

Adrian: What I gather is that you're preparing, looking at the process management, would it be, for design?

Anton: Not really in depth. Our plan is to investigate if it's possible to create a sort of network online, to make more communication happen between the community, just people living around the city, and on the other side the government and private instances. So we were interested in seeing how you guys communicate with people living in areas where you work around.

Jonas: If you communicate with the community, or the government or municipality?

Adrian: The way that urban planning often happens—we're urban planners, architects generally deal with the building or the larger site, they don't have to deal so much with the community, that kind of stuff has already happened. We come from an architectural background, architectural engineering. So there's not so much a habit of consulting with the community, it's just something what I do. But the more that we're involved with complex projects, the more we realize that you have to do that. You have to find a way—not necessarily because you want to be nice—but you realize that the community and the businesses and organizations all have something to contribute to a project.

Anton: Yes. That's sort of our point of view: that the community can add something more to certain projects.

Adrian: So in what situations can they add, and what can they do? You have two approaches for dealing with the community. One is where you have... The first one is what I call the "band-aid" solution. The band-aid solution is where you basically are putting out fires, avoiding trouble. And that's where you're giving people just enough information to...

Anton: To keep them happy?

Adrian: Keep them happy, and then you can get along with what you're doing. Because in the long term, your assessment of the situation is that people are going to be angry because there's going to be change. It doesn't matter what it is, they're going to be angry. And so you basically have to make sure that they have enough information.

The second is where you actually bring people *into* the story, and then you try and make them part of the project. That's what you call participation. There's two types of participation. One is participation where you're not so concerned about their opinion but you just want them to feel like they're part of the processes. Which is not genuine participation of course... So, one might be... The participation where you're just basically offering the possibility for the community to comment, but you're not so concerned about the "bigger" concerns of the community. All you're concerned about whether a building is painted blue or, you know... That's the first group, you know, the band-aid solution: where you're offering a bit of the problem solving to the community, so that they feel involved. That's bullshit stake holding(?). The second is—but okay, if you have a very clear project where you know that, or rather there's an opportunity to do something, and that there is not much flexibility in the kind of program, then *why* involve the community in the first place? If it comes down to the color of the building or whatever: alright, fine, but it's not really a big part of the decision making. But if you have a really complex project, where you don't know the solution, the end point, that's where you have a different kind of discussion. Much more interesting in terms of how you involve the community, who you involve the community—could be business community, knowledge community, residential community, the municipality. That's that. What is interesting is the following. You have these stakeholder models—and that would be something that's quite interesting to investigate—how you address what type of stakeholders should be involved in projects so that the project has different perspectives, people represent different perspectives. Which is important, because someone might be a resident, but also might work for the municipality, but they may also work at the university or study at the university. There's three types of stakeholders that that one person is representing. They have a conflict of interest if you suddenly say: "Hey, I want you to give me feedback on this." Where as you say: "I want you to give me feedback, *as a resident*, not as a person who works at the municipality." Then it's a very different perspective. So then, how do you frame that? That's very interesting.

So, we have this model, called the "Penta Helix Model", which is very useful for innovation. So you have in a group, usually five parts. You have the *residents*, bevolking. You have *knowledge*, kennis—that's universities, R&D. You have the gemeente, the municipality, but it's also public organizations, so *public*. Then you have *business*—

Anton: That's investments, or investors?

Adrian: No, business is business, actually doing business. Like us, we're business. Then you have *cash*, the capital. So they're five different groups. Depending on the project, for instance on one project, the residents group might be quite small, and the public quite big. On another project, the business might be quite small, or might be very big. So how do you play with this mix? The thing is, this is very useful for dealing with a complex project, where you need to be innovative.

Anton: Where you can visualize the relations between the different groups?

Adrian: Also, but this is the complicated one: knowledge. You always need capital, you always need business. You'll have the public administration, you'll have the residents. It's a question of, in what cases do you need knowledge, because it depends on which project and complexity. So knowledge equals complexity in my opinion. Yep. Because it means research, analysis, it's decision making, it's all sorts of things like that. That's why we use this kind of model.

