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Design for services and place development
Interactions and relations as ways of thinking about places: the case of periurban areas

Abstract
Services are a constituent element of urban planning. Nevertheless, a new perspective arises when considering regional contexts, and when considering services as an approach to design and subject matter for design.

The essay presents reflections raised by a group of projects in various parts of the world, conducted by local research partners within the international DESIS Network (Design for Social Innovation and Sustainability) and dealing with agricultural periurban territories. These projects are methodologically related to one currently in progress in Milan conducted by the Politecnico di Milano, Slow Food and Università Scienze Gastronomiche, which is expected to generate a scenario of sustainable local food production and consumption for the region.

Service design here aims at introducing a service-driven vision influencing the approach to regional planning, with the objective of strengthening the role of sustainable agriculture by creating a network of services supporting production systems and de-meditating offering and demand. Short food chains, multifunctionality of the systems and mutual collaboration between the stakeholders are the concepts framing the project. Fostering social innovation is considered a crucial action, since local creative communities can play a major role as potential engines of change.

The essay discusses the methodological framework through which these projects are conducted, the role of design schools and researching-teaching activities in the factual promotion of this kind of design issue, and a first set of design results of the ongoing projects, making connections among them.

Radical changes in the everyday life of communities
We claim that designing for sustainability with a strategic perspective means facing and promoting radical changes in ways of living (Manzini & Jegou, 2003). This assumption informs the way we use strategic design and design for services to tackle the sustainable development of places and regions.

Design for Services is an essential component of strategic design when the aim is to move from a framework of values and characteristics into specific solutions, and when we need to make manifest possible future behaviours that require new ways of interacting and producing value within a community and its environment. Services in fact exemplify systemic changes at the level of everyday experiences (Meroni & Sangiorgi, forthcoming 2011).

Strategic Design is an approach whose goal is to interpret ongoing situations, where problems are open and ill-defined, tasks unclear, processes experimental and where knowledge is something that emerges step by step, by continuous interactions with other players. Any strategic decision is the consequence of interaction with the environment, its actors, constraints and opportunities and, according to Game Theory the behaviour of players can be driven by the comprehension that favouring the interests of the community can be strategic to favouring one’s own interests (Zurlo, 2004 and 2010). Therefore, strategy can result in win-win solutions, where the interests of the individual (a person, a company, an enterprise) can converge with those of the environment and of the collectivity. In compliance with Bateson’s concept of ecology (Bateson, 1979), affirming that the minimum unit of survival in evolution is never simply an individual organism, not even a species, but always species-plus-environment, win-win strategies appear to be those with this potential for causing them both to evolve. Any strategy to achieve a radical but successful change must, consequently, consider both eco-efficiency and social behaviour (Brezet & Ehrenfeld, 2001; Vezzoli, 2007) in a brand new approach.

Investigating and promoting social innovation (innovation that moves from emerging behaviours in society) takes us in this direction: by working with innovative social parties, searching for, exploring, observing and involving in the design activity the most pro-active and creative social, economic and productive resources of a context, we believe that we can start a project with a reasonably good chance of successfully causing a situation to evolve. It is here that social innovation becomes crucial, especially when a project is about communities and territories. We call these emerging social behaviours creative communities, groups of people who creatively organize themselves to obtain a result in ways that are promising steps towards sustainable ways of living and producing (Meroni, 2007), and visionary ventures, meaning...
enterprises that challenge the conventional ways of doing in the market, in the name of a fairer, more sustainable and valuable production and consumption system. This kind of social innovation is actually prototyping innovative ways of doing that can be seen as a driver for technological and production innovation. The practices they propose combine a high degree of feasibility and an impressive visioning; they have the power of transmitting to us their ideas, feeding our imagination about the future and becoming the source of inspiration for new solutions and services rooted in existing assets. They embody in a positive and fashionable way the contemporary interpretations of jobs which we believe can become the basis of a truly green economy: they try the unprecedented with remarkable bravery, they risk, they learn by doing, they apply a trial-and-error approach that is costly and often apparently reckless. They are led by visionary individuals who have been able to gain the support of the community, attracting and motivating people by the strength of their ideas (Manzini, 2007; Leadbeater, 2007; Drayton, 2010) All together, these phenomena of social innovation create a strong pattern of local changemakers (Drayton, 2010) who we believe can become the drivers of innovative projects.

