



Final Project Report

May 2026



Co-funded by
the European Union

This project has been funded by the Agencia Estatal de Investigación (AEI); by Innoviris Brussels; by Federal Ministry of Research, Technology and Space (BMFTR); by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office (NKFIH); by the Ministero Dell'Università e Della Ricerca; by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) and by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK) under the Driving Urban Transitions Partnership, which has been co-funded by the European Commission.

Contents

Document Information.....	3
1. Project Overview.....	4
2. Work performed	6
3. Project Outcomes and Assessment Plan	18
4. Project Sustainability.....	19
5. Lessons Learned.....	20
6. Project Deliverables and Documentation	24

Document Information

Grant agreement	F-DUT-2022-0046
Project title	Fostering The City of Proximity through Maas Integration
Project acronym	FORTHCOMING
Project coordinator	UPM
Project duration	30 months
Related work package	Work Package 1
Related task(s)	
Lead organisation	UPM
Contributing partner(s)	All
Due date	30 May
Submission date	
Dissemination level	Public

1. Project Overview

The FORTHCOMING project was conceived in response to the growing need for sustainable, inclusive, and climate-neutral urban transitions. Existing approaches to proximity-based planning had primarily focused on dense city centres, leaving suburban areas underrepresented in policy and research. In these peripheral environments, lower population densities, dispersed service provision, and deeply entrenched car-oriented mobility patterns made the application of 15-Minute City (15mC) principles substantially more difficult.

The project addressed this gap by investigating how the 15-Minute City concept could be meaningfully adapted and transferred to suburban contexts, providing local authorities with practical tools and evidence-based guidance to do so.

The FORTHCOMING project pursued the following core objectives:

- Developed a practical and evidence-based framework that enabled cities to adapt and scale 15-Minute City strategies to suburban and peri-urban environments.
- Combined proximity-based urban planning principles with sustainable mobility solutions and future mobility concepts to create integrated approaches to suburban accessibility.
- Promoted active and shared mobility modes, including walking, cycling, and public transport, as viable alternatives to private car use in suburban settings.
- Enhanced quality of life and social inclusion, with attention to boarder population groups to participate in urban planning.
- Pretended to reduce car dependency and associated greenhouse gas emissions by supporting behaviour change and multimodal integration at the local level.
- Supported more effective public investment decisions by providing local authorities with tools to identify interventions that generate the greatest accessibility and quality-of-life improvements.
- Strengthened cross-sector collaboration between researchers, local authorities, mobility providers, and community stakeholders, building long-term capacity for innovation and knowledge exchange across Europe.

To test and validate the approaches developed, six Urban Living Labs (ULLs) were established in cities across Europe and beyond: municipality of **Las Rozas ULL in Madrid** metropolitan area, **Altona in Hamburg**, **Vila Franca de Xira in Lisbon**, **Kertvaròs in Debrecen**, **Küçükçekmece in Istanbul**, and **Settimo Torinese in Turin**. These case study locations were selected to represent a diversity of territorial configurations, socioeconomic conditions, institutional frameworks, and governance capacities, ensuring that the findings and methodologies developed would be broadly applicable and transferable.



Figure 1. Forthcoming case studies

The project anticipated a range of societal, environmental, and economic benefits:

Societal

- Provided strategies that improve access to everyday services for all residents, particularly those in underserved suburban locations.
- In its participatory concept, could enhance social inclusion for mobility-disadvantaged groups including older adults, young people, and car-free households.
- Healthier lifestyles through increased walking and cycling as part of daily routines.
- Greater opportunities for participation in local community life.

Environmental

- Provided strategies that reduce car dependency and lower greenhouse gas emissions from the transport sector.
- Could achieve more efficient use of existing urban infrastructure and land.

Economic

- More effective public investment by helping cities identify and prioritise high-impact accessibility interventions.

- Long-term capacity building for innovation and cross-European knowledge exchange.

Finally, FORTHCOMING was directly aligned with and contributed to a number of key European policy frameworks and initiatives:

Framework	Relevance
DUT Partnership	Driving Urban Transitions (the primary funding and policy framework for the project).
EU Mission on Cities	EU Mission for Climate-Neutral and Smart Cities (supported transition pathways for urban areas).
EU Sustainable Mobility	European policies promoting sustainable transport, multimodal integration, and active travel.
Inclusive Urban Development	EU frameworks supporting accessible and socially inclusive urban development.

FORTHCOMING demonstrated that the 15-Minute City concept can be meaningfully adapted beyond dense urban cores when supported by context-sensitive planning, inclusive stakeholder engagement, and integrated mobility strategies. By focusing specifically on suburban areas, which is a context often overlooked in proximity-based planning discussions, the project made a distinctive contribution to sustainable urban transitions across Europe.

The transferable framework, harmonized KPI set, and practical implementation guidance developed through FORTHCOMING provide policymakers and planners with concrete tools to identify accessibility gaps, prioritise interventions, and promote more sustainable travel behaviour in the places where such change is often most needed but most challenging to achieve.

2. Work performed

WP1. Project Management and Coordination

Project management and coordination actions and activities undertaken during the project period (Lead: UPM):

1) Internal coordination of activities in collaboration with WP leaders and partner entities:

- Three General Assemblies were conducted in Turin (Feb 12-13, 2024), Istanbul (July 3-4, 2025), and the final event was in Brussels (May 27-28, 2026).
- Regular coordination meetings (on average every ½ month) or when necessary.
- Ensuring compliance with agreed procedures and ethical standards set before participatory activities with citizens and local organisations

- Extension of project to June 2026 for all project partners

2) External coordination activities (Lead: UPM)

- DUT Deep Dive meeting #1 (Dec 4, Online)
- Deep Dive meeting #2 (June 10, Online)
- DUT Projects Event (Sept 30-Oct 1 – Milan)
- Disseminate project findings and participation to external events (see WP7)

2) Innovation, Quality, Risk and Data Management Plan (Lead: Parabol):

- Ensuring adherence to data management plans and verifying that deliverables meet quality standards.