Jonas: Ah, okay.

Anton: And do you have a certain platform where you communicate to the other groups? Or, how does communication usually happen? Do you just get a—I guess most of the time, things have already been decided and people just need a visualization of a plan, or?

Adrian: Yeah... In theory we should actually be driving this discussion. We should be the ones helping to organize this. But in practice, this is not so common because we're just not in the habit of doing. But it's something we're going to be doing more.

Now, you're talking about platforms. I suppose you're not so concerned about the theory, as practice of how you do it?

Anton: Well, no but more like—

Adrian: You're talking about: "do you have an online platform?"

Anton: Yes, for example, or, who are your basic contact persons or something, if there are any.

Adrian: Well, that's the thing. If you've done this analysis, you'll go like "okay". Then you'll think: "what's the platform?" But you're not going to say: "We have a platform, now how are we going to find the stakeholders to put in the platform." You're going to find the stakeholders first, and then the platform is dependent on that. If it's an online platform, ... Ideally you'd have a choice of platforms. Maybe you have something as simple as a Google group, or it

could be a Facebook page. It could be, ah I don't know. There's a dozen collaboration platforms which you can choose from. It could be also, I don't know, newsletters and all that stuff. That's the thing you should be choosing—  
Anton: But in the case of newsletters, that's only one way communication.

Adrian: Yes, no dialogue. But that's of course here: do you want dialogue or not? You can decide, is the platform going to be open, is it going to have dialogue? Because sometimes you don't want that, because if you have a dialogue, the project becomes—

Anton: That's a good question for us of course. Like what we want to do, is it needed? Is it even necessary what we're doing?

Adrian: I gather what you guys have in mind is that "hey, we can come up with a cool platform where people can collaborate and they could then—

Jonas: Yes, but it's more research in to if it's necessary or not, and *how* can we solve this problem.

Anton: And can we solve it at all? We're not necessarily going to create a platform, but we're more looking at if it's possible, necessary or...

Jonas: Yes, indeed.

Adrian sighs.

Anton: This is very valuable information.

Adrian: How can I put this. My problem, I think fundamentally, is: how can go from this story (model), to that story (platform). And what is it, like, I don't know how much it is, you can make generic. Because it depends on if you break down what the platforms are, you've got Facebook, that's (?), you've got closed platforms like Teambox, or we use Confluence. But you've got—

Jonas: Basecamp, is Basecamp—

Adrian: Yeah, Basecamp. They go on... So, and then you've got Mailchimp if you want to do mailing. But to *build* the platform which basically links them all together. I mean, maybe there is a way of creating a link which basically says: "You wanna mail with a Mailchimp newsletter? Alright, here's this thing where you can..."

Anton: And is it a good thing maybe to create a platform to give this group maybe, the residents, more "voice"? Or an easier way of communicating to the other parts?

Adrian: In Australia, I was working with a guy, a bureaucrat. He created a system like that, which was basically so these big developers could have a website where the residents could the go on, and say: "Oi, I hate what you did to my trees!" And you know, just bwehh (makes slight vomiting sound). Did it do anything? Not really, I don't think.

Anton: Do you have a name of that?

Adrian: Oh, not of the top of my head. But you can imagine what it's like. It's like a ranting platform.

Jonas: Not really a solution.

Adrian: Not really a solution. In my opinion, online platforms have to be viewed in terms of the bigger picture of how you're conducting workshops. How you're connecting physically with people, how to give them updates, ... And sure, there might be a system which can make that easier, but in many cases, what people do is, they just grab bits and pieces of whatever's available.

Anton: Because it's hard to get a complete picture of everything.

Adrian: Yep. So this step between determining what the stakeholders are, and what the platform is, I think is actually quite interesting. That's your story, I think!

Anton: Haha, no, you're right.

Adrian: I've got questions for you guys, actually. So, I'm curious to see what your perspective is. Maybe you can help me with this. Anyway, Is that getting closer to what you guys were thinking?