Bateson’s concept of ecology shows us the profound and vital relationship of a community with its environment, which means for designers two fundamental factors to be investigated: the community’s sense of belonging to the (private and public) space, and the relationship that exists between local people and local resources. These two issues are, with different shades of meaning, the focus of investigation for some schools of urban and regional planning around the world (the Scuola Territorialista in Italy; the New Urbanism movement in North America; the INTBAU - International Network for Traditional Building, Architecture & Urbanism in UK) that we like to acknowledge as scientific references when speaking about sustainable place development. They actually affirm that the valorisation of local heritage (environment, urban settlement, culture and society) is the only possible approach to producing the lasting enrichment of an area, because places are the result of a historical co-evolution of human settlement with environment, nature and culture, whereas the functionalistic approach tends to consider the territory as a kind of technical support for activities organised independently from the local means, resources, potentialities and qualities. Therefore, sustainable development not only refers to the reproducibility of natural resources, but also to the way in which urban systems are established; to the coherence of production systems with local resources and entrepreneurship; to the development of capability and self-government by local communities. In short, to community sovereignty (Magnaghi 2000).

We take this multilayer definition of “place” as the result of the interaction of the community with the environment and believe that Design for Services, which has recently taken up the debate about regional development (Meroni et al, 2008; Meroni, Simeone & Trapani, 2009; Jégou, 2010) can significantly contribute with conceptual tools to research on these topics. In fact, Service Design looks at the interrelations within a community and at the relations of the community with its territory with a distinctive approach, as we will discuss in this essay.

We also believe that, on one hand, this disciplinary approach can complement those of planners, architects and sociologists and, on the other, it can shape the competences and skills of a new profile of designer.

New generations of designers and new skills

A new generation of designers needs to grow up, be trained to develop new skills and equipped to contribute in solving new kinds of problems that are both systemic and wicked (Manzini in Meroni, 2007; Buchanan, 1992). At the same time, a new generation of entrepreneurs needs to flourish, oriented to the so called green economy and commit to jobs that are potentially the engine of this economy, but that ought to be reinvented in the light of contemporary lifestyles.

In the most established design schools all around the world, interdisciplinary curricula oriented to train students to design for services, or to develop a strategic approach to design are flourishing. The Politecnico di Milano has matured over 10 years experience in master level courses in Strategic Design, Product Service System Design and Service Design, being one of the schools pioneering these approaches. We believe that new design profiles should address the abovementioned new design demand, and therefore students can beneficially be challenged with problems of a systemic dimension. And, even more, we believe these students can significantly contribute to “warming up” research thinking in this field, and prototyping tools for intervention in systemic problems. Actually, their involvement can result in a double achievement: practising on real cases helps them to develop awareness towards sustainability and systemic thinking, and approaching these themes in design studios allows teachers to begin exploring new research topics with more freedom and creativity. Therefore, we systematically combine research and training, setting up design processes where training activities are synergically integrated with action research, and giving students the opportunity to measure themselves with similar topics, in dedicated studios or workshops. This is a unique chance for cultivating in young people an alternative awareness of design and business, where emphasis is laid on the environmental, social and ethical issues of the community, and for testing the preliminary hypothesis of research with initial ideas.

Investigating a community in its own environment means paying primary attention to the ethics and values of the project, so as to orient design actions to make these values tangible and to develop an approach that connects design to human dignity and human rights (Buchanan, 2001). In doing this, a shift from the concept of User Centred Design to one of Community Centred Design is implied (Meroni, 2008), where understanding behaviours and collaborating with the most active social communities in conceiving and developing solutions (Ogilvy, 2002, Jégou & Manzini, 2008) is the distinctive work of the designer. Community Centred Design refers also to an approach that upgrades the consolidated methods and tools of User Centred Design to the scale of community, in order to understand its behaviours, needs and network of relationships.