WP2. Portfolio of Successful 15minC Strategies in Urban Areas: [Lead:EUR]

Developed a scientific basis for the FORTHCOMING project by assessing state of the art and practice of the 15minC in urban areas of the international setting – (Leads ITU & Eurocities)

- State of art of academic literature (15mC definition and dimensions, challenges, success factors identified in the literature)
- Review of relevant European projects and initiatives to identify relevant successful best practices and key factors of success
- Review of grey literature and city policy documents related to 15mC
- Mapping of existing 15mC policy/ implementation worldwide
- Review of recent DUT documents on 15mC (position paper, mapping of best practices)

Developed a portfolio of successful 15-minute city strategies in urban cores (Lead: Eurocities)

- Development of a framework to select best practices drawing on four key areas of actions as identified by DUT as an initial framing device, as well as on critical issues identified in literature and through discussions with partners to ensure relevance for ULLs.
- Identification of best practice interventions in each of the four key areas of actions (e.g. cycling parking, pedestrianisation, citizen participation in urban planning, last-mile delivery solutions, digital nudging, development of MaaS application, etc).
- Two workshops with representatives of FORTHCOMING ULLs using Miro board to identify relevant aspects of 15mC (four dimensions) and relevant key areas of actions/ types of intervention for each of the ULLs.
- Exchanges with city representatives and relevant stakeholders to identify and evaluate impacts of each intervention, key success factors and lessons learnt.

- Selection of 15 best practices for the portfolio including lessons learnt and success factors as well as initial analysis of relevant elements for peri-urban contexts.

WP3. SWOT Analysis of 15minC Strategies: [Lead: HCU]

WP3, led by HCU, focused on strengthening the understanding and implementation of 15-Minute City strategies across the six Case Studies. As Work Package leader, HCU coordinated the contributions of the task leaders (ITU and SZTAKI), ensured alignment across tasks, and maintained regular communication with the project coordinator (UPM) through structured WP meetings.

WP3 focused on the following tasks:

- Conduction Focus groups with local stakeholders in each ULL, including the reviewing and validating of KPIs clusters as well as conducting SWOT analysis of local strategies (Lead: SZTAKI)
- Analysis of insights from focus groups / SWOT analysis (Lead: SZTAKI)
- Development and final validation of relevant common and ULL-specific KPIs in collaboration with all project partners. (Lead: HCU)

Local strategies across all six Case Studies were selected, collected and consolidated into a list of potential KPIs. Some of these KPIs were categorized as common and others as specific, that respectively respond to the collective and respective case studies and ULLs.

The initial list of indicators was generated through questionnaires and a collaborative Miro exercise with local partners, which produced a broad set of potential KPIs. This list was then consolidated through literature review. Throughout this phase, representatives from the six case studies provided continuous input and feedback to ensure the KPIs reflected locally grounded realities.

The initial list was taken to the Focus Groups, involving experts and local stakeholders, where they collaborated in ranking and refining the defined KPIs and extracting the opportunities and challenges in each case study. This process helped narrow down and refine the comprehensive KPI list based on relevance and feasibility.

- 1) Conduction Focus groups with local stakeholders in each ULL, including the reviewing and validating of KPIs clusters as well as conducting SWOT analysis of local strategies (Lead: SZTAKI)
- 2) Analysis of insights from focus groups / SWOT analysis (Lead: SZTAKI)
- 3) Development and final validation of relevant common and ULL-specific KPIs in collaboration with all project partners. (Lead: HCU)

The KPIs within the Forthcoming project were developed to guide the transfer of the 15-minute city strategies developed in the 6 ULLs. They emphasize multimodal mobility, user-centric models, and digitization. The KPIs were divided into:

- Input KPIs: for evaluating resources and planning efforts
- Process KPIs: to measure operational aspects

- Output KPIs: to evaluate the impacts of the 15mC designs on the quality of life.

The initial list of KPIs was defined and clustered into: C1-Proximity, C2-Inclusivity, C3-Digitization and MaaS, C4-Density and Land Use, C5-Sustainability & climate action, C6-Governance, C7-Modal Share, C8-Economic Impact. Three proximity KPIs were defined within the C1-Proximity cluster, all classified as process indicators. In total, 92 KPIs were developed as an preliminary list, and then refined into 9 common KPIs and 6 specific KPIs. The 9 common KPIs were selected to be applied and refined, allowing the cross-sectional analysis - conducted by the partners - with a comparative framework between the partners in WP4.

A relevant output of this step was the development of the specific multiple metrics for each KPI. Each cluster contained from one to three KPIs, while each KPI contained one to two complementary metrics, creating a composite index. The first cluster encompasses the Proximity KPIs, where *Proximity to Green, Blue and Public Spaces* measures the share of the ULL area reachable within 15 minutes of parks, waterfronts, and public squares. The second KPI within the cluster, *Proximity to Essential Services*, assesses access to services organised into six social functions drawn from Moreno et al.'s (2023) High Quality of Societal Life (HQSL) framework: living, working, getting supplies, enjoying, learning, and caring/being healthy. For each function, a proximity index is calculated per transport mode; the sum of all six functions' scores per mode yields a composite walking index and biking index. The third KPI, *Proximity to Public Transport and DRT*, measures the proportion of the ULL area within a 15-minute walk of fixed-route or demand-responsive transport stops, complemented optionally by a service frequency metric. The cluster of Inclusivity measured the *Inclusivity in Accessing Mobility Infrastructure*, with two complementary metrics assessing the Availability of Discounted Public Transport Ticket Types and the Quality of Barrier-Free Walking Infrastructure. The Density cluster measures the Built-up Surface (Urban Density), combining the metrics of Built-up Surface with the Total Built-Up Area Ratio – which calculates the ratio of the total built-up area (including residential, commercial, industrial, etc.) to the total land area; and the Diversity of Land Use, with the metrics of Types of Mixed-Use Developments and Ratio of Key Land Uses to Total Area. The cluster of Modal Share included the *Active Mobility Infrastructure* KPI. Digitalisation contained the Availability of Multi-Modal Mobility Services. The Governance cluster, on its turn, contained the KPI of Citizen Participation in Urban Planning. The complete and detailed list of KPIs is described in the deliverable D3.2 of FORTHCOMING.

WP4. 6 EU 15minC Urban Living Labs: [Lead: UPM]

Activities conducted during the project:

- 1) the set-up and characterisation of the six ULLs (Lead: UPM)

To provide a comprehensive setup of the ULL, both quantitative and qualitative data collection approaches were followed. For the sake of consistency and comparability among different case studies, common open data sources (such as the OECD Local Data Profile Database and Eurostat) were used. When necessary, each CC and ULL used national, regional, or local databases. For all six case studies, both the core city and the ULL were characterized by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, urban planning and land use characteristics, transport and mobility characteristics, and governance and policy framework. Then, based on focus group discussions, the key opportunities and challenges were concluded. To this end, a set

of unified Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) was developed for data collection that captures ULLs homogeneously.

