COST Action CA18126 Writing Urban Places New Narratives of the European City

***Core Group meeting***

**Monday, July 04 2022**

Present: Klaske, Susana, Giuseppe, Onorina, Angeliki, Dalia, Luis, Carlos, Slobodan, Kinga, Marcel, Willie

**Updates**

* Canakalle: all preparations on track, logistics, venues, travel journals, poster. Giuseppe has established contact with STSM candidate Sergios who is working on the topic of Urban Myth. He will contribute.
* Skopje: we discuss selection of participants and decide on the final list accepted/waiting list/rejected. The letters to applicant have been prepared and will be sent by Slobodan. Then Salma will send out the e-cost invitations.

MC Meeting

We discuss the different scenarios for the MC meeting in Skopje: online, hybrid, in person?

Valuable input from Marcel about other COST Actions, and from Susana about the annotated COST rules.

Klaske presents the list of MC members, there are in total 69 MC members of whom some 20 are inactive. Do we have to invite all to travel to Skopje? How can we make the Skopje meeting as productive as possible and spend the travel money on those members who are actually contributing?

Proposal:

Instead of an MC meeting, the last day of the Skopje meeting will be a strategic meeting with active members: core group plus the most active WG members. At the meeting, we will discuss the work and budget plan for the final year: fieldwork events, final event, final book, other publications projects to be rounded off.

Early October, we hold an online MC meeting where we will present the Work and Budget Plan to the MC, and ask for the votes.

Action: each WG leader makes a list of max 7 WG members who should be invited.

New field work projects

* San Sebastián and Seville were contacted but they can’t manage it in time
* There is interested from Porto by Eliana

Yet, we visited Porto before, so it does not sound like a good option

* Interested from Bochum, Germany by Menatulla. She is active in applying but organising a big event might be difficult considering her participation in Tampere, which was not very productive.
* Tirana – confirmed by Dorina and we are expecting a proposal soon.
* Riga and Chemnitz couldn’t manage. First and good options but unfortunately both proposers are unable to host an event in GP4.

Other options:

* Belgium members > no contact yet. Kris Pint and Luc Pauwels (Hasselt). Klaske will contact them
* Malta could be an option, (Andrea Steggani presented in Porto) but this was about a small-scale cultural renovation. project and maybe not so related to WUP.
* Marko Jobst > not related to a city, but it was specific on Queer writing. Would this kind of event fit within the scope of the action? There is a film on his work which should be watched first before approaching him.

Being practical means that we can also have less than 3 workshops. In the memorandum of understanding we said 4-6 events which is something we can manage.

We could also have a couple more smaller meetings to spend our budget on the book and strategic meetings.

Tentative program for events

* Belgium November 2022
	+ small one, for example to test the repository of methods
* Tirana Spring 2023
* Delft September 2023

The Book

*Compile the proposal part 1*

WG1 + WG2 have delivered their abstracts

WG3 + WG4 still need to send it. (Done immediately after the meeting, thanks!!)

*Part 2 – city essays*

The choice of cities comes from the events and meetings held there during our COST Action, but the text should not be a report of the fieldwork action that describes the programme that was carried out, but rather a case study text on the city in relation to the themes of the Action. Material that came out of the meetings and workshops could be used. The contribution could address, for instance, about how the experience of the city has been addressed in literature (Osijek example), or about how we can ‘narrate’ the stories of a particular urban place through speaking through its objects and subject (Tampere). Different modes of writing may be used. Illustrations can play a role especially in the city texts.

Good example: Osijek and Canakkele (the A4 abstracts of these cities have been shared among the core group)

Almada > the literary walk that was done during the Almada meeting would be interesting to start with, perhaps combined with material from Luis’ exhibition which tells more about the context of Almada.

Tampere > abstract needs revision after this conversation. Also, the STSM could help here, but although 3 people seemed interested, no one submitted an application yet.

Porto > abstract is more difficult > field work activities, the local cases presented during the Porto meeting, or …

The authors for city texts outside of the core group (the local organisers) will be approached this week.

This goes for Limerick, Tallinn and (possibly?) Tirana.

Planning for city texts:

Beginning September abstract and end of September first draft.

*Possible peer reviewers:*

Sonja, Angeliki and Giuseppe make a plea to have some key experts to review the overall work we made, so that the book is recognized as academic outcome. This could take place in the time frame after the final drafts have been delivered but not yet proofread.

Challenge: This tight timeframe means they should be approached immediately after the summer break.

It is a huge task to review everything, so we should think carefully about what to ask: review the outline, review one part per reviewer?

Suggestions:

Professor Leo Rafolt (Osijek, literature)

Alberto Perez Gomez, (architecture)

Next meetings (smaller ones)

Between 18-20 of July

during Canakkele meeting: Giuseppe, Susana, Luis, Sonja, Carlos and Willie will be present,

Klaske, Jorge, Angeliki and Dalia are on holiday

**Mid august (proposal: Wednesday 17th?)**