As a consequence, this approach requires two kinds of
A critical context for urban development and food sovereignty

Periurban areas are, today, among major critical contexts in regional development projects: lying between a town and its rural surroundings, they are mainly used for agricultural activities (sometimes sustainable, often conventional), but subject to urban expansion where formerly separate cities and towns merge into vast urbanised zones: the way this comes about is crucial for the sustainable development of a region (Donadieu 2005 Viljoen, 2005). We take them as metacontexts (Manzini, Collina & Evans, 2004), that is widely found typologies with analogous characteristics in different contexts. Periurban areas are the thresholds where urban and rural dynamics meet, creating unique opportunities (or risks) to improve the quality of everyday life and make a decisive step towards sustainable development. The reflection developed in this essay arises from a cluster of ongoing projects around the world (Milan, Shanghai, New York and Porto Alegre) within the DESIS Network* which, notwithstanding the different progress of the work, can be seen to rest on similar bases and hypotheses.

Initial field observation, supported by theoretical and empirical research, led us to recognize the following main needs, resources and design challenges:

Needs and critical factors:
- Agriculture is managed through both sustainable and conventional methods: in the absence of alternative and more direct channels of sale, agricultural practices become gradually less profitable year by year (Fleury, 2005; Donadieu 2005)
  - the proximity to town is a real threat for these areas, given the unquestionably higher value of urban exploitation compared to agricultural use of the land, in the current mainstream market (Viljoen, 2005; Petrini, 2005) and in the limited perspective of the present day;
  - the aging population and the progressive lack of motivation for youth to work as farmers are the reasons for the massive exodus from these areas. This is due to several factors, among which: the meagre profitability of the work; the industrialisation of activities and the “downgrade” of the role of farmer to one of industrial worker; the lack of appeal of agriculture-related professions due to their apparent obsolescence and inadequate social recognition in mature economies.
  - the overall quality of life in the areas is perceived as low because of the scarcity of services, entertainments, infrastructures, social opportunities.

- Resources and local assets:
  - sustainable agriculture can become a recognised added value, thanks to the demand for “clean and fair produce” (Petrini 2005) which comes from the city and is usually bigger than the offering;
  - proximity to town can be seen as an advantage for these agricultural areas, because of: 1) the ease and convenience of food transportation and delivery to town; 2) the possibility of inventing local tourism formulae connected to agri-culture, taking advantage of easy and fast connections with the city; 3) the opportunity to mix functions and activities so as to complement and match urban ones;
  - the quality of life in these areas is, in terms of health, unquestionably better than in town, because of cleaner and fresher air, vegetation, less noise and pollution, more open spaces;
  - the presence of creative communities and visionary ventures, challenging the traditional way of living and producing in urban and rural settings, is noticeable here and has a relatively high impact: the sizable number of initiatives operating in the agricultural field is likely to be due to the application of urban-like creativity (Florida, 2005) to agricultural issues. Actually, the diffusion mechanisms of creativity and activism which are often accelerated in cities and rely on emulation, find in these critical contexts a natural area of application. These kinds of initiative offer a good picture of the lively humus characterizing these contexts, despite scarce support from the Institutions and even the apparent obstructionism of policy against these small actors, to the advantage of big territorial players (agribusiness, builders, big retailers).

- Design opportunities and challenges
  - to increase the regional self-sufficiency of the food system through various forms of local food sale and de-mediation (Meroni, 2006) of agricultural production. This still remains the most important function of periurban agriculture (Petrini, 2005);
  - to foster multifunctionality of systems and differentiation of offering over specialization, in order to increase the economi-
cal profitability of enterprises, while enhancing the attractiveness and feasibility of services;
- to conceive new cultural meanings for agricultural jobs by creating added value services and produce, build over the quality of products, services and activities;
- to strengthen the relationships between rural areas and the city in terms of material, economic and cultural flows, and rationalize then according to a sustainability assessment;
- to invent new forms of agrotourism, agroforestry and proximity leisure to take urban inhabitants into the nearby countryside, and to intensify relations between agricultural activities and urban life by imagining new services supporting urban farming;
- to find creative interconnections and new forms of collaboration and synergies between farms and other local activities, so as to save resources and create closed loop systems, connecting inputs and results of rural activities within a logic of service symbiosis (Mirata & Ristola, 2007);
- to implement new communication technology as support for collaborative services (Manzini & Baek, 2009);
- to create an imaginary around the place and its produce: branding products and services in the name of quality and values.

