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1. Introduction

Local government agencies, public institutions, small and medium companies experience numerous problems when they want to use the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) data for their own services. They are in need of intermediaries – climate data services purveyors, for example – those who can provide them with specific climate urban data targeted for their specific activities in comparison with routine data (zero baseline).

Motivation

Climate-fit translates the best available scientific urban climate data into relevant information for public and private end-users operating in cities for sectors including health, energy, emergency planning, urban planning, mobility, and cultural heritage.

Users play a key role within the Climate-fit project, along with climate data providers and service purveyors.

The goal of this deliverable document D3.1 is to work out an evaluation framework for climate services from the user's perspective. The assessment of such services is very new and there is not a standardised methodological model yet. Therefore, the following assessment framework relies on different tools and is explicitly dedicated to the specificities of the Climate-fit project, i.e. mostly the demonstration of climate services between the three actors.

While chapter 2 summarises the specific aims of WP3, the third chapter focuses on the role of users interacting with stakeholders. The forth chapter of this report will go into detail regarding Arctik’s and users’ roles in the present evaluation framework and subsequently the report. Chapter 5 will provide the methodological background for the scope of evaluation.

The following chapters, i.e. 6, 7 and 8, will apply this methodology for each step of WP2. Chapter 10 will articulate the different methodological tools (mostly an online questionnaire, interviews and focus groups) that will be implemented for the overall assessment.
2. The specific aims of WP3

According to the DoW, the specific goal of WP3 is about assessing the services implemented in WP2 from the user partners perspective (DoW, p. 17). WP2 was about stakeholder mapping (T2.1), co-design (T2.2), and especially demonstration (T2.3) of the six sectoral service cases to relevant user communities (DoW, Part A, p. 13 & 14).

The outcome of WP3 will provide valuable input for the:
- market replication (WP4)
- the Socio-economic evaluation (WP6)
- dissemination and marketing (WP7)
- business development (WP8)

More specifically, this evaluation framework will assess the added value provided by the services that are based on the use of specific urban data, in comparison with routine climate data.

3. The primary intended users within Climate-fit

There are 6 groups of users that will assess each demonstrator in which they are involved:
- The Public Health Agency of Barcelona (ASPB) for the Climate and Health service,
- The private building energy performance modelling company INES for the Building Energy service,
- The city of ANTWERP for the Emergency Planning service,
- IURS (The Czech Association of cities and towns) together with the cities of Prague, Ostrava, and Hodonin, for the Urban Planning service,
- The private company BIKE CITIZEN for the Active Mobility service,
- SSBAR (organisational structure of the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Tourism and it has the institutional objective to preserve and promote the archaeological heritage of the City of Rome) for the Cultural Heritage service.

In addition to these mentioned users, six new users will join the Climate-fit project involving new cases. The report resulting from the service evaluation framework will be then relevant for these news users in terms of market replication (WP4).

3.1. Definition of users within the project

According to the DoW, users are defined as the “organisations actually using the information from the climate service purveyors as part of their activities” (Part B, p. 7).
### 3.2. List of users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City of Antwerp</th>
<th>BikeCityGuide</th>
<th>SSColosseo</th>
<th>INES</th>
<th>IURS (with the cities of Ostrava, Hodonin and Prague)</th>
<th>ASPB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td>Disaster Management Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Quality and Intervention &amp; Health Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sector</strong></td>
<td>Emergency planning</td>
<td>Active mobility</td>
<td>Cultural heritage</td>
<td>Building energy</td>
<td>Urban planning</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td>Planning and management of different types of disasters on the territory of the city of Antwerp</td>
<td>Promoting and stimulating active mobility so as to contribute to improved mobility and environmental quality</td>
<td>Protecting, enhancing and preserving the Roman heritage</td>
<td>Private engineering company</td>
<td>Supporting sustainable urban development, helping a wide variety of local stakeholders to understand and follow the principles of sustainable urban development, transferring know-how and initiating the development of new tools for sustainable development of settlements</td>
<td>Monitoring population health status and its determinants, developing and implementing public health interventions and policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: List of users*
3.3. Interactions with other stakeholders

Stakeholders are defined as “the group of organisations who do have an interest in the topic of one (or more) sectorial climate service(s). These are the users and climate service providers/purveyors who form part of the project, but also users and purveyors outside of the project, customers of the users, public administrations responsible for a related sector policy implementation, policy makers, communication actors, citizens living in urban areas, regulatory services, private companies providing linked services, etc.” (DoW, Part A, p. 9). From a user perspective, there are mostly links with three groups of stakeholders:

- Local stakeholders, i.e., third parties (ex: Barcelona City Council), with which users are in touch to get to know better their needs if they use the service,
- Climate data service providers (ex: VITO) which provide climate data,
- Service purveyors which are businesses providing added-value information to users like consultancy firms or GIS data providers (ex: ISGlobal, Meteotest, KU Leuven, GISAT, JR).