Anton: Yes, very much. Because we came here with no clear picture of how communicating in this sort of environment works, so—

Adrian: Yeah... It's fairly improvised, there's no industry standard. Because the problems you need—

Jonas: They're not always the same, the problems. It's always something different.

Adrian: Yes. It's like—if you look at our portfolio you'll see—we're dealing with mobility, we're dealing with transport system for all of Vlaams-Brabant, we're dealing with, the Reyers site, which is the television site in Brussels, with—

Anton: Also, because I saw on your portfolio, you guys made some visualizations I believe, of the plan to make Leuven climate neutral, so you were only a small part of that?

Adrian: Yes. We did—we were involved, but not so much in the technical side, as much as the communications and the mostly the strategic—

Anton: So, you mostly get a briefing of you can create something—

Adrian: Exactly.

Anton: So there was no real communication between you and residents, or the public?

Adrian: Not so much, because they've got a team the size of a village helping out with the project. So, that's a case where we're not so involved, because they've got this team. It's the university and municipality which is paying, so the staff that are involved are them. In other cases, like—

Anton: The case we were very interested in, in the beginning, when we were first thinking of plans to start with this project, was the renewal, changing of the railway area. There are a lot of changes going on, are you involved in those projects?

Adrian: In Leuven? Yes, BUUR is, but I personally not so much, but that's one of the reasons why BUUR actually exists right now. Because of what the train line developments—

So anyway, how could you go on from here? In my opinion, the process, the analysis process for stakeholders I think is really interesting. This Penta Helix model or method, that's something which is used for (our?) R&D, research and development. Actually, there might be a better system than this. You can tell me, but there are stakeholder approaches for products. You know, when you make a product or something, you have types of stakeholders. Manufacturer, the retailer, the consumer, the distributor, you know? That's not useful for us. And that's usually very top-down. You have a very clear list of the problems that they're going to face—so you address those problems. Where as we are dealing with dialogue. So it's going both ways.

In many cases, a lot of the stuff that we deal with is very face to face. We need that, because of the process of ideation, of thinking. And that in my opinion is really interesting. There's this book, which is how do you think through problems with people. That's something we really want to do. Here is how you can start—how can you appreciate that these people are valuable, and then what are the kind of—how do you get these stakeholders involved, within

the discussion? It's not the online platform! It's the constant discussion. That's the really interesting thing. So, if you can find a way of allowing these guys to feel like they're part of a project and to open up, to contribute, through the process, then the platform is not so important. The platform is merely just a way of proving what you've been doing. How you then connect this group, this multidisciplinary, multi-interest, complex group of people—

Anton: And it's always a different kind of group, depending on the project, so that makes the question even harder, I guess.

Adrian: Yes. This is moving into the world of knowledge creation and innovation. Which is, whew, if you've got the time to research that, it's fascinating. But I don't know whether that's where your focus is.

Anton: It's getting more and more complicated already.

Jonas: Yeah.

Adrian: But in my opinion, I'd shift this platform, which sits outside of this (points at Penta Helix model) towards the center.

Anton: To see what can be in the center of the Penta Helix model? Okay.

Adrian: Yes, that's my opinion.

Anton: That's an interesting view. I think we have one more question maybe, because we also want to go talk to maybe some others, for example the municipality. Do you have a contact person we can go to? Looking at the website, we don't find a lot of helpful information only, a list of projects.

Adrian: There's a dozen of people downstairs who you can speak to—I'm not involved in those projects. Look. The challenge is that you've got simplicity, where you have a project, and where you have a site. For example, you have this site, and you want two hundred, I don't know, rooms. And you want three hundred parkings, and you want ten thousand square meters, and prrt (makes farting noise). You've got this plan, and that's kinda how things are done now, you know? So this model is a participation model (points at Penta Helix model), it doesn't work with that.

Anton: So it's a question of combining those two?