2) Collection of quantitative and qualitative data/indicators for the screening of the 15min city dimensions drawing on KPIs defined in WP3 by key stakeholders (e.g. local municipal and expert stakeholders, local residents in certain case, project partners, etc). Detailed proximity KPIs analysis for the six ULLs is included (Lead: HCU)

The necessary data for the analysis of the 6 ULLs was collected and the process was automated, including the data collected in the previous task of characterisation of the ULL. The selected KPIs served as key criteria for assessing 15minC strategies and both the urban living lab (suburban context) and the core city (central, denser context). The data collection template for Task 4.2 was created and structured the analysis. The necessary data for drawing on the defined KPIs and screening the 15min city dimensions was identified per KPI and a data collection methodology was suggested for each. It was identified that for certain KPIs, for instance, direct contact with local stakeholders for data retrieval was necessary, while for others a GIS-based calculation should be conducted.

The proximity analysis methodology was based on GIS and python, combining open geospatial data, isochrone mapping, and coverage computation. The methodological foundation for visualising proximity distinguishes two spatial techniques: the isochrone method, used for walking (5.1 km/h) and cycling (18 km/h), which maps the actual area reachable within 15 minutes via the street network; and the isodistance method, used for public transport, which defines a straight-line perimeter based on standardised modal speeds (bus: 20 km/h, tram: 25 km/h, train: 75 km/h). POIs sourced from OpenStreetMap are used as origin points, and the resulting coverage polygons are clipped to the ULL boundary to compute the percentage of the total area — or population within it — that falls within the 15-minute threshold. The calculation could be automated to use the Mapbox Isochrone API, allowing the production of the QGIS map outputs used throughout the broader data collection process.

To this end, the proximity analysis was automated through a custom Python script using the OSMnx library and the Mapbox Isochrone API. In the first step, the script retrieves the spatial boundary of each ULL from OpenStreetMap and downloads relevant points of interest (POIs) organized into thematic categories, according to the KPIs: with Green, Blue, and Public spaces; Public Transport; and Essential Services — for which a comprehensive list was delivered compiling of all "Keys" and "Values" from OSM that correspond to the main 6 essential services categories based on the urban functions' framework established by Moreno et al. (2023), including working; supplying; caring/being healthy; learning; enjoying; and public transport. In the second step, 15-minute walking and cycling isochrones are generated around each POI using Mapbox routing engines. Finally, these isochrones are merged and clipped to the ULL boundary, and the share of the ULL area falling within the proximity threshold is calculated per category and transport mode, enabling systematic KPI reporting across all six sites.

To allow the later cross-sectional analysis, the collection draws on a broad range of quantitative data collected across four thematic areas: demographic and socioeconomic characteristics (population, age distribution, income, unemployment, and inequality); urban planning and land use (area, density, land cover, built-up surface, and green space per capita); proximity and mobility infrastructure (cycling and pedestrian networks, walking and cycling access to public transport and points of interest); and mobility

patterns (modal split and motorisation rate). Data sources vary by ULL. Cross-checking between various platforms took place to land on the most integral one. The sources therefore include national statistical institutes, the OECD Local Profile Database, municipal planning documents, OpenStreetMap, Geoportal platforms, and proprietary platforms such as Esri Living Atlas and Endeksa; alongside the geodata calculations. Where ULL-level data was unavailable, figures from the broader core city or municipality were used as proxies.

The KPIs developed by HCU were applied to Hamburg and its living lab, as well as to all the partner cities. This step resulted into measurable and standardised indicators across the different cities that allowed comparability and assessment. The detailed proximity KPIs analysis for the six ULLs was included. The developed KPI and python script was part of the WP4, within task 4.2, and is included in the report D4.2.

This step has also resulted in a set of KPI maps for all different cities, including proximity maps and land use share maps, as part of the WP5 and present in the deliverable D5.1

3) Visualisation of proximity analysis for the six ULL areas, evaluating their proximity to different POIs (Lead: HCU)

Due to a shift in planning, HCU took over the added task of visualizing the proximity analysis of the 6 ULLs. The maps were developed for the first two KPIs of the Proximity Cluster (*Proximity to green, blue, and public spaces*, and *Proximity to essential services*) and were designed in the same format and template for all ULLs with the data from the previous task of data collection and screening. The proximity maps are planned to be present in the project's Guidebook ("15minC Implementation Guidebook for Suburban Areas") as part of the WP7. In addition, maps identifying the exact territory of the ULL, Core City (CC) and study area were developed for all ULLs, standardising the terminology and names used for each ULL. The Guidebook is expected to contain all main achievements of the project, being currently written in collaboration with all the partners.

4) In depth cross-sectional analysis of the six ULLs (Lead EUR)

For the cross-sectional analysis, we used a mixed-method methodology integrating both quantitative and qualitative data collected within WP3 and WP4. Initially, a basic quantitative comparative analysis was conducted on the socio-demographic, land-use, and mobility profiles of the ULLs.

The quantitative analysis was complemented by a proximity analysis for each ULL, carried out under Task 4.2, which combined open geospatial data, isochrone mapping, and coverage computation. The proximity analysis evaluated the proportion of each ULL that could be reached within a 15-minute walk or cycle ride to selected categories of destinations, or Points of Interest (POIs), including: (1) Green, blue, and public spaces; (2) POIs aligned with the functions of 15min-C: Getting supplies; Enjoying; Learning; Caring / Being healthy and (3) Public transport.

We completed the analysis with in-depth contextual information provided by each ULL representative (Task 4.1) and qualitative insights obtained during the first round of focus groups with local stakeholders (Task 3.3). Visualizations of proximity analysis were developed for each Living Lab using a consistent isochrone-based approach. Isochrones were generated from points of interest (POIs), representing areas reachable within a 15-minute threshold. Proximity was differentiated by mode, distinguishing areas

reachable only by walking, only by cycling, and by a combination of both modes. Two maps were produced: (1) one using blue, green, and public spaces as POIs, and (2) one using the different public transport modes collectively as POIs.

The analysis was further contextualised through a brief overview of the governance structures within which each ULL operates, as well as through one-on-one follow-up discussions with ULL representatives to clarify specific issues identified in the data and to explore potential measures for adapting the 15-minute city model to the distinct contexts of each ULL.

Finally, the results of the cross-sectional analysis were presented to and validated during our General Assembly in July by the project partners and the external local expert group, which included representatives from Las Rozas Innova, the Municipality of Torino, the Municipality of Vila Franca de Xira, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, and the Küçükçekmece Municipality.