Interactions between the three actors started very early in the process and are still going on.

4. Arctik’s and user’ role

Arctik is defined as a “neutral” partner due to the fact that our company is not a service provider within Climate-fit. According to DoW, it will establish an evaluation framework (T3.1), undertake a service evaluation, and provide a report concerning the evaluation (T3.2). This entire service evaluation (WP3) takes place between month 10 and 30 of the Climate-fit project.

More specifically, Arctik’s role is to coordinate the evaluation, including its preparation with interviews and questionnaires.

As explicitly requested in T3.1 in DoW, Arctik pays special importance to confidentiality and will guarantee it in relation to data collection and subsequent analysis. This is in line with the various requirements of WP9 Ethics requirements.

Therefore, the report will not include names of individuals and the questionnaire designed by Arctik will not be disclosed outside of the company.

The General Assembly on the 13th of June 2018 offered the opportunity to present the methodological framework used for the service evaluation. User partners have agreed upon the following calendars:
Therefore, **users’ role is to be proactive** with regards to:
- Checking potential gaps in the assessment,
- Responding to a designed questionnaire,
- Participating in interviews and focus groups,
- Drafting a final report.

**The added-values of Arctik:**
Our company will follow the highest standards of assessment defined by the Norms for Evaluation of the United Nations Development Program, in terms of independence, intentionality, transparency, ethics, impartiality, high quality, time, and usefulness\(^1\).

The dissemination level of D3.1, D3.2, D3.3, D3.4 of WP3 is public and the target audience is above all the different stakeholders of the Climate-fit project.

5. The methodology for our scope of evaluation

The methodology for our scope of evaluation from the user perspective is structured as follows:

1) An assessment of the three WP2 tasks but mostly service demonstration (5.1)
2) that are divided into dimensions (5.2),
3) with Key Evaluation Questions (5.3),
4) relying on quantitative and qualitative indicators (5.4),
5) for which direct questions to users (5.5) are formulated.

5.1. The three different tasks of assessment

According to the DoW, the scope of the evaluation involves the assessment by users of the services implemented in WP2. The tasks of WP2 are defined as thus:

- Stakeholder mapping (T2.1),
- Co-design (T2.2),
- Demonstration (T2.3).

Our assessment methodology places emphasis on the interactions that users have concerning services with climate data providers, service purveyors, and stakeholders before, during, and after the co-design process.

5.2. Dimension of assessment

We then sub-divide each WP2 task into different dimensions of assessment. For example, the dimension related to the success of the service within the service demonstration is a core component of our evaluation framework.

5.3. Key Evaluation Questions

We assess each dimension of WP2 task with a Key Evaluation Question (KEY).

Key evaluation questions are high level questions that the evaluation report will answer. In other words, they are not specific questions that will be asked to users in the designed questionnaire. Instead, they are more generalised questions which are both exploratory and explanatory: they shall assess what has happened from the user’s perspective and how it relates in terms of interactions with other project partners.

The particularity of these Key Evaluation Questions is that they are in line with SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis. The European Commission defines SWOT analysis as a “strategic analysis tool” that “combines the study of the strengths and weaknesses of an organization, a geographical area, or a sector, with the study of the opportunities and threats to their environment”\(^2\). The goal of the “analysis is to take into

account internal and external factors, maximising the potential of strengths and opportunities, while minimising the impact of weaknesses and threats*3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal factors</th>
<th>Positive aspect</th>
<th>Negative aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External factors</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Threats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3 - Rationale of SWOT analysis – source: [link](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/minisite/en-methodological-bases-and-approach/evaluation-tools/swot-strenghts-weakness-opportunities)

Based on this perspective, SWOT analysis was applied to our KEY approaches, the latter of which will pay close attention to:

- the internal strengths and weaknesses of users at each WP2 step,
- while dealing with the opportunities and threats created by interactions with other partners within the Climate-fit.city project.

