TechRevolution 2.0

Thematic Objective	3. Competitiveness of SMEs

Partnership

	City Name	**Country**	**Region**
LP	Barnsley	UNITED KINGDOM	EU transition region
PP	Alytus	LITHUANIA	EU less developed region
PP	Novska	CROATIA	EU less developed region
PP	Rzeszow	POLAND	EU less developed region
PP	Roeselare	BELGIUM	EU more developed region

Project summary

Medium-sized post-industrial cities in Europe seek ways to grow & diversify their economies to compete with the pull of larger hubs. This is even more important in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. Barnsley has been committed to growing higher value jobs, particularly within its tech and digital sectors. The Good Practice comprises 2 main pillars:
- Enterprising Barnsley, an award winning business support programme
- The Digital Media Centre, a landmark hub for tech business in the town centre.

EAP Assessment

The EAP would <u>recommend</u> the proposal *Tech Revolution 2.0* to be funded.

The EAP makes the following suggestions for improvement:

- **Consideration should be given to ensure that all transfer cities have the necessary funds to facilitate the transfer of the Good Practice.**
- **Consideration should be given to mitigate the challenges related to effective transfer from a larger to a much smaller city.**
- **Consideration should be given to ensure that the partner cities have the relevant conditions in place to successfully transfer the Good Practice in addition to learning from it.**

Comments

Criterion A – Quality of the Partnership (40%)	*Very Good*

The way in which the quality of the partnership has been presented is 'very good'.

The proposed partnership covers an appropriate geographic mix of EU Member States and includes four URBACT newcomers. The proposal explains in detail the criteria for selecting the transfer cities and their specific needs, offering a very good opportunity to test the Good Practice in different settings. All of the partners demonstrate high levels of motivation and

strong political support to learn the Good Practice and progress their local economy through the development of tech digital jobs and entrepreneurship.

However, a key shortcoming exists:

- The level of motivation across the transfer cities on actually transferring the Good Practice in addition to learning from the Good Practice is not clearly demonstrated.

Criterion B – Transfer potential (40%)	*Very Good*

The proposal demonstrates that the transfer potential of the Good Practice is 'very good'.

The transfer methodology has been adapted and further improved on the basis of the learnings from the transfer cities of the first wave and the growing importance and resilience of the tech and digital sector industries during the COVID-19 crisis. Each element of the Good Practice is restructured into individual components which can be differently combined. Taking into account that all transfer cities are new to URBACT, the Lead Partner has planned sufficient time and resources to providing strong support and guidance at the beginning of the process representing high motivation levels to facilitate the transfer of the Good Practice.

However, a small number of shortcomings have been identified, which include:

- The risks and challenges with regard to transferring the Good Practice from a larger to a much smaller city have not been elaborated in sufficient detail.
- The expected extent of the transferred elements of the Good Practice has not been fully explained.
- The proposal demonstrates less clearly that all transfer cities have the necessary funds to facilitate the transfer of the Good Practice.

Criterion C – Quality of the Planned Activity and Outputs (20%)	*Very Good*

The quality of the proposed methodology and activities is considered to be 'very good'.

The planned activities are clearly explained, logically framed, and interlinked. The methodology proposed to link transnational and local activities presents a well-designed hybrid model of physical and virtual interactions. The Transnational Meetings and ULG Meetings are clearly structured, including a comprehensive utilisation of URBACT tools for facilitation and learning. Furthermore, the proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of the expected outputs.

However, a small number of shortcomings have been identified:

- It is not clear how the adjustment process of the Good Practice will be facilitated in the transfer cities.
- Some of the outputs (e.g., Network Sharing Products, Quarterly Network Reports, Transfer Roadmaps) and the process around their development is not fully elaborated.