WP5. Transfer Guidelines of the 15minC (scale-up): [Lead: IST]

Activities conducted during the project:

1) Development in collaboration with all partners of a comprehensive methodology with clear criteria and a checklist for the transfer of 15mC strategies from core cities to suburbs (Lead: IST)

Within Task 5.1, a transferability assessment methodology was developed to examine whether actions associated with 15-Minute City strategies implemented in Core Cities can be applied in suburban Urban Living Labs, and under which conditions such transfers are feasible. The methodology responds to the recognition that strategies effective in dense urban contexts may not function in the same way in suburban environments and therefore require systematic assessment rather than assume that a direct transfer is possible.

The approach is grounded in policy transfer and policy learning literature, particularly the work of Dolowitz and Marsh (2000) and Marsden and Stead (2011), and translates these conceptual perspectives into an operational framework for spatial planning practice. The framework clarifies the motivation for transfer, the elements to be transferred, the contextual constraints influencing implementation, and the criteria by which transfer success can be assessed.

The methodology is organised as a sequential assessment process combining quantitative and qualitative analyses. Quantitatively, it applies a set of Key Performance Indicators derived from earlier Work Packages (3,4) and complemented by Urban Design indicators introduced in WP5.1. These indicators are calculated within a 15-minute walking buffer around existing and potential intervention areas, enabling a systematic comparison of demographic, spatial, infrastructural, and urban design conditions between Core Cities and suburban Living Labs.

Qualitative assessment complements the KPI analysis through coherence and feasibility checks. The coherence analysis examines institutional capacity, alignment with planning frameworks, consistency with ongoing projects, citizen participation, and stakeholder involvement. The feasibility analysis focuses on the availability of financial resources and implementation capacity. Together, these assessments ensure that strategies are evaluated not only in terms of spatial compatibility, but also institutional and operational viability.

Based on predefined decision rules, strategies may be identified as transferable, adaptable through emulation, or non-transferable. When transfer is not appropriate, the method supports the development of new, context-specific suburban strategies, which are assessed using the same analytical logic to ensure consistency while allowing for local adaptation.

The methodology was applied in pilot assessments across the Living Labs, demonstrating its applicability across different territorial contexts and supporting a transparent, replicable, and context-sensitive approach to scaling 15-Minute City strategies.

2) Testing and application of IST's transferability methodology by all partners, adapted to the specific interventions identified in previous WPs for transfer from core cities to each ULL (Lead: IST/HCU)

- ULL's representatives conducted a detailed transferability assessment following the framework developed in D5.1 Methodology for Transferring 15minC Strategies from Core Cities to Suburban Cities. In each transferability assessment, ULL's representatives identified challenges and opportunities, needs for adaptation and adjustments for each of the selected interventions. Contributions of each ULL can be further seen in D5.2. Transfer potential city-to-suburbs and scaling-up to other contexts and cities.

3) Semi-structured interviews: scaling-up successful 15minC strategies to other contexts and cities (Lead: EUR)

- Organisation and delivery of 14 semi-structured qualitative interviews with representatives of cities to further assess the transferability potential and scalability of 15mC strategies in lower density contexts. The interviewees (8) were selected from cities outside of the project where there was an implementation of a relevant intervention to one or several of the project's ULLs. Interviews (6) were also conducted with city representatives from areas comparable to the Urban Living Labs (ULLs) in terms of governance, mobility systems, and travel patterns. These included Rákospente (similar to Kertváros in Debrecen), Alcalá de Henares (similar to Las Rozas), Hamburg (for comparison with Lurup), Oeiras (similar to Alverca do Ribatejo), Rivoli (similar to Settimo Torinese), and Konya Metropolitan Municipality and Kadıköy Municipality (for comparison with Küçükçekmece).
- Development of interview guide drawing on methodology developed in T5.1. Interviews focused on barriers and challenges as well as adaptive measures to transferability and scaling up in lower density contexts covering aspects such as governance structures, strategic alignment, citizen and stakeholder engagement, land use and urban form, transport infrastructure, digital infrastructure and funding mechanisms.
- Thematic analysis of interview material to identify strategies and success factors for transferability of 15mC strategies from urban core to outskirts outlined in deliverable D5.2.

WP6. Multi-Stakeholder Impact Assessment: [Lead:POLITO]

The objectives of WP6 were to develop an Impact Assessment Methodology based on the design of a survey administered to citizens of the ULLs and of focus groups to involve local stakeholders. The final outcome was assessing the strategies co-created in the six ULLs considering the four dimensions for all type of stakeholders/users. The objectives have been fully reached giving a clear picture of how the proposed 15-min strategies are received by citizens in terms of importance, of barriers to implement them and the expected impacts. Despite the heterogeneity among the ULLs and the challenging comparison of the 43 strategies, commonalities and divergences were identified and recommendations provided for all other suburban contexts not only in Europe (having also a Turkish case study).

The activities conducted during the reporting period were twofold:

- development of initial Impact Assessment Methodology (Lead POLITICO);
- data collection design and data analysis for impact assessment (Lead: POLITICO) to evaluate the perception of citizens and stakeholders about the barriers and expected impacts of selected strategies.

Concerning the first activity, two main tasks were carried out:

- designing a comprehensive methodology for conducting a multi-stakeholder impact assessment of the 15minC strategies implemented in the suburban city of each Urban Living Lab (ULL). The assessment concerned all ULLs and aimed to adopt a common approach allowing a comparison among the different cities, but considering possible specificities as ULLs present some differences in terms of both territorial context and strategies adopted;
- identification of the tools for conducting the impact assessment in each ULL.

The two above activities constitute the Methodology Plan presenting the choice of the survey typology, the design of the survey, the selection of the sampling plan, the administration of the survey and, finally, the data analysis design.

The survey adopted the mixed method approach, combining a questionnaire administered to citizens with a focus group administered to stakeholders and, in some cases, also to citizens.

The questionnaire was administered via web to the sample of citizens and was composed by four sections: 1) users' travel behaviour; 2) users' opinion; 3) evaluation of strategies; and 4) personal information. The questionnaires were translated from English and administered in the local language. The focus group was designed to discuss the section 3 of the questionnaire, related to the evaluation of strategies, with the stakeholders who proposed them. A subset of citizen who answered to the questionnaire in the ULL of Settimo Torinese, and who gave the availability, participated also in a focus groups.

The above activities allowed to identify several operational implications for the development of proximity-oriented and sustainable mobility strategies in suburban and peri-urban contexts have been identified, and to propose six main recommendations.