Adrian: Yeah. So this is a thing, if you're talking about stakeholder participation, you're talking about seven types of projects. What I was saying in the beginning. The expression is putting lipstick on a pig, you know. You may not actually be adding value. This is about adding value. You should put that in capitals: VALUE. Here you go, that's it. Really think about that, because this is about value creation. Which is what these guys talk about (points at books). So. You're going to talk to people at the municipality and they're going to be: "Pfft, it's a waste of time". But that's only relevant if you're talking to them about certain types of projects. If you're talking about this type of project where you got—it's very clear that there's going to be a building with a certain number of floors, and certain type of car parking space, and there's going to be a certain amount of trees—this is not that.

Anton: Then it's already decided.

Adrian: Then it's decided. So you don't need these people (points at residents)—why would you?

Anton: So it's more when it's about bigger things, when it can change people's lives and routines—

Adrian: A fundamental change, yes.

Anton: It's about people, and where they live and... That's sort of our main focus point of—because it's about people's lives, and how people live—can we create something that helps the communication, so that mostly the residents have more say in certain projects, and if there is enough communication, let's just research that, or...

Adrian: Yeah. As I said, I think it's—who is involved in this story? You know, when you're talking about residents, are you talking about *all* of the three thousand residents, or are you talking about a selection of two or three, who are representing all of those residents? And can you do that? Are you talking about *all* the businesses, or a couple of people representing the interest of the businesses? How do you create—how do you develop value creation? Like, what are the kind of ways of ideating, developing and synthesizing what it is, the actual problem—and then how to move on? What the problem is, what the objectives are, and how to move on? The planning process. And through that, of course, you be ought to think about the relevant platform, the different functionalities you need, and that kind of stuff. If you can take it from that perspective, I think this (platform) is going to move a lot more into here (model). And so, in the end, if this—whatever this thing is (model), can become the central part of the organization, of how you think through—but that's going to have to be very process driven. Because it's not about creating this platform where you've got pages, and you've got a blog feed, and you've got an array of images—it's gotta be like, how do you create the kind of the activities, a list of activities—how do you then summarize the conclusions from those activities, how do you allow for a time for reflection. How do you then go into this cyclical process where you're getting closer, and closer and closer.

Anton: To reach a conclusion?

Adrian: Yep. How do you do those three steps: the analysis, setting the objectives and then getting to the center of the problem? That's the interesting thing. Anyway: is that something?

Anton: Yes! Very helpful.

Jonas: Yes, of course. Whohow.

Adrian: So don't try and—I would really try to avoid creating this perfect website where you—

Jonas: That wasn't really our plan, we're just investigating if it's necessary, or not?

Adrian: Yeah. Because here, as graphic designers, you can start to pull out the kind of things that these people want. They're talking about cash, they're talking about assets, such as a house, they're talking about interest. Businesses, they're talking about goods, clients, they're talking about an image. The public administration, they're talking about safety, about taxes, they're talking about population, happiness, health, wellbeing. Knowledge, you're talking about tshh...

Out of all of these things, you can then pull together a kind of visual language which then can become part of a—you know, the kind of personalities of each one of these, could then become visualized. Then you can say: "Now, what is it what we're talking about here when we're talking about you as a public representative, what are we talking about here when we're talking about you as a business person, and so on and so forth. So then, it becomes quite clear—you in terms of the resident, you're talking about your access to public space, your comfort, your access to services, your sense of freedom and all that kind of stuff. All those kind of things can be visualized. So that's quite interesting. Then they become tools which then you can use for this (taps). Then, when you're looking for residents, you say: "Alright. You're the resident that's interested in open space, you're wearing that open space hat." So you're wearing an open space hat—sorry, you're wearing a residence hat, but then on top of that you're wearing the—

Anton: The open space flag?

Adrian: The open space flag, yeah exactly. So then you might have a variety of different residents representing different kinds of interests. Then you can really focus on what is it that these bigger stories bring to my problem? How do I resolve that?

Anton: Very complex.

Jonas: Yes, indeed.

Adrian: It's complex, but at the same time—

Anton: It can be narrowed down—

Jonas: Yeah! And that's the interesting fact.

Adrian: So if you guys are involved with that, then I'd be very happy to help you out and if—because this is something we haven't developed a lot, because it's a problem that we have. We'd love to explore that more. And if you're prepared to—

Anton: Yeah, we have a few weeks.