### 5.4. Quantitative and qualitative indicators

As explicitly requested in the DoW, Arctik relies on both quantitative and qualitative indicators to perform this evaluation mission. On one hand, quantitative indicators give us a numeric assessment of WP2 tasks from the user perspective. Thus, they facilitate the comparison between different users’ experiences. On the other hand, qualitative indicators provide us a non-numeric evaluation of the same tasks. They are a means to go into details about the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that users encounter within the Climate-fit project.

### 5.5. Direct questions to users

The end result being that we provide questions that will be posed to users. After defining each dimension and KEY for WP3 tasks, they are placed as the last and logical step of our evaluation framework.

**We do consider that stakeholder mapping (T2.1) and especially co-design process (T2.2) are essential for the development of the demonstration phase (T2.3). However, the latter is obviously the most important to be assessed in link with the previous ones.**

This is why we are suggesting the following decreasing number of direct questions to users for each WP2 task:

- 27 for T2.3,
- 8 for T2.2,

• 8 for T2.1.

According to the calendar (please see section 4), it is important to note that these direct questions are examples to be discussed with users during the first stage (middle of September 2018).
6. How do users evaluate service demonstration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Quantitative and qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Examples of questions to users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Evaluation Question in line with SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1. <strong>Success of the service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the service a success?</td>
<td>Previous experience with climate service demonstration</td>
<td>1) How do you assess your previous experience with climate service demonstration? Please attribute a value from 1 to 4:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal strengths and weaknesses for the demonstration phase</td>
<td>1) Novice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal strengths gained within the Climate-fit project</td>
<td>2) Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities and threats within the process</td>
<td>3) Well experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential impact in near future</td>
<td>4) Very well experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evolutive role of users</td>
<td>2) If you were already well or very well experienced with climate service demonstration, what were the advantages for you in participating to the activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) However, could you identify some internal weaknesses for your climate service demonstration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) If you had a very small or even non-existing experience with climate service demonstration, what weaknesses did you have to overcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) What solutions did you find to handle them? Please list and explain them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) How do you evaluate the similarity between your initial expectations and the final service demonstration? Please attribute a value between 1 and 4 with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Perfect match</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Reasonable match
3) Imperfect match
4) Complete inadequacy
Please explain your answer.

7) How do you evaluate the similarity between stakeholders’ initial expectations and the final service demonstration? Please attribute a value between 1 and 4 with:
   1) Perfect match
   2) Reasonable match
   3) Imperfect match
   4) Complete inadequacy
Please explain your answer.

8) Please list and describe the 3 most important features of the service. Then for each of it, please rate (using a scale from 1 to 6, where 1= low and 6= high) the following characteristics:
   • Fit for use, i.e. its capacity to correspond to your use
   • Effectiveness, i.e. its capacity to produce desired output
   • Usability, i.e. its capacity to be solution-oriented
   • Completeness, i.e. its capacity to cover all your needs
   • Understandability, i.e. its capacity to be understood by your organization

9) Globally, how do you assess the service demonstration? Please attribute a value between 1 and 5 with:
   1) Very negative
   2) Negative
   3) Neutral
   4) Positive
   5) Very positive
10) Please provide a one page answer to the following question: what is the added value of the specific climate data compared with routine data for your service demonstration? Use the following structure in your answer:
   1) Characteristics of the ex-ante situation
   2) Characteristics of the current situation
   3) Opportunities and threats with the current situation

11) Do you think that the project could contribute to outcomes which extend beyond the duration of the project? If you answered yes, which ones?

12) How do you define your role in comparison with all the different partners of the Climate-fit project?

13) Did this role change before, during, and after the co-design process and demonstration one?

14) What were your initial capabilities in terms of using, processing, interpreting, communicating climate data?

15) What are they now?

16) Did you transform yourself into climate data purveyors?

17) If so, what were the exact configurations and with whom?

18) Do you consider that you have reached some social and economic benefits with the service demonstration for your company/administration?

19) If so, are they related (for each answer, please provide any relevant explanations like figures):
1) Jobs
2) Cost reduction
3) Direct or indirect income
4) Better information for your audience
5) Other?

20) To what extent do you agree on the following statement: “Climate-fit project can achieve more tangible outcomes in the next six months”
Please attribute a value from 1 to 6 where 1 is “totally disagree” and 5 is “I totally agree”.
   1) I totally disagree
   2) I disagree
   3) I have no opinion
   4) I agree
   5) I strongly agree
Please explain your choice.

21) What is the probability that you will uptake the service and use it on a regular basis?

22) Did you identify within the service demonstration some new social economic/market services that were not previously planned?
23) If so, what are they exactly?