First, mobility policies should prioritise visible improvements in everyday accessibility and usability. Interventions capable of directly improving daily travel conditions, safety, continuity, and local accessibility are more likely to receive social acceptance and behavioural support than highly abstract or technologically

oriented measures disconnected from ordinary travel experience. The findings therefore suggest that sustainable mobility policies are evaluated less according to abstract sustainability objectives alone and more according to their capacity to improve the ordinary functioning of everyday urban life.

Second, active-mobility policies require continuous, safe, and operationally coherent infrastructure systems. The analysis repeatedly shows that route fragmentation, discontinuities, unsafe intersections, and poor maintenance conditions significantly reduce the practical attractiveness of walking and cycling, even in contexts where respondents express positive attitudes towards sustainable mobility objectives.

Third, public transport strategies should focus not only on network expansion, but also on reliability, service frequency, integration, territorial accessibility, and intermodality. In several ULLs, respondents evaluate public transport positively in principle while simultaneously criticising operational deficiencies affecting everyday usability and travel predictability.

Fourth, governance coordination should be treated as a core implementation condition rather than as a secondary administrative issue. The effectiveness of sustainable mobility interventions depends heavily on institutional continuity, coordination capacity, and the ability to integrate planning processes across different actors, sectors, and territorial levels.

Fifth, public-space quality should be integrated directly into transport planning frameworks. The results consistently show that respondents evaluate transport systems not only according to transport efficiency, but also in relation to safety, urban quality, social interaction, and the broader usability of everyday environments. Across several ULLs, respondents consistently interpret pedestrian-oriented interventions and public-space enhancement not simply as urban-design measures, but as fundamental components of broader accessibility and liveability systems.

Finally, sustainable mobility policies should account for the existence of different behavioural and attitudinal profiles within suburban populations. The segmentation analysis demonstrates substantial differences between strongly car-oriented users, multimodal and environmentally oriented respondents, and individuals who remain dependent on private vehicles primarily because alternative transport systems are not perceived as sufficiently reliable or credible. As a consequence, sustainable mobility strategies should avoid assuming homogeneous behavioural responses and instead recognise the diversity of mobility cultures, accessibility conditions, and practical constraints characterising suburban and peri-urban contexts.

Three broader strategic takeaways emerge from the analysis.

First, proximity-oriented and sustainable mobility strategies require strong contextual adaptation. Interventions cannot be transferred mechanically across suburban environments characterised by different territorial structures, governance systems, and mobility cultures. Effective strategies need to be grounded in local accessibility conditions and everyday mobility practices.

Second, sustainable mobility alternatives require credible material conditions in order to influence behavioural change. Safe and continuous infrastructure, reliable public transport services, high-quality public spaces, and operationally integrated mobility systems represent essential preconditions for reducing dependence on private vehicles.

Third, implementation capacity is as important as technical design quality. Even well-designed mobility interventions may remain only partially effective in the absence of governance coordination, institutional continuity, adequate maintenance capacity, and long-term planning support.

WP7. Dissemination and Transferability: “15minC Implementation Guidebook for Suburban Areas”: [ITU+Parabol]

Activities conducted during the reporting period:

1. Communication and Dissemination Strategy

2. Project website, social networking, and dissemination material:

3. Contribution to scientific journals, conferences, and external workshops:

- Project Presentation with Poster (UPM) at the DUT event in Milan on October 1, 2025 (See ‘valorisation activities’ below). Online project presentation with poster (HCU) on September 30, 2025 (HCU).
- Facilitation of ‘proximity fresk’ workshop with Chaire ETI (Paris 1 University) and Presentation of project poster and portfolio of best practices in exhibition area (Lead: Eurocities) at Start with Children Summit in Bratislava, 13–14 May 2025 .
- Co-organisation with Eurocities and Chaire ETI (Paris 1 University) of an interactive workshop during Eurocities Mobility Forum (Rome, 18-20 March 2026) on proximity integrated urban planning for liveable and resilient neighbourhoods with four city cases (i.e. Utrecht, Braga, Stockholm & Barcelona). The workshop built on the work of Chaire ETI on the 15-minute city and [Sustainable Urban Proximities](#) using scenarios (drawing on real-life city challenges) and personas and putting in practice the theory of change principles.
- Project Presentation (HCU), World Urban Forum 12, German Pavilion, Cairo, November 4-8, 2024
- Project Presentation (HCU), DUT Networking Conference (DUT-Vernetzungskonferenz) organised by Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) - BMFTR. Hamburg, May 13 2025.
- Paper session “Adapting the 15-Minute City Model for Suburban Areas: Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Multimodal Mobility Strategies” (HCU / SZTAKI) at AESOP conference, 7-11 July 2025 Istanbul
- Redesign and update project website: (Lead Parabol) - <https://www.forthcoming.info/> - (See ‘valorisation activities’ below).
- Interview with Ville de Bruxelles on their 10-minute city tool and publication of article on Eurocities’ website: <https://eurocities.eu/latest/brussels-new-tool-brings-the-10-minute-city-closer-to-reality/> (See ‘valorisation activities’ below).
- Gangneux, J. (2026), Contested Places: Navigating the Politics of the X-Minute City in Bell, K., Foster, E. & Satheesh, S. (eds)The SAGE Handbook of Eco-Social Policy and Politics. SAGE Publications.

(Published, open access: https://uk.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-assets/149310_book_item_149310.pdf)

- Submission paper ‘Guiding Shared Micromobility Development in Suburban Areas within the 15-minute City Context: Evidence from Six European Cities’ for the TRA 2026 conference in Budapest – 18-21 May 2026

4. Project Event Management: Mid-Term and Final Event (Lead: EUR)

Organisation and delivery of the project final event in Brussels (May 27 & 28) at the regional urban planning agency Perspective Brussels. The event was co-organised by Eurocities and UPM and presented the project’s final results. It also included a series of interactive workshops, discussions, and input from the representatives of the local urban living labs as well as from external experts.

