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Minutes: Cost meeting #3 @ Delft

**Launch action website, Jorge**

* Website is launched
* <https://writingurbanplaces.eu>
* Website and WG1 presentation are intertwined
* Website designed by Sanne Dijkstra and group experienced with Cost websites
* Website has 2 parts: public and restricted area
* The website’s functioning has been discussed with many people (even family members)
* News can appear in the top banner on the website
* About>institutions>names of people involved
* About>team>WG>Tasks, deliverables, group members
* Calls>overview of open calls for conferences, people, papers, etc.
* Newsletters (is not there yet but should be made after today)
* Library >Bibliography>Links to e.a. open source papers
* Library>output>simple overview
* Library>links>around 10 projects/journals that link to what we are doing
* Homework: each WG can come up with links + ideal scenarios where we can publish our work
* So Library contains: sources, own production, links to others and a working guide/vadacum
* Applying for cost on the website
* Restricted area
* <https://writingurbanplaces.eu/login/>
* Blackboard>publish and share topics with Cost members
* Agenda
* Email>9 Email accounts for working groups etc. (those mails should organize the different discussions)
* Mailing list>
* Minutes>post the important notes of meetings: keep everything organized
* Question about agenda: “is the agenda public?/what info should be in there?”

**Presentation WG1, Jorge**

* Scientific communication: the scientific nature of this project demands communication: to test and let your ideas be critized
* “We have a duty to preserve the constant permanent testing of ideas beyond the action”
* The website is already an important part of this
* Internal:
* embedded WG1 members in other groups make sure that everything we discuss is open to the public
* webpage
* editorial board: secure that we operate as a network, instead of loose individuals
* peer review system: because our network has many experts on a wide range of fields we can make use of it when papers/output has been produced
* External:
* Academia: technical reports
* Social media: twitter, Instagram, YouTube, Facebook
* Goals: fluidity, consistency, openness, visibility
* Targets: ongoing communication, straight academic work>year 2: academia, year 3: general public, year 4: stakeholders
* Tasks: how do we evaluate our work? How to ensure internal collaboration and communication? Clear task assignments “Fluidity is a measure for success” If water stands still it tends to rot”
* Questions: Klaske: editorial board and peer review system does it not overlap with the core group? Avoid double work. Jorge: the core group could possibly extrude out over everything, so overlap can be useful > editorial board and peer review system should be inclusive -> it is a patchwork
* Question: isn’t this complicate? Jorge: sure, but we need it to be productive. Klaske: is it correct that cost output should always be made by people from different countries? YES.
* Question: What is the benefit of being this COST output? Klaske: you benefit from the network. A collective production is beneficial.

**Presentation WG2, Svava Riesto**

* How can theoretical reflections stimulate the thinking and praxis of narrating urbans places of medium sized cities?
* Big diverse group > make use of this
* Proposal: make a small book, to pile theoretical concepts and share this when you are out in the field
* Field book handguide: vademecum -> Goal: publish in spring
* It is about urban places (still vague)
* What is mid-sized? Not a quantitative term. We see it as something that is slightly out of the mainstream discourse, so not the metropolis, but more connected in local regions
* Minor literature: Deleuze: Svava reads note about Frans Kafka, the use of German language, minor is linked to deterorialization, they are minor in the sense that they are not yet taken up in the urban discourse
* Co written by wg 2
* 4 editors
* NAi publishers, spring 2020 -> allows us some freedom
* Of course the book is open to reflection after it has been published
* Do you want to contribut? Send before 1st November to [svri@ign.ku.dk](mailto:svri@ign.ku.dk) (svava)
* Upcoming events: 12-13th December in Limerick
* In limerick there is another interesting conference about: Utopia, ideology in urban texts
* 2020 hand-in proposal for conference round-table
* 2121 conference roundtable
* Question: what a about the list of other definitions that are not in the book? Send or tell them now
* Questions: is vadamecum is it only published as a paper book? What happens if you want to add something a year later? “A book has the quality to be handy and meaningful” “but we foresee in the future it also becoming something else than a book” The book will be open access online, this is discussed with publisher. On the website it could be more adaptable to change. Cost is also pushing for open access.
* Jorge: do we want to publish things on our own?
* Klaske: the network should be an open platform where initiatives can arise. I want to avoid ‘a system of control’. But the WG1 should be aware. Klaske
* *(vlodimir blai?)*: We cannot have structure without an organization
* We need an integration
* It is not for the sake of control, but for the sake of coordination and critical reflection
* Question: I am little bit confused by vademecum, it sounds like wg2 final work. But what is the stage after the publishing of the book? Dilemma: a field guide when you leave the field is sad, but the b Therefor: a wild dictionary that inspires us, that has an overview of all the different disciplines and all the different terms that are being used, it is a starting point, in the next years it will be more polished and perfected
* Space-based knowledge that comes from different groups > to compensate for the overrepresentation of knowledge from the European west > take the richness of all the different languages we speak
* Question: why don’t we wait a bit longer for the other groups to make a more complete publication? The book is part of our dialogue.
* Suggestion: publish one text that will not be Deleuze, lets theorize the European city altogether, expand vadamecum with a certain text. We are creating keywords but also references/links. Every cost member should suggest 1 definition.