24) What is the probability that you will invest in further improvements in the future?

25) Please provide any comments that you find relevant for this assessment report.

### 6.2. Communication quality

**How was the communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific and overall communication evaluation with other partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) What was the quality of your communication with climate services providers during the demonstration phase?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please attribute a value between 1 and 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) What was the quality of your communication with services providers during the demonstration phase? Please attribute a value between 1 and 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please justify your choice.
### 7. How do users evaluate co-design process in link with service demonstration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Quantitative and qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Examples of questions to users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Key Evaluation Question in line with SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis | - **Number** and **nature** of agreements  
- **Number** and **nature** of disagreements  
- **Found compromise**  
- **Implementation** of the service’s compromise  
- **Difference** between **timeframe for the task** and the **ex-post situation** | 1) What was the level of disagreement/agreement with partners during the discussion on service design? Please attribute a value between 1 and 4 with:  
1) Strong disagreement  
2) Disagreement  
3) Agreement  
4) Strong agreement  
2) How many important agreements did you have with partners during that discussion?  
3) What were these agreements? Please list and explain them.  
4) Do you remember how many important disagreements you had with partners during that discussion?  
5) What were these disagreements? Please list and explain them: what were the reasons?  
6) Would you say that the final service output is:  
1) similar to what you agreed with other partners during the discussions?  
2) different to what you agreed with other partners during the discussions? |

7.1. **Discussion on service design**

What were the agreements and disagreements with other partners during the discussion on service design?
### 7.2. Overall value of the co-design process in the demonstration phase

What is the added value for users of the co-design process for the demonstration phase?

- **Utility measurement** of co-design process within the demonstration phase
- **Opportunities** and **threats** of the stakeholders’ mapping within the demonstration phase

1) What is the level of utility of co-designed services in the demonstration phase? Please attribute a value between 1 and 3 with:
   1) Useless
   2) Useful
   3) Very useful

Please explain your answer.

2) Globally, what benefits and barriers did you identify from the co-design process in the demonstration phase? Please provide a half page answer.
8. How do users evaluate stakeholder mapping in link with service demonstration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Quantitative and qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Examples of questions to users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Evaluation Question in line with SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis</td>
<td>- Prior level of interactions with stakeholders</td>
<td>1) How do you assess your level of interactions with stakeholders beforehand? Please attribute a value from 1 to 6 with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Freedom to select stakeholders</td>
<td>1) Non-existent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scale of stakeholders’ mapping</td>
<td>2) Very high level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of confirmed stakeholders</td>
<td>3) High level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internal strengths and weaknesses for users in the stakeholder mapping</td>
<td>4) Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunities and threats during stakeholder mapping</td>
<td>5) Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Difference between timeframe for the task and the ex-post situation</td>
<td>2) How many did you identify? Please select one of the options below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) &lt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) &lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) &gt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) How many stakeholders were involved in the final project? Please select one of the options below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) &lt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) &lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) &gt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) How do you assess the level of easiness of this stakeholder mapping? Please attribute a value from 1 to 4 with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Very easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1. Identification of potential stakeholders

How did users identify with partners other potential local stakeholders (third parties)?
4) Very difficult
Please explain your answer by listing your internal strengths and weaknesses for that purpose.

5) More generally, what unexpected opportunities did you identify in that stakeholder mapping? Please list and explain them.

6) What unexpected issues did you have to handle?
7) How did you overcome them?

8.2. Value of the stakeholder mapping in the co-designed and demonstration phase

What is the added value of the stakeholder mapping in the co-designed service and demonstration phase?

- **Utility measurement** of each WP2 task within the demonstration phase
- **Opportunities** and **threats** of the stakeholder mapping within the co-designed service and demonstration phase

1) What is the level of utility of stakeholder mapping in the demonstration phase? Please attribute a value between 1 and 3 with:
   1) Useless
   2) Useful
   3) Very useful

   Please explain your answer.

2) Globally, what benefits and barriers did you identify from the stakeholder mapping in the co-designed process and demonstration phase? Please provide a half page answer.
9. Overview of the implemented methodological tools

Arctik will articulate the mentioned assessment questions with different methodological tools, i.e. online questionnaire with a report template, oral interviews, and one focus-group.

9.1 Online questionnaire for the user-made report

This evaluation primarily relies on an online questionnaire designed by Arctik. This designed questionnaire will include the specific questions formulated to users in sections 8, 7, 6. Before the official submission to users, the latter will comment those questions and suggest some more according to the agreed calendar of the whole evaluation process (please see Figure 2).