- Three sessions on the project final results including:
 1. Overview of FORTHCOMING key activities and results by Andrés Monzón (Emeritus Professor – Transport Engineering, Urban and Regional Planning, Polytechnic University of Madrid)
 2. Overview of survey insights & 15-minute city strategies in the urban living labs by Cristina Pronello (Professor – Regional and Urban Studies and Planning, Polytechnic University of Turin)
 3. Policy Recommendations & presentation of the project final guidebook on 15minute city implementation for suburban areas by Anna Ibraeva (Senior researcher, TRANSyT-UPM)
- One interactive poster session during which each ULL representatives presented the highlights, learnings and strategies coming out of their respective ULLs
- One panel discussion with local representatives of the ULLs (i.e. DKV Debrecen, Vila Franca de Xira, Settimo Torinese, Las Rozas Innova & Istanbul Planning Agency) on how to adapt the 15minute city model to different urban contexts
- Three interactive keynote sessions:
 1. 15-Minute Cities in the U.S. : Realistic Goal or Crazy Dream? By Susan Handy (Distinguished Professor of Environmental Science and Policy & Director of the National Center for Sustainable Transportation, University of California, Davis)
 2. Brussels as proximity city by Kätti Rob & Elisa Donders (Territorial Knowledge Department, perspective.brussels)
 3. Making the 15-minute city work beyond the centre: Results from the Brussels pilot in DUT funded project DREAMS by Imre Keserű (Deputy Director of the Mobilise Research Group, VUB Brussels)
- One study visit: From “urban highway” to pedestrian zone: The large-scale reconfiguration of Boulevard Anspach in Brussels facilitated by Livia de Béthune (Architect and Urban designer -

Faculty of Architecture at KU Leuven, MultipliCity architecture & urbanism) and Jean-Philippe De Visscher (Professor – Louvain Research Institute for Landscape, Architecture, Built Environment; Université Catholique de Louvain)

51 people registered for the event from 9 different European countries. Over the two-days 40 people participated including representatives from the project local urban living labs as well as from local (European Cycling Federation, Perspective Brussels, Innoviris Brussels, Bruxelles Mobilités) and European stakeholder (RMIT Europe, DG MOVE).

3. Project Outcomes and Assessment Plan

Each ULL served as a real-world laboratory for the co-production and testing of proximity-based strategies, involving local stakeholders in the design, assessment, and validation process throughout the project lifecycle.

The project unfolded through a structured sequence of methodological and analytical activities:

- Compiled a comprehensive portfolio of successful 15-Minute City practices from across Europe, establishing a knowledge base for identifying measures transferable to suburban environments.
- Conducted SWOT analyses and extensive stakeholder engagement activities (Focus Groups) in all six ULLs, involving local authorities, transport providers, researchers, businesses, civil society organisations, and residents.
- Developed a harmonised framework of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) covering the dimensions of proximity, mobility, accessibility, land use, governance, and quality of life, applied consistently across all ULLs to ensure comparability.
- Carried out detailed quantitative and qualitative analyses using open geospatial data, accessibility modelling, and proximity mapping to assess access to essential services within a 15-minute travel threshold.
- Designed a transferability methodology to evaluate whether successful 15mC interventions from dense urban cores could be adapted to suburban areas, integrating spatial indicators with assessments of governance capacity, stakeholder engagement, policy coherence, and implementation feasibility.
- Co-constructed 43 strategies with local stakeholders and evaluated them using a mixed-method approach combining structured questionnaires and focus groups across all six ULLs.

The assessment of 43 strategies across all ULLs confirmed that there is no single or universally transferable model for sustainable mobility transitions in suburban environments.

Although several strategic priorities recurred across the six ULLs, including accessibility improvement, public-space quality, active mobility, public transport reliability, and multimodal integration, their perceived relevance and implementation feasibility varied substantially according to local infrastructural conditions, territorial configurations, governance capacity, and everyday mobility practices. Sustainable mobility strategies were found to be deeply embedded within context-specific spatial, institutional, and behavioural conditions.

- Implementation guidebook providing practical, step-by-step guidance for designing and rolling out proximity-based strategies in lower-density environments.

4. Project Sustainability

The FORTHCOMING project has laid the groundwork for sustainability beyond its formal completion through several interconnected mechanisms. The six Urban Living Labs (ULLs) established in Madrid, Hamburg, Turin, Lisbon, Debrecen, and Istanbul were not conceived as temporary research settings but as lasting community-embedded structures. The capacity built within each ULL; bringing together local authorities, researchers, mobility providers, civil society, and citizens around a shared proximity planning agenda, constitutes a durable asset that extends well beyond the project lifecycle.

A particularly significant outcome in this regard is the community of stakeholders constructed across all six ULLs. For example, as demonstrated in Turin (Settimo Torinese), where citizens' involvement proved especially successful, this participatory infrastructure has strengthened the communication and co-design of initiatives between universities, local governments, and residents. The decision by the municipality of Settimo Torinese to organise a dedicated public event, where POLITICO will present project outcomes directly to citizens, exemplifies how project results are being translated into ongoing civic engagement and institutional commitment, rather than remaining confined to academic or technical outputs.

Sustaining the project's impact requires resources across three principal dimensions:

- **Institutional resources:** Continued involvement of local authorities in embedding the KPI framework and transferability methodology into their planning cycles, zoning regulations, and mobility strategies. This requires dedicated staff capacity within municipal planning and transport departments.
- **Financial resources:** Access to follow-up funding (e.g., through Horizon Europe, national urban regeneration programmes, or cohesion funds) to pilot and scale the strategies co-developed during the project. The interest from local media and public administrations in several ULLs creates a favourable environment for attracting such investment.
- **Knowledge and network resources:** Maintenance of the cross-European network of researchers, practitioners, and stakeholders built through the DUT Partnership. This includes continued

engagement through professional associations, urban planning networks, and academic dissemination channels.

The long-term success of FORTHCOMING's objectives rests on the degree to which its tools (i.e., the KPI framework, the transferability methodology, and the implementation guidebook) are adopted and integrated within the institutions and local authorities. Several factors support this:

The project's outputs are designed to be practical and operational, not merely analytical. Local authorities in partner cities have been engaged throughout the process and are therefore already familiar with the tools and invested in their application. The visibility generated through final conferences and media coverage in cities reinforces political will and public accountability, creating conditions under which continued implementation becomes both expected and supported.

Furthermore, the collaborative model demonstrated by FORTHCOMING, where universities act as knowledge brokers between research and local administration, offers a replicable template for other European suburban contexts seeking to transition towards proximity-based planning.

Despite these strengths, several challenges must be acknowledged:

- **Institutional continuity:** Changes in local government following elections or administrative restructuring may disrupt ongoing engagement. Mitigation requires embedding project outputs into formal planning documents and technical standards that transcend individual political cycles.
- **Funding gaps:** The absence of dedicated post-project funding could stop implementation momentum. This can be mitigated by proactively connecting ULL cities with relevant EU funding instruments and supporting them in preparing follow-up project applications under the DUT Partnership or Mission on Cities frameworks.
- **Uneven capacity across ULLs:** The six ULLs demonstrated substantially different governance capacities and institutional readiness. Cities with weaker administrative capacity may struggle to sustain implementation without continued external support. Peer-learning mechanisms between stronger and weaker capacity ULLs facilitated by the project consortium could help address this imbalance.
- **Citizen engagement fatigue:** Maintaining the high levels of citizen participation achieved during the project beyond its formal end requires ongoing investment in participatory processes, which can be resource-intensive. Light-touch engagement mechanisms and embedding participation into existing local processes (neighbourhood councils, urban planning consultations) offer a path to sustainability without requiring standalone structures.