These design challenges, focused on delivering services and relations for a more ecological food production, distribution and consumption, represent the core of the innovation demand expressed by periurban areas, and have different specifications in the different geographical contexts.

**Approach and method of work**

As mentioned, a Design for Services perspective to Place Development shifts the design focus towards the investigation of interactions and relations. In the specific context, these are represented by the network of services supporting the agricultural business and the new forms of de-mediation between offering and demand.

Shortening the food chain, fostering multifunctionality of the systems and implementing collaborative practices are the key concepts in common that shape the design briefing of the projects, which is based on the following hypotheses:
- using local resources to develop a distinctive offering (Mirata & Ristola, 2007; Magnaghi, 2000) and activating collaborative practices of work (Cottam & Leadbeater, 2004) can produce tangible and effective improvements in the quality of life and environment;
- sustaining local collaborative patterns, which involve inhabitants and enterprises, can create the conditions for social innovations to flourish and change settlement models by changing underlying practices (Latouche, 2004);
- supporting social innovation is therefore crucial, because creative communities can play a major role as potential engine of the change. This assumption implies an approach to transformation that, borrowing concepts from Positive Psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Inghilleri, 2003), relies on and enhances the positive assets of a system or a context in order to produce a change;

- bridging divisions between disciplines, institutions and public, private and voluntary sectors is, today, the most advanced way to innovate in production and particularly in service provision. According to Landry (2000), new forms of alliances have to be set up, while Murray, Caulier-Grice and Mulgan (2010) speak about overlapping fields of the social economy, social entrepreneurship and social enterprise.

Therefore, the method of work currently being experimented starts by observing local assets, goes on to create specific projects shaped by/oriented towards a scenario and ends up with the creation of a network of synergies:

1. Resources and assets mapping: finding, analyzing and visualizing the “place capital” (natural + artificial + social) and the relative potentialities.
2. Social innovation mapping: finding, describing and representing the local creative communities and their initiatives.
3. Scenario and solutions design: co-designing a set of scenarios for the context, exemplified in specific solutions connected to the existent social innovation.
4. Defining pilot projects: finding the most promising initiatives and developing ideas about how to replicate them or start up new initiatives using existing assets.
5. Project networking: linking projects in a local system, creating mutual connections and relating them to the external environment.
6. Project communication: communication of single projects and of the whole scenario.

One crucial point of scenario-building is the connection of the projects into a network organization, or more specifically, the way the different services are connected to support one another and to frame a consistent scenario. The strong sense of community that we have observed in cases of social innovation leads us to assume that the social and relational basis for the network is likely to be the need to enhance actors’ perception of a coherent community where everybody (the local “champions” - Drayton, 2010) contributes to collective success. This is facilitated when a shared vision confers the network with a sense of identity, claims values, creates trust and orients motivations, actions and strategies (Van Alstyne, 1997). The functional basis for the network is the need to share or complement the various assets and operations of the different activities, so as to make beneficial synergies. As a consequence, three forms of synergy can be investigated:

- Synergies between analogous activities: economies of scale and scope of similar solutions that can benefit from sharing some operations and infrastructure, and creating critical mass.
- Synergies between complementary activities: economies of scale and scope between different solutions which, while delivering different products and services, have many common elements since the outputs of one activity become the inputs of another.
- Synergies between compatible activities: economies of scale and scope between solutions which, when combined, can generate mutual virtuous savings and reinforcement.

Synergies allow collaborative problem solving to happen, meaning that they create the condition for breaking tasks into
sub-tasks and sharing them (Van Alstyne, 1997), activating collaborative services (Jégou & Manzini, 2008) and collaborative entrepreneurship (Dayton, 2010). Altogether they outline different scenarios of Community Supported Agriculture, where food production, trading, hospitality, leisure, cultural and social activities create a unique mix of functions.