**Presentation WG3, Lorin Niculae**

* B; methodology of carrying the research
* C; methodologies for new urban narratives: 3 tasks
* Planning: we have a low horizon, main concern fit activities so that they have the best benefit for the project
* State of affairs: kick of paper by members
* Start bibliography
* Excel with an overview of various tasks
* State of affairs: the group is still in the forming, open for newcomers
* Belgrade meeting: 3 sub-groups
* Sub-group narrative: 1. Narratives of the city, 2. Narratives in the city, 3. Narratives for the city
* Sub-group mapping
* Sub-group visual narratives
* State of affairs: we have collected a repository of methods, chosen by members, 11 November: submit 5 pages about chosen depository, 5th December: comparative analysis of the methods listed, will be distributed to all the members
* In progress: WG3 will publish in a journal in 2020
* Benefit of working in this network: that you can collaborate with people that work in the same field of studies
* In progress: 2020 training school, (time is running fast)
* In progress: STSM
* Integration with other WG: share repository, we want a cross document, validate with WG2, Test with WG 4
* “We are going to be experimental”
* “We are going to brussels to fail”
* It is important to analyze our success and failures to come with conclusions that really work in practice
* “The leave that we give to WG4 has to deliver the oxygen to make the brain of WG 2 put to work”

**Presentation WG 4, Luis, Slobodan**

* Meeting in Almada
* What we present here is not put in a collective discussion
* We are in an anxiety, because we are in the end of the line, so we are depending on WG 2&3
* Hopefully in Almada we can really start with something, that generates collective discussion
* 3 parts: part 1; precatory phase, part 2; five (or more) case studies, part 3; presentation and dissemination of the results
* Almada is crucial to set the following developments, what we present here is a proposal
* COST network is not about network, but about research
* Use research to organize field work
* 1/3 of the WG4 members was there today, but minutes will be shared
* All members should propose a past project or ongoing project > pool of projects > identify past experiences
* Discuss very nature of mid-size city > also WG2 has questions about what is a mid-size city -> we propose to keep this open, and make a reflection on our definition of mid-size city in the end
* **Kick off Almada meeting 21st-22nd November 2019**
* we need more meetings to define the criteria for mid-size cities and how to research them
* we suggest a Writing Places issue to publish research and pool of projects
* Klaske: it is clear that WG4 has a slow start. it is good that you suggest pool of projects. we can think of ways we could work more locally. there are many case studies which are already ongoing with students or in commissions, but how can we map those already and compare them?
* Klaske: maybe the links and connections with local institutions and contacts can be already made visible
* Question: what is the scale of the site? This will not only be discussed in WG4, but in the discussion this morning we found that it is quite difficult to deal with the definition of mid-sized cities. Klaske: we take particular sites in a city; we cannot study the whole city; pick certain themes like former industrial sites. Discussion: Istanbul is not a mid-sized city, but it contains neighborhoods that work in a way a mid-sized city works, so therefor we keep the definition open.
* Jorge: it is not studying a city/neighborhood with a method, but studying the methods that are already used. So the case studies could contain already existing methods of studying cities. Reaction: of course, but it al depends on the methods that will be put on the table by our actors.
* Suggestion: are there already other tools than STSM? use our own members to research cities when we are there**.**
* Discussion: we need first this pool of cities before we have something to be able to discuss
* WG2 wants to work together with WG4 after summer 2020
* We need a draft of vadamecum, to be able to give feedback

**Mickael Pero & Olga Gorczyca**

* How to work together a this needs to be clear in the group
* In COST you represent the intern community of your country > not you institution.
* From the first and second mc-meeting is to make the flow of decisions more easy > the best is to delegate which is to the cogroups (they can more ease have meetings and can decide for the whole group).
* The academic journal issue and the literature compendium will be combined in the vadamecum. So that after the research a more deliberate literature…
* Good example > Mickael will share this with Jorge
* Next COST monitoring > how do you monitor the difference in countries and other issues such as gender etc.
* Africa as a new COST Partner country > this means that people/scholars are covered by COST and will not be taken form the funding of this specific action (it is form their own country budget). At the moment they are trying to in cooperate more countries in this kind of system.
* Travel insurance (no luggage etc.)
* ICT Conference Grant – they now only need to send the list of participation.
* Local organizer support can be only with the minimum of 40 participants (consider this to be registration etc.)

**Grand and ambitions for the grand period 2**

* The main topics are on the slides containing the idea of having a mid term conference. And see slides for more.
* Conference and mc meeting will be combined together. The option is not to hold it in Porto.
* The working group meetings are Finland and Denmark which is only one of the places for a meeting. There will be around 3 meeting in a month. The other two places are still open > who wants to host????
* We are aiming for quite a wide spread of meetings. Also think of ideas on combining working groups.
* The proximities are needed for the conference – so maybe next year is too soon.

**Voting**

*Missing Cyprus, Macedonia and Malta. North Macedonia was present at the meeting and gave a mandate for their vote to the organisers after consulting the topics.*

* GH manager to cancel invitations if not answered within 10 days
* LO + core group to reduce the flat rate for upcoming meetings
* WG leaders to keep a list of relevant WG members and propose a list to core group for reimbursements
* Cor group

Invite WG members that will receive reimbursement

Re-allocate underspending from one activity to another?

Approve STSMs

Approve ITC CGs

* All accepted

Second voting containing the summer school and the relocating “left over money”.

* Accepted

**Next MC meeting**

Between September and October 2020

Before that there are only working group meetings.