5. Lessons Learned

The implementation of FORTHCOMING provided a number of important lessons for future projects addressing proximity-based urban planning, sustainable mobility, and urban transitions in suburban and peri-urban contexts. The experience across the six Urban Living Labs demonstrated that the application of

the 15-Minute City concept beyond dense urban centres requires a shift from the direct replication of established urban models towards context-sensitive, integrated, and evidence-based planning approaches.

- **There is no one-size-fits-all model for suburban proximity planning**

One of the most important lessons from FORTHCOMING is that the 15-Minute City concept cannot be transferred to suburban areas as a fixed planning model. The six ULLs differed considerably in terms of density, land-use structure, transport provision, governance arrangements, socioeconomic characteristics, and mobility cultures. Consequently, strategies that may be effective in one context may require substantial adaptation, or may not be appropriate at all, in another.

The transferability assessment demonstrated the value of systematically distinguishing between strategies that can be directly transferred, those that can be transferred through adaptation or emulation, and those that are not suitable for a particular context. Future projects should therefore treat transferability as a process of contextual adaptation and policy learning, rather than replication.

- **Proximity needs to be understood as accessibility, not simply distance**

The project demonstrated that proximity is not determined solely by the physical distance between residents and destinations. The ability to reach essential services within a reasonable time depends on the availability and quality of walking and cycling networks, public transport, service frequency, barriers in the urban environment, and the characteristics of the population.

The use of GIS-based isochrone analysis and multimodal accessibility indicators provided a more meaningful understanding of proximity by considering the actual areas that can be reached within a given travel time. This suggests that future urban planning projects should move beyond simple distance-based measures and evaluate functional accessibility and everyday usability.

- **Land use and mobility planning need to be considered together**

FORTHCOMING reinforced the importance of integrating spatial planning with mobility planning. Improving mobility alone does not necessarily create proximity, particularly where essential services, employment, education, healthcare, and recreational opportunities remain spatially dispersed.

The analysis of land-use characteristics alongside proximity, mobility infrastructure, modal split, and motorisation helped reveal the relationship between urban form and mobility patterns. Future projects should therefore avoid treating transport interventions and land-use interventions as separate policy domains and instead consider them as components of an integrated accessibility system.

- **Suburban sustainable mobility requires credible alternatives to the private car**

The project showed that reducing car dependency cannot be achieved simply by promoting behavioural change. In many suburban contexts, private vehicles remain attractive or necessary because alternative modes do not provide sufficiently reliable, safe, direct, or convenient access to everyday destinations.

The impact assessment highlighted the importance of continuous walking and cycling infrastructure, reliable public transport, intermodality, and high-quality public spaces. This indicates that behavioural change should be understood as a consequence of creating credible alternatives, rather than as an intervention that can be pursued independently from infrastructure and service provision.

- **Infrastructure continuity and quality are as important as infrastructure availability**

A recurring lesson across the ULLs was that the presence of infrastructure does not necessarily guarantee its effective use. Fragmented pedestrian and cycling networks, unsafe intersections, discontinuities, poor maintenance, and weak connections with public transport can substantially reduce the attractiveness of active and sustainable mobility.

Future projects should therefore assess not only whether infrastructure exists, but whether it provides a continuous, safe, accessible, and operationally coherent network. This is particularly relevant in suburban areas where urban development has often occurred incrementally and where infrastructure networks may be fragmented.

- **Public space should be treated as part of the mobility system**

The project demonstrated that public-space quality is closely connected to accessibility and mobility. The assessment of the strategies showed that citizens evaluate mobility interventions not only according to travel time or transport efficiency, but also according to safety, comfort, attractiveness, social interaction, and the overall quality of the urban environment.

This suggests that future mobility projects should adopt a broader urban-planning perspective in which streets, pedestrian areas, public spaces, green and blue spaces, and mobility infrastructure are considered as interconnected elements of the same urban system.

- **Participation improves contextual understanding and the relevance of planning interventions**

The experience of the six ULLs demonstrated the value of involving local authorities, experts, transport providers, civil society, and residents in the development and assessment of strategies. Stakeholder engagement provided knowledge that could not be captured through quantitative indicators alone, particularly regarding perceived barriers, local priorities, behavioural patterns, and implementation constraints.

At the same time, the project showed that participation needs to be structured and connected to concrete planning decisions. Future projects should therefore combine quantitative evidence with participatory and qualitative approaches, ensuring that stakeholder knowledge is translated into measurable planning priorities and actionable interventions.

- **Harmonised indicators are valuable, but local indicators remain necessary**

The development of a common KPI framework allowed the six ULLs to be assessed using a shared analytical structure and supported cross-sectional comparison. At the same time, the project demonstrated that not all relevant aspects of suburban accessibility can be captured through a single common set of indicators.

The distinction between common and ULL-specific KPIs was therefore important. Future projects should retain a common analytical core for comparability while allowing locally relevant indicators to reflect specific territorial and governance conditions.

- **Data-driven planning requires both technical analysis and local knowledge**

The project successfully combined open geospatial data, GIS analysis, automated proximity calculations, quantitative indicators, surveys, interviews, and focus groups. This mixed approach provided a more comprehensive understanding of suburban accessibility than any single data source could provide.

However, the availability and quality of data varied between ULLs, and in some cases local stakeholder input or proxy data were necessary. A key lesson for future projects is therefore that data-driven planning should not depend exclusively on standardised datasets. Technical evidence and local knowledge should be treated as complementary sources of planning intelligence.

- **Governance and implementation capacity are fundamental to successful urban transition**

FORTHCOMING demonstrated that technically appropriate strategies may still face significant implementation barriers if institutional responsibilities, funding, coordination mechanisms, or administrative capacities are insufficient. Governance was therefore identified not simply as a supporting element, but as an integral component of successful proximity planning.

Future projects should assess implementation capacity alongside spatial and technical conditions from the beginning. This includes considering institutional responsibilities, policy alignment, stakeholder coordination, financial resources, maintenance capacity, and the ability to integrate proposed measures into existing planning frameworks.