The six-step process here described aims to generate ideas for activities and services based on the creative use of local assets and to establish a direct connection with local creative communities and ventures. We propose that regional planning be informed by these ideas and by the network structure of city and its periurban area that they imply. Having said this, we believe that the specific contribution of design for services consists in offering a methodological toolbox to support a new paradigm of urbanisation based on this approach, and in engaging a continuous, strategic dialogue with the community (van der Heijden, 2005; Manzini, Collina & Evans, 2004; Landry, 2000; Kahn et al., 2009).

**Ongoing projects**

The process presented in the previous paragraph has been applied, in different stages, to the aforementioned projects. While the ones in New York and Porto Alegre are still in the proposal phase, Milano and Shanghai have already developed to a stage that allows more than a few reflections about their outcomes as design and training experiences. For these two contexts the opportunity to share some design thought arises from a couple of applied research projects for the local periurban areas: the Agricultural South Park in Milano and Chongming Island in Shanghai.

The process has been reiterated more than once in the two situations, upscaling the substance and importance of the projects. In fact, in both cases an extensive design experiment has been carried out involving students in initial self-committed research. A couple of workshops have created the first scenarios and set of ideas that enabled the start of a strategic conversation with prospective partners and interlocutors for projects with real commitments. From here further professional research steps have recently been taken.

**Milano**

The Milanese project, in fact, started as methodological research, funded by the Italian government, and then evolved into a bigger, more specific project named "Nutrire Milano. Energie per il Cambiamento" (Feeding Milano. Energy for change, http://www.nutriremilano.it), funded by local institutions (Fondazione Cariplo - a bank foundation- Comune di Milano and Provincia di Milano). The project was proposed and is now being developed by a partnership between the Politecnico di Milano, Slow Food Italia and the Università di Scienze Gastronomiche. Students’ contributions have been integrated in the process since its beginning, and currently other classes of service design students are participating in it: for them the topic has definitely become their chance to face a real context of application, and for the School of Design a consolidated and recognised field of work.

The first ideas developed with students have evolved into a broader scenario built on the principles of direct relations (de-mediation) between producers and consumers, and collaboration among actors. Eight service models, inspired by the existing situation and taking it a bit further (Meroni, Simeone & Trapani, 2008), have helped the scenario to materialise into tangible lifestyles and business opportunities. These include the Collective Park Brand, the Farmers’ Market, Public Green Procurements, Food Box Subscription, the Visitors’ Centres, the Rural Cultural Centre, Horticulture and Urban indoor/outdoor agriculture (for a detailed description see: Meroni, Simeone & Trapani, 2009) (fig 1).

![Fig. 1: The network of service models developed for the periurban area of the Parco Agricolo Sud di Milano, Italy.](image)

This scenario has then laid the basis for the project, Nutrire Milano, whose pillars are multifunctionality, de-mediation and collaboration.

The main actions undertaken in this project are: 1) supporting existing best practices and resources in the agricultural field; 2) activating resources not yet / no longer valorised; 3) creating new services. The project will systematically implement pilot activities to test and assess ongoing ideas: the local farmers’ market is already under experimentation (http://www.mercatidel-laterra.it/ita/network/milano) (fig.2)

![Fig. 2: The ‘Mercato della Terra’ in Milano: the first pilot project](image)
launched within the framework of the project Nutrire Milano for the Parco Agricolo Sud di Milano, Italy

Shanghai

The Chinese project started as a self-committed applied research project by Studio TAO of TEKTAO4 and IDEO Shanghai, and then, by involving Tongji and Politong university students, it has grown in scope and capability of creating connections with local and international partners. Currently the various seeds of ideas planted by the students have flourished into a comprehensive scenario which joins different services of food production / distribution and local tourism into a network, and proposes a hub (Design Harvests Hub) as a local engine for discussing the scenario with the local community and gradually implementing it. In particular, the workshop with the Politong students5 has led to a proposed network of five new, creative business ideas dealing with food, agriculture, hospitality, mobility and health, to create an entrepreneurial community in the village of Xian Qiao, in Chongming Island. (fig.3)

Fig. 3: The five new business ideas developed for the periurban Island of Chongmin, Shanghai, China.