Jonas: True. We didn't get your name!

Adrian: Adrian. This is—there you go (hands card).

Anton: Okay.

Jonas: Thank you.

Adrian: Sorry, your names were?

Jonas: Djonas, Jonas—

Anton: —and Anton.

Adrian: Cool. But yeah, if you're happy to develop this, I'm happy to support you, as much as you like. But so long as you're happy that in the end maybe we can do a bit of sharing.

Jonas: Yeah, of course.

Anton: Yeah! For us, that's also a motivation, I guess to keep things professional.

Adrian: Because I had a catch-up with Silke as well, and—

Anton: Yes. She's doing a more different approach to the subject.

Adrian: She's got the urban agriculture. And her story is more about how you can think through the opportunities for urban agriculture. And likewise, the kind of things that she's developing is super interesting, for people who're interested in urban agriculture. You know, it's just like: "oooh, urban agricultural problem!" But how do you actually get into it? So she's creating like a toolkit—I *think* she's creating a toolkit.

(all laughing)

That's what we spoke about. And that's going to be really cool. You know, when you're talking to people who are doing urban agriculture you can say: "Hey, what's your space?", and you've got only this amount of space, and you've got a nice wall, then these are the kind of things you can do with it.

Anton: She's doing a more practical approach, I guess.

Adrian: Yep.

Anton: We're looking at a theoretical issue. I guess we can look at those books (points at books).

Adrian: But this one you know of course, do you (points at one)?

Anton: Nope.

Jonas: Nope.

Adrian: Oh, okay.

Anton: We're not really marketing—

Adrian: Well, you'll have to come across this, at some stage. This is basically the canvas. The canvas is super simple. This is another problem which I have, which I'm trying to work on. I was hoping you knew a bit about this. Obviously this is going to be complicated. But that's okay. If we can look at this one, then that's going to be a lot of fun.

Businesses are also quite complex in the sense of they're a collection of things. You know, you're making money—how do you make money? You're making money because you have certain kinds of people, you have a certain kind of product, or whatever. You have a certain kind of cash which you invest into things. There's a certain way you connect with your clients or users. So this is about visualizing all of that together. You've got who you are as a team, the kind of—you know, the people in your team. It might be internal, it might be external. The kind of things you're doing, the kind of skills or materials or things that you're using—so that could be computers. And then on the other side you have the customers, so it could be stakeholders, it could be the people who are buying your things or using the things, whatever. You've got ways of connecting to the clients or stakeholders or users—sorry, that's the emotional side, the kind of tone. Then here is how you connect, which is: do you call people up, do you use Facebook and that sort of stuff. And the value proposition is very interesting because that's what—what are you trying to sell? What are you offering? Are you reducing people's time in doing certain things, are you giving them a fantastic new flavour that they've never experienced?

Anton: So I guess, in the case of urban planning, it's more about giving them new open space, for example, or better —

Adrian: Providing them better wellbeing. It's quite abstract. That value proposition is an abstract objective. And then you find, through this, that you eventually say: "Alright, our partners are the municipality and tududu, and our customers segment is residents, and we want to give them better quality of life. We have a certain amount—this is the money we have to invest, this is what we expect back". Revenue streams is not just cash, but it's also about value, happiness. That kind of stuff. And so through doing this little research, doesn't tell you what you need to produce, just—

Jonas: It gives you an image.

Adrian: It gives you the foundations of where to start. From researching on this, then I can say: "Hey, creating more parks is actually what these people—you know, this is the kind of thing these people—you've got two million euros, we want something back in the long term." That's super interesting in terms of exploring a business problem. But it's also a stakeholder problem. You can apply that to different things. Here is the Penta Helix which is used for RT and R&D which we are now applying to urbanism. And here is the business model canvas which we want to apply to urbanism, in terms of how you think through a problem. The project you're talking about here is much more interesting. This could actually be a part of that project as well. So I was trying to think: how do you turn that into—how do you turn this into more of a dynamic thing that you can use. Because this is static, really.

Anton: Yes. If you make the canvas, not everyone knows who's on the canvas, if you know what I mean? Maybe that's also an interesting thing where the different groups on the model can have an image of who's communicating with who. Is that an interesting thing, maybe—to generate communication?

Adrian: Yep. Yeah. Yeah, but that's also something that it misses. This is good for products and stakeholders. What about problems? Like, bigger problems—where you need to think about the planning process. How you develop them. Because as I said this is static in terms of—these are the people we've got and—usually we start the value proposition, it's we need to improve people's well being. Then our clients are these people, based on those two things, we realize this is our team. Our team is going to be, in our case, landscape architect, sociologist, urban planner, the municipality might have someone on board, there's an engineer, bla bla bla. Through that you then develop, decide what your cash is, and that could be an upfront cost or it could be every month. Then you look at how you could get this back. Is it that you're looking for cash—what are you expecting, how are you expecting to get that back? So for instance, with getting the investment back, through saying: "we want better well being". Our revenue stream is going to be—maybe you get money back from higher up space, so you can open up a cafe or restaurant, to give you the money back to pay for the park.

Jonas: Because it's not really evident—

Adrian: No.

Jonas: To get your investment back, when you're building a park for example.

Adrian: No, exactly. But you might say: "Alright, this is not our money, in the first place. We just had a lend from someone"—

Anton: But then they have interests in having the revenue.

Adrian: Yep. So anyway, the point is: this is quite static, what we want to do is actually have some kind of dashboard where we can say: "You've got the static side—which is that, the analysis—, now how do we move forward, how do we do something with it?" So that's what I've been trying to create here, which is like a way of visualizing—this is something I was doing yesterday, actually.

Anton: Oh, cool. We're first.

Adrian: Yeah, exactly, you are the first. This is just my thinking process, it's sort of chaotic, but... You have these four groups—four, where is the fourth (mumbling). That's that, that's that. Last one is, team. So it's team, int, ext, skills, type of work. What I was thinking is, you've got these. That the kind of team you got—

Anton: So that, for example, could be BUUR?

Adrian: Could be BUUR, so BUUR is the internal team. The external might have, I don't know, have engineer, sociologist, you might have someone who is from the university—

Anton: Yes, the knowledge.

Adrian: It could be this stakeholder group.

Anton: The complete thing?

Adrian: It could be that. These are the kind of skills that you need for the project. That's the kind of work that you're doing. What we're talking about here is mobility, strategy, with some kind of urban planning thing, with—or we're talking about going with a new design for fun. Then you have the relationships between the clients, the stakeholders—so the client is who is essentially paying for the project.

Jonas: Yep, okay.

Adrian: The stakeholders are the one that are using it, but it's important—well, stakeholders... That should be users. Then how do you relate? You're going to have a very different way of relating it to your client as you would to your stakeholders—sorry, your users. So here you might be using Facebook, and you might be using newspapers. Here you're talking about email, meetings—

Anton: Yeah, direct.

Adrian: That's the canvas side, the static stuff. And here you've got the problem. Usually what we do as urban planners is we redefine what the problem is, we have a project—we have a problem. Often a client—this is for complex projects ofcourse—so often a client gives us a project, which is: "we have a congestion". And they might in fact say: "Hey, we need to widen the ring in Brussels." And we say: "Hey, don't jump to conclusions yet. What we need to do is explore what the problem is first—

Anton: Yes, and what's causing it.

Adrian: And what's causing it—and then we'll see: "do you really need to change the ring, or should you just cut the car subsidies," which means they'll have less cars. You know what I mean?

Jonas: Yeah.

Adrian: So you have this project's definition, or it's—probably definition the scope. You'll look at your experiences—

Jonas: Your personal experiences, or—

Adrian: Background. So then you can start to look at what other things you have done in the past—

Anton: If they can relate to the problem?