- **Planning should move from isolated interventions towards integrated strategies**

The assessment of the 43 strategies across the ULLs demonstrated that individual interventions are most effective when considered as part of a broader system. Walking infrastructure, cycling, public transport, shared mobility, public-space improvements, land-use measures, digital mobility services, and governance mechanisms can reinforce one another when designed in an integrated manner.

A key lesson is therefore that future projects should focus not only on identifying individual “successful measures”, but on understanding how combinations of interventions interact within specific urban contexts and how these combinations can contribute to broader accessibility and quality-of-life objectives.

- **Transferability should be understood as a learning process**

Finally, FORTHCOMING demonstrated that transferability is not simply a question of whether an intervention can be reproduced in another location. Successful transfer requires an understanding of why an intervention worked in its original context, which underlying conditions enabled its success, and which elements need to change in the receiving context.

The transferability methodology developed through FORTHCOMING provides a basis for this process by combining spatial indicators with assessments of governance, policy coherence, stakeholder engagement, and implementation feasibility. Future urban transition projects can build on this approach by making adaptation, experimentation, and learning central components of knowledge transfer.

6. Project Deliverables and Documentation

This section provides a comprehensive register of all documents and reports produced over the period of the FORTHCOMING project. Deliverables are organised by category and include information on document type, responsible partner, dissemination level, and delivery status.

All project documentation was stored and version-controlled in the shared project repository throughout the project duration. Public deliverables are accessible via the project website and, where applicable, through the DUT Partnership's open-access repository. Confidential documents remain accessible to consortium partners and the DUT Secretariat in accordance with the terms of the Consortium Agreement and project proposal. Archiving responsibilities following project closure are held by UPM as coordinating partner, in compliance with the applicable data retention requirements.

Formal Project Deliverables

These are the main outputs defined in the project proposal and workplan. They are typically listed in a table such as the following:

Deliverable Nº	Deliverable Name	Dissemination Level
D1.1	Coordination and Monitoring Plan	Public
D1.2	Administrative, Financial, Ethical, Gender, and Legal Coordination	Public
D1.3	Innovation, Quality, Risk and Data Management Plan	Public
D1.4	Intermediate Project Report	Confidential
D1.5	Final Project Report	Public
D2.1	Portfolio of Successful 15min-C Strategies in Urban Areas	Public
D3.1	SWOT Analysis of 15min-C Strategies	Public
D3.2	Definition of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs): Input-KPIs, Process-KPIs, and Outputs-KPIs	Public
D4.1	Report on the Set-up of 6 European Living Labs	Public
D4.2	Cross-sectional Analysis of 6 European Living Labs	Public
D5.1	Methodology for Transferring 15min-C Strategies from Core Cities to Suburban Cities	Public
D5.2	Transfer potential city-to-suburbs and scaling-up to other contexts and cities	Confidential
D6.1	Impact Assessment Methodology	Public

D6.2	Assessment by CS and Cross-sectional Analysis	Confidential
D7.1	Communication and Dissemination Strategy	Public
D7.2	"15min-C Implementation Guidebook for Suburban Areas"	Public

Project Management Documents

These are the internal governance and administrative records produced throughout the project:

Document	Description	Responsible	Date / Frequency
Project Management Plan (PMP) (D1.1)	Overarching document defining governance, roles, communication protocols, and risk management procedures	UPM	M1
Consortium Agreement	Legal agreement governing roles, responsibilities, and IP among partners	UPM / Legal	M1, signed by all partners M6
Project Workplan / Gantt Chart	Detailed task schedule across all work packages and partners	UPM	M1, updated periodically
Progress Log	Running record of task completion, milestones reached, and deviations from plan	UPM	Updated monthly

Meeting Documents

All formal project meetings generated agendas, minutes, and supporting materials. These were stored in the shared project repository and circulated to all partners within an agreed timeframe (typically five working days after each meeting).

Meeting Type	Frequency	Documents Produced
Kick-off Meeting	Once (M1)	Agenda, presentations, action log
General Assembly Meetings	Every 1 year	Agenda, partner reports, decisions log
Work Package Leader Meetings	Monthly	Agenda, progress updates, minutes
DUT Partnership Meetings	Quarterly	Presentations/posters, management reports
ULL Stakeholder Workshops (Focus Groups)	Per ULL, per phase	Workshop design, facilitation guide, consent form, voice records, outputs summary, participants list
Final Conference (Event)	Once (M30)	Programme, presentations, proceedings summary, posters, attendance list

Periodic Status Reports

Periodic reports were submitted to the DUT Partnership Secretariat in accordance with the reporting schedule defined in the Consortium Agreement.

Report	Period Covered	Submission Date	Status
Periodic Report 1	M1–M12	Feb 2025	Submitted
Periodic Report 2	M13–M24	Jan 2026	Submitted
Periodic Report 3 (Final)	M25–M36	Dec 2026	To be submitted (the project end date is different among Partners)

Each periodic report comprised a technical progress narrative and contributions from all partners. Financial statement were not reported at DUT Partnership level but at national level.

Research and Knowledge Documents

These are the substantive analytical and knowledge outputs produced in the period of the project work:

Work	Type	Lead	Availability
Literature Review on 15-Minute City Concepts	Research report	ITU	Public
European 15mC Practice Portfolio	Research report	EUR	Public
ULL Context Profiles (×6)	Analytical reports	ULL partners	Public
Accessibility and Proximity Mapping Reports	Geospatial analysis	HCU	Public
Stakeholder Engagement Summaries (×6)	Process documentation	ULL partners	Confidential
SWOT Analysis Reports (×6)	Analytical reports	ULL partners	Confidential
Strategy Evaluation Questionnaire Results	Survey data report	POLITO	Confidential
Focus Group Synthesis Reports (×6)	Qualitative analysis	ULL partners	Confidential
KPI Monitoring Dataset	Data repository	HCU	Confidential
Strategies extracting and scale-up	Interviews and reports	IST	Confidential
15minC Implementation Guidebook for Suburban Areas	Book	UPM	

Dissemination and Communication Outputs

Output	Type	Channel	Date
Project Website	Online platform	https://www.forthcoming.info/	Launched M3
Social Media Presence	Communication	LinkedIn	M3 onwards
Scientific Papers	Peer-reviewed articles	Academic journals	M12–M30
Conference Presentations	Oral presentations	DUT events, urban planning conferences	Throughout
Final Conference Proceedings	Event documentation	Public	M30
Press Releases / Media Coverage	Media	Local and national press	As generated