Conclusions

The conclusions we would like to draw from the discussion of these experiences fit into two categories: results concerning the disciplinary approach of design for services applied to place development, and the involvement of design school students in similar activities.

The discipline: design for services

• The value of introducing a design for service perspective in place development processes, can therefore be summarized in the distinctive contribution it makes to the following points (Meroni & Sangiorgi, forthcoming 2011):
  • Creating convergence: assuming that the key objective of scenario building is to generate convergence among diverse players on a vision for the future (Manzini & Jegou, 2003), design for services can help scenarios “materialise” into concepts and artefacts;
  • Supporting design thinking: assuming that today, and more and more in the future, good ideas will come from both amateurs and professionals (Leadbeater, 2008), new approaches are needed to reverse top-down design processes and shape horizontal frameworks of collaboration where innovation is interpreted as a social, cumulative and collaborative activity. Design thinking represents an approach to idea generation and problem solving that both designers and non-designers can develop and apply: Design for Services can create the conditions for it to spread, offering specific tools to help (highly relational and multidisciplinary) co-design processes to target communities of innovators. This leads to the concept of community centred design, where attention shifts from the individual “user” to the community, which replaces the role that was previously reserved for the “user in helping the designer to decode and interpret the emerging design demand;
  • Building capacity: assuming that the very essence of designing strategically is enhancing and building capacities in communities and organisations to see problems better, while choosing the right strategies to act (Burns et al., 2006; Meroni, 2008; Zurlo 2010), design for services can contribute by conceiving services that enable new behaviours through the provision of competences and by appealing to people’s individual motivations. In fact, social psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) teaches us that the systematic building of competency and skills is a way to prevent problems and facilitate collective wellbeing (Von Hippel, 2005). According to several authors (Parker & Heapy 2006; Zuboff & Maxmin, 2002) a new service enterprise model is emerging which is no longer centred on products or services, but on the provision of “the support” people need to navigate a complex world and to lead their own lives as they wish. Manzini (2007) speaks about “enabling platforms” and “enabling kits” as ways for designers to help people generate their own solutions.

The involvement of design schools

• Cross fertilization: assuming that design for service and design thinking are approaches that largely benefit from transdisciplinarity and extended strategic conversations, the systematic involvement of students becomes a real opportunity for “warming-up” thinking and creating a larger arena for idea generation and discussion. It is, moreover, an opportunity for them to practice systemic thinking, tackle wicked problems, develop and prototype ideas and get in touch with competences other than design.
  • Links: for designers, and thus even more for prospective designers, the exercise of conceiving and developing ideas which are mutually interconnected into a local system is a way
to experience the complexity of a real context and to trigger a mutual learning process.

• Empathic design: assuming the importance of stepping into the shoes of others in order to understand their positions and become more capable of designing for and with them, the social innovation led approach brings a distinctive value both to education and practice. Pushing students to work as “antennas” of social innovation (Jégou & Meroni, in Meroni, 2007) is a way of training young designers in field work while, at the same time, putting them in touch with extremely motivated groups of visionary, non-professional, designers who reveal unexpected creativity, opening the mind and driving one to think-out-of-the-box. We have experienced in students what we have also noticed in our research team, viz. the development of emotional connections and empathy with the context that eventually also stimulate a real sensitiveness towards sustainability.

• New design skills: assuming the need for academics to respond to a new demand for professional design, place development projects offer the chance to build and test a new set of skills for designers dealing with services.

To conclude, we would like to acknowledge that similar research projects are opening to designers, and especially designers working for services, quite a promising area of operation which has been so far territory of architects, urban planners, sociologists and economists. Designers are here bringing to the table a kind of knowledge that is likely to be peculiar and therefore not exclusive of other roles, but instead complementary. This new role is connected to the rising impact of services on the way economies produce value, and to the increasing importance of network technologies as means of self-organisation and distributed creativity. Therefore these research projects are experimenting, in both professional and academic contexts, methods and tools for this new role of the designer.
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The essay presents a social innovation led approach to the design of public space, following the reflection developed for the research Human Cities (2009-2010) within the EU action programme Culture. Assuming social innovation to be a set of promising new ways in which people and communities engage to strengthen themselves to achieve a result, often as a bottom-up initiative, it discusses what motivates these groups to take action over public space, and how design can support them.

This perspective implies the power of the social fabric to make an effect on the condition and development of a physical public space, instead of the other way round.

This action of (re)shaping public space underlines its value as a common good, meaning that all the members of a community can make use of it. It is defined as an inseparable unity of social and spatial elements. As a countercheck to this observation, we find that, when the sense of community and empowerment is lost, the frail essence of this kind of good is no longer recognized and it becomes continuously subject to acts of violence.

The analytical phase of the research presented in this essay is based on the observation of case studies, from where we synthesize a reflection on the role of creative communities and collaborative networks in generating and promoting new typologies of public space. Community can be built on: spaces and common services shared and opened to their neighbourhoods; local resources and skills connected to a wider network; initiatives aimed to promote the value of a place.

In conclusion, the paper proposes a possible pragmatic strategy to create design contexts and tools to support similar phenomena.
in the plenitude of society, according to what Inghilleri (2003) calls "sense endowed materialism", using artefacts instead of being used by them.

Necessarily following on from this set of conditions, awareness towards common goods increases and all commons acquire a new importance in the personal and collective sense of wellbeing and belonging. This trend becomes manifest in what we can call the emerging economy\(^2\), which is founded on three pillars:

- a social character that is closely linked to the social innovation we have been studying;
- an environmental re-orientation that leads to a green-revolution, and a new territorial focus;
- technological innovation that comes from an unprecedented Such an economy calls for a new kind of product/service system, enabling people to address the lives they want to live. The accent shifts from products or services to "the support" they provide to people, in order to lead their own lives as they wish, and to navigate a complex world. Manzini talks about platforms for actions, enabling people to express themselves and bring their own capabilities into play in creating the solutions for their own lives, becoming part of the answer rather than part of the problem. Here, services acquire a unique importance: service provision rather than goods is becoming fundamental to economic exchange\(^3\). Value is co-created with and defined by the user, rather than embedded in outputs, and that's why services become the paradigm of this emerging economy (Meroni & Sangiorgi, forthcoming 2011).

**Public space as a special kind of common**

The social economy is an emerging phenomenon also characterised by the following elements: a strong role for values and missions in clustering groups active in certain fields; an emphasis on collaboration and on repeated interactions to accomplish bottom-up actions, aiming to achieve a common goal; a preference for care and maintenance rather than one-off consumption; the blur of boundaries between production and consumption; the intensive use of distributed networks to sustain and manage relationships, capable of being realized by broadband, mobile and other means of communication (Murray, 2009).

Public space seems to be one of the favourite hot spots of this economy and of social innovation, given its intrinsic nature of space "of and for" relationships.

We define public space as a special type of common good. Public space is traditionally a common, defined as a collectively owned resource. We believe that the novelty lies in considering it from a broader perspective which privileges the cultural and behavioural spheres over the spatial one, in a holistic vision of what a "common good" is. Thus it is what happens (or could happen) in the public space that reflects its true significance for the community. Public space is therefore both a social, political, and physical space "where things get done and where people have a sense of belonging and have an element of control over their lives"\(^4\).

Public space, in the times of social economy, promotes the values and the missions shared by the local community, fostering a sense of identity and belonging: we can see this very clearly, for instance, in the diffused system of community gardens in the Lower East Side in New York City; in the seafront promenades of many Italian towns, where people bring tables and chairs to eat and chat outdoors; or in the cultural and social mix to be found on the beaches of Rio de Janeiro. Public places are the accessible fields of opportunity and interaction, where people can meet to share experiences and visions, where they can try-out new paths to solve their own problems and improve the quality of life. Given its inherent character of accessibility, public space is the natural stage for social interaction and collaboration, promoting buzz, reciprocal influence and unexpected delight in the most dynamic neighbourhoods of our cities. As a countercheck to this statement, we can observe that the meaning of public space is continuously eroded when the sense of being a group of empowered people with a common interest, living together in a given place, is lost. Suddenly public space starts to lose its valuable status of common good, becoming either a no man’s land, a place of fear, crime and degradation or the domain of building speculation.

Over the decades, the ability to reshape urban space to new needs has always been an effective way to promote an attitude of care and maintenance rather than one-shot consumption. The topic of land waste is certainly crucial in the present environmental crisis, but the rising awareness of its limited availability can prevent disappointed citizens moving to the countryside only if the community is able to make cities desirable places to live in.

While other kinds of common goods, such as air and water, are "given", public space is commonly "produced". For this reason its meaning, allocation and use has to respect the needs of a vast audience, which has led to the birth of PARK(ing) DAY\(^5\) in San Francisco, where 70% of public space is dedicated to vehicles, while only a fraction of that space is allocated to the public realm. The situation is even worse in many other metropolitan areas around the world. Anyone can participate in this strictly non-commercial project, which has been expanding worldwide, intended to promote creativity, civic engagement, critical thinking, unscripted social interactions, generosity and play. The creativity of those who live and run the cities will determine their future success and attractiveness. Creative groups are often the starters of renovation processes in contemporary cities, later involving a wider range of social groups. However, we often forget that creativity is not an exclusive domain of artists and innovation and is not exclusively technological. The emerging paradigm shifts attention toward social innovation, which mostly takes place in the commonly produced good of public space (Landry, 2000).

**Cases and purposes**

To investigate the different shapes that public space could take as a common, we have made an extended observation of cases and then selected those with a clearer focus.
In this investigation, particular attention has been given to cases produced in Milan and discussed within the context of the research, Human Cities. Observation has been directed to situations where creative communities have taken action towards public space with different purposes. This has led us to the following categorization, which helped in understanding the rationale of the different actions, though not assumed to be exhaustive:

To produce goods and services for the household economy – the household sub-economy and the extension of family productive space into public space, as in an extended home: i.e. allotment gardens and community gardens;

• USA, New York City, Lower East Side Community Gardens. A network of Community Gardens in public plots, created and maintained by the local residents, has been flourishing since the Seventies, greening the neighborhood and providing it with a rich social space;

• France, Paris, Jardin Nomade - Nomadic Garden. Residents transform an abandoned plot into a shared neighbourhood garden.

To host services and activities shared by community housing – the public space of a neighbourhood community formally or informally structured as a co-housing community: e.g. playgrounds for children, barter and yard markets, open access workplaces;

• Italy, Milano, Cantieri Aperti - Beyond the building site. A project of the group of activists esterni that aims to turn temporary building sites into physical and ideal spaces the neighbourhood can enjoy or use to host events;

• Italy, Milano, The Community of Villapizzzone. A community to share everything with everybody, The Villapizzzone community is a place in which people live sharing everything they have;

• Italy, Comeglians, Udine, Albergo Diffuso - Diffuse hotel. A system to manage accommodation for tourists in the local territory, using private houses and existing resources;

To reclaim the streets for different uses – the city re-appropriated for more human activities: e.g. proximity-vacation spots, spaces to rest and relax, public dining tables, public dancing floors, cycling and walking areas, open-air cinemas;

• Brazil, São Paulo, Elevado Costa e Silva (Minhocão, Big Heartworm). A violent wound in the city that is now closed to traffic on Sundays, by the will of the municipality, when it opens to the public for bicycle recreation;

• Italy, Milan, Film Festivals. A series of initiatives of the group esterni, which bring the cinema to the streets and public spaces, creating unconventional open-air theaters and places of encounter;

• Italy, Milan, Tango Illegal. It is an amateur dance group

To create contexts in which elective communities can express themselves, get organised and find synergies to help each other – the realm of public art and of amateur activities: e.g. flash mobs, arts performances, sport sessions, knitting happenings, music performances;

• Lithuania, Vilