

Session 8



PreMortem Scenarios Worksheet

A **Pre-Mortem** is a strategic planning activity that imagines a project has failed. This type of thinking helps to identify and mitigate risks early on in the planning phase. In a way it is a “worst-case scenario” planning, although life shows us we can rarely predict the future, < but we can definitely be stoic about it! >

Situation: January 2023.

Your URBACT-funded APN project has ended almost 6 months ago. However, no much sign of activity in the implementation of the local IAP can be seen, and the ULG created hasn't been active after the official end of the project. It seems that the IAP remains just a document, and there is almost no one from the former ULG pushing for the actions included in the IAP to be taken into consideration.

Below you will find suggestions of things that went wrong and led to the above situation.

What you need to do:

0. Consider your real case situation. Take into account your current role in your APN and your APN.

1. Consider the first 3 scenarios. Write on your printed pre-mortem worksheet what you could have done to prevent these scenarios.

2. Add new scenarios and possible ways to prevent them.

3. Be prepared to share your solutions during Session 8- Grand finale group work.



What went wrong?

(situation in January 2023)

→ Scenario 1 >>

The local IAP co-creation process failed to take into account the COVID-19 pandemic. Stakeholders felt that the topic of the IAP was not reflecting how reality had changed. Actions did not respond to real needs based on a sound understanding of the local context, challenges and opportunities.

→ Scenario 2 >>

There was little inspiration from transnational exchange and learning, because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Zoom-fatigue, disappointment on how work changed, work load on just completing tasks etc. left the main local teams unmotivated to follow all the steps described in their IAP roadmap and keep the ULG and decision-makers engaged around the topic.

→ Scenario 3 >>

Actions in the IAP did not have a clear financing plan and did not address all three pillars of sustainable development in terms of economic, social and environmental objectives. They failed to be matched with funding available for EU's strategic objectives post 2020.

→ Scenario 4 >>

There was no strategic local support for the actions in the IAP. Actions did not fit with the local internal strategic logic of the city. Moreover, after elections there was a change of leadership in the city, and the new team failed to understand how the work of that APN related to the local context.

→ Scenario 5 >>

There was strong criticism that the IAP did not involve key relevant stakeholders in its development or for future implementation and that there was little clear communication on how new stakeholders could join the ULG group.

→ Scenario 6 >> *Other, please fill in*

→ Scenario 7 >> *Other, please fill in*

What could we have done in the past to prevent this?

(actions you could do from October 2020- August 2022)