Adrian: Yes, existing knowledge. This is the outcomes, the kind of learning that you get. You've done something, so you know how to do something. So you—that's something you need to add to your experience. This is the communication. This is learning internal, which is new stuff that's coming to you. This is new stuff that you're communicating into the external world. For example, saying to the newspaper: "Hey, we've come up with this new plan!" And then there's the long term—what you do in the future. This is my idea of the canvas. And then you have the—I think it was like that, yes. So that's the investment in, that's the returns, and then you've got the how you actually go about doing the process, that's the planning type. And then there's the last one here which I've lost, which is the project values, which is here.

That's the thinking instrument that you can use to discuss projects with the team—within BUUR, or with, I don't know, your stakeholder team—sorry, your work team. Then you can go through these things. It's quite transparent. You could say: "Alright, this is how much we're investing in at the moment, this is how we expect to get paid back."

Jonas: Yes, so you have a clear vision on the whole project.

Adrian: Yep. Anyway, that's the—I was hoping you'd be ought to help me with this, but I think that's going to be too much for—

Jonas: Yeah (laughs).

Anton: Yes. That's more of a business management thing.

Adrian: What's actually—you guys. It's industrial designers that have come up with this. They're designers, they're

not running a business but they have a product and they need to communicate how—with a simple prrt (makes farting noise). This is what it is.

Anton: Yeah. I think graphic designers are more communicating with just simple clients? They already get a briefing that's been done within a business.

Adrian: Yep. So if you're willing to work on this Penta Helix stuff, that's interesting. I don't know what your mentors and your teachers are going to think of that.

Anton: I think, they were—I can explain what our initial plans were.

Jonas: Yes. Maybe it's a good idea.

Anton: We were like: "Okay, we live in Kessel-Lo, we saw a lot of problems with mobility—so, let's fix some things. Let's build a bridge, let's fill up the gap that the railroad has made between both Leuven and Kessel-Lo. Let's fix it. And then let's see what we can do with that." But that was very urban planning—

Jonas: Too specific already.

Anton: Because we were already talking about how the evolution of people how people built trainstations and railroads. So cities changed, they have a back side of the station and a front side. We were thinking: "Okay, let's have a broader look on that problem, and the people living there, and how has that evolved and is there something we can do about it." But then we were thinking... I don't know when we changed—

Jonas: Yeah, I don't remember, also, it was—

Anton: "Okay, let's keep Leuven and the station neighborhood as a case—

Jonas: As a case study.

Anton: Now we're completely changing.

Jonas: Yeah, something different. Because the first thing was: "Okay, we could win eighty thousand square meters when we were thinking about building a bridge over the whole railway." Twelve football fields? It was a lot of extra space. But then the mentors told us: "Okay, it's too specific, you have to think a bit broader." I don't know when we switched to—

Anton: I guess it's when we thought about that they *are* changing the neighborhood over there, but we don't get a lot of communication about that, as people, residents of the neighborhood. So how can we investigate the communication between the municipality and the neighborhood and the people living there and the people who are going to use the roads there and stuff like that. So I think that's how we came into this project—

Jonas: Yes. Mostly because—you know the Martelarenlaan, on the back side of the station?

Adrian: Yes.

Jonas: They are rebuilding it and they are going to build the Belle-Vue park there. But we were looking into the plans, and we were thinking that they could do something bigger than only building a small park and and the road next to it. We were questioning if the residents had anything to say about how it was affecting their road. And then we switched to: "Okay maybe we have to research the communication between the residents and..."

Adrian: Yep. More interesting would be the process of you moved through a problem. I wouldn't lose your story. Keep your story, but I think what you'll find is in telling the story: "Okay, we have this problem, which is, you have this piece of land, why is it in the middle of a city. It's valuable land, how do you deal with it?" Then you can start to build on that and say: "Well, alright, the residents need to be informed." But then you realize that they're actually one part of the problem—not part of the problem but one group, which is associated with this. But then in fact, to really think about this properly so that this works—sorry, and then you might say: "Well, there isn't in say one part of the group, but there are other interest groups that need to be consulted either." And how do you get them to co-produce—which is an other word you should write down: co-produce.

Jonas: Co-produce.

Adrian: Yep.

Anton: Because it's a long the communicative scope (?).