This online questionnaire will be the basis for the user-made report. Indeed, the provided answers will be automatically integrated in the user-made report that Arctik will compile. Essentially, the online questionnaire will include forced-choice questions and open-ended questions that will require either short answers or long answers.

9.1.1. Forced-choice questions

On one hand, forced-choice questions have limited answers, but they assure comparability among respondents answers.

Example: To what degree have you exchanged some data with your climate data provider?

___ no exchange
___ little exchange
___ moderate exchange
___ extensive exchange

9.1.2. Open-ended questions

On the other hand, open-ended questions are free to answer. They offer the opportunity to get more in-depth general information as well as unexpected responses.
We formulated two types of open-ended questions:

1) A first type which requires a short answer. For example, “if you had a very small or even non-existent experience with climate service demonstration, what weaknesses did you have to overcome?”

2) A second type that requires a longer answer. For example, “Please provide a one page answer to the following question: what is the added value of the specific climate data with routine data for your service demonstration? Please use the following structure in your answer: 1) Characteristics of the ex-ante situation, 2) Characteristics of the current situation, 3) Opportunities and threats with the current situation”.

9.2 Oral interviews

In comparison to open-ended questions included in online questionnaires, the advantage of oral interviews with users is to tailor each of them by asking more specific oriented interrogations. These individual interviews will allow for the opportunity of addressing the guidelines provided in the DoW (p. 17):

- For ASPB and its evaluation of the Climate and Health service, what is the “added value of using urban climate information (in particular accounting for the urban heat island effect) as compared to routine (non-urban) meteorological or climate data” with “special attention […] to extreme events such as the summer 2003 heat wave, which caused unprecedented high mortality records throughout Europe”.

- For INES and its assessment of the Building Energy service, what is the “added value of using urban climate data compared to regular data from e.g. a nearby airport” and “the value of site-specific (urban) climate data, presumably with lower uncertainties, in reducing planning and investment costs for buildings”.

- For ANTWERP and its evaluation of the Emergency Planning service, what is the “increased efficiency in flooding disaster management, and an assessment of the potentially reduced loss of human life, and evacuation of time lapse, as a result of incorporating this service”.

- For IURS, together with the cities of Prague, Ostrava, and Hodonin, and their assessment of the Urban Planning service, what are “stated user needs such as the monitoring/prediction of urban microclimate, impact of urban densification, the assessment of urban green fields to mitigate urban heatwaves, and scenario simulations of city development and related urban cooling capacity towards various climate change scenarios”.

- For BIKE CITIZEN and its evaluation of the Active Mobility service, what is “the added value of urban climate information to their existing tool ‘Bike Citizens Analytics’ and the extent to which this information can be easily integrated into this tool” with a focus on the “geographic transferability of the active mobility climate service, which is important given the fact that Bike Citizens Analytics addresses cities across the globe”.
9.3 Focus group

Arctik plans to organize a focus group with users in Czech Republic for the next General Assembly of Climate-fit (11th & 12th of December, 2018). A focus group is a small-group gathering that aims to collect information from their various participants.

The main advantage is to stimulate a moderated dialogue between participants on clearly defined topics that individual interviews cannot bring. Another additional asset of focus group is for users: they are inclined to learn from one another by sharing similar experiences within the Climate Fit project. The focus group interview for this project will last around 90 minutes and the format of the questions will be short, open-ended, and one-dimensional.

10. Conclusion

The goal of this deliverable was to introduce a combination of different methodological tools in order to assess services’ demonstration from the user’s perspective. It adapts to the specificities of the Climate-fit.city project, i.e. its three different tasks with 1) stakeholder mapping, 2) co-design, and especially 3) service demonstration. Moreover, it puts forward for each task a combination of a) different dimensions of assessment associated, for each of them, with a b) Key Evaluation Question, c) qualitative and quantitative indicators, and d) direct questions to users. The particularity of this evaluation is to mostly rely on the proactive role of users throughout the whole process and facilitate their drafting of their report. Thus, this present evaluation framework (D3.1) will provide a coherent and sound assessment report (D3.2) that will bring some insight for the market replication evaluation report (D3.3) and the cross-sectoral synergies one (D3.4). It will also offer new perspective for market replication (WP4), the socio-economic evaluation (WP6), dissemination and marketing (WP7), and business development (WP8) of the Climate-fit.city project.
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