers how Quartera could complement existing tools and engagement processes. • The closing explains what open source would practically mean for Eurocities members: the licence rights to use, Quartera's publication and documentation status; and the distinction from open data and open standards. Alpha phase to clarify more detailed adoption requirements include local data integration, model checks, setup, training, hosting, support and maintenance, with effort or cost drivers where known.
14:10–14:17 (7 min)	Q&A
14:17–14:20 (3 min)	• Introduction to group discussions • A brief overview (also on screen) introduces the two rounds, the discussion sheets and the expected results. Three mixed groups of five to seven members exchange perspectives across cities and departments.
14:20–14:42 (22 min)	• Round 1: use cases, incentives and barriers
14:42–15:04 (22 min)	• Round 2: evidence, data and other tools
15:04–15:12 (8 min)	• Brief group feedback • Short summaries, around two minutes per group, highlight promising applications, important incentives or barriers, and evidence or support needs. The facilitator draws together shared themes, different perspectives and outstanding questions.
15:12–15:15 (3 min)	• Closing synthesis and plenary messages • The closing synthesis brings together three concise messages for the later plenary and possible areas for follow-up.

Notes, questions and prompts for group discussion

The discussions bring together members from different cities, departments and professional

backgrounds. A facilitator supports each group's exchange and helps capture its main themes; a representative shares the short summary. Brief individual reflection may help members gather their thoughts, while city or departmental context can be noted where it helps explain an example.

Indicator and dataset references provide optional support for the discussion [optional]. These would explain definitions, units and spatial/time scales where relevant, sources, and implemented/planned status, distinguishing input parameters from indicators and outputs. Dataset information would ideally include access conditions, any tested non-Dutch or European sources, and integration or adaptation requirements.

Round 1: use cases, incentives and barriers

Possible findings from this round could include promising applications, perceived benefits, and significant barriers or enabling conditions across different city contexts.

[10 min] Question 1: In which situations could such evidence-based scenario and visualisation tools help cities with planning or engagement?

Possible prompts: public hearings; exploring scenarios with residents, including senior citizens; rapid expert reviews; and discussions across municipal departments. What benefits could these tools bring, and who might benefit?

[10 min] Question 2: What incentives and barriers might shape their use, including confidence in the evidence and collaboration with academia?

Possible prompts: technical capacity and data access; political incentives and willingness to consider alternatives; organisational ownership and academic partnerships; budget, staff time and continuing costs; transparency and accessibility. What would justify confidence in the results, and what could undermine it?

Round 2: evidence, data and other tools

Possible findings include priority evidence or indicator gaps, examples of existing tools and data, and areas where further research, collaboration or practical support could help.

[10 min] Question 1: What information, indicators or evidence would help cities assess and discuss policy options, and what gaps do members encounter?

Possible prompts: indicators of interest, such as energy use, costs, comfort, green space and access to services; gaps in available information; impacts or residents' perspectives that are difficult to capture.

[10 min] Question 2: How could scenario tools (open and closed) work alongside the tools and data cities already use, and what would support their adaptation to different contexts?

Possible prompts: existing consultation methods or visual tools; information spread across departments or difficult to access; support from academia or other partners to fill gaps, check results and explain findings.