Adrian: And then, because you might actually find—if you're looking at the side they might be looking at this bit. But in fact the problem could go well into the back and fourth. And then you could start to create—then the story becomes much more integrated. Then, if you can start to build up the complexity of this project, and you can start to say: "Hey, what we actually need is a way, a method of dealing with these complex interests."

Anton: This could be very interesting.

Adrian: Part of the critical thing about this is how to visualize that very quickly. What you can do is start to create this visual language.

Anton: Yes! Because we—our class is called Information Design, so maybe it's not even necessary to build this practical solution, but more like the model, even. If we could develop or just go further on that, it could be very interesting.

Jonas: True.

Anton: I guess our mentors on the project will be supportive of that.

Adrian: These guys (points at book), have this nice approach where they talk about: "Alright, one of the most important things is how to communicate your ideas." And what they say is: "Well, all you need is a couple of glyphs, a couple of shades, some text, numbers, and then you can create anything." (taps book) So if you had some kind of visual language like that, then, I'd say that you'll—you'll be in business. Cause then there's a way of—you know, there's people that can draw, like you guys. There's people that can't draw, probably like me. How can we still communicate through what they call 'Artefacts'. Artefacts being like drawings.

Anton: Can we think about it like this, there is people who know about the process of urban planning and changes in the city, and there's people who don't know? Is that a bridge we can build, or something like that?

Adrian: No, because that's technical knowledge. I would say what you're trying to create here is a platform of bringing together the stakeholders, and in that case you need to set the conditions for that relationship. Because each stakeholder has a certain kind of expertise, and a certain knowledge, which they bring in. And you wouldn't say that there is one group which knows more than the others. The question is in which kind of context there should be more of one group or of another. That's something else you'll kind of have to improvise, but how you then facilitate that—which is this book (taps on book)—super important. In my opinion, the facilitation process is what you guys should be focussing on. Not necessarily—don't worry too much about the philosophy. That will send you crazy and—just think about the process of facilitation, what the kind of games, the kind of things that people need to break down the barriers and to communicate openly. You can think about this kind of—also, for you guys in terms of how you do this

—think about it practically. How big should the group be? Is this a right number of people? Do you have a moderator, who is doing it? How do people contribute? With artifacts being something you draw, and do you paste it on? Or do you have—can you actually create a collection of these objects which then you can paste together, and you can very quickly create things you can visualize. I don't know, this is where all the fun happens. And you guys are going to come back and going to be like: "Hey! We've got this awesome solution!"

(laughter)

Anton: Let's hope.

Adrian: You've got how long?

Anton: Not a long time actually. We should be—

Jonas: Six weeks?

Anton: The middle of may is when we have a first deadline. It's in the context of an international competition, so that's one deadline. Then the end of june is when it's got to be completely finished.

Jonas: Yeah.

Adrian: If you can create like a little handbook? A pdf-type handbook thing, which basically gives people a collection of objects, tools, like what I mentioned to Silke. You just have to create a list of things that you can basically pick and choose from.

Anton: Yes. That's a very interesting—

Adrian: Yeah. Then I think that's a nice start. Anyway. I'll let you guys—

Jonas: Sort it out.

Adrian: Sort it out, yes. Keep me posted, yeah? On the thirty first of may, there's a girl coming here called Mara, who's from a little office called 'Visuality'. She communicates how to do this visual communication while you've got a group running. So if you want to come, it's a two hour workshop.

Anton: Yes, maybe that's interesting?

Jonas: Thirty first of may?

Adrian: Sorry, april! Fuck. April, it's at the end of this month. If you want to join you are very welcome.

Anton: Okay, we'll keep you up to date.

Jonas: (writing) Workshop with ...? What was her name?

Adrian: Mara... Prrrt (makes farting sound) I don't know. It's downstairs. You send me an email, I'll invite you. But you'll need to confirm whether you're going to come or not, because it comes with lunch. Well... Een kleine broodje.

Jonas: (laughs) Klein.

Adrian: Well guys.

Anton: Thank you very much.

Jonas: Thank you, very much!

Adrian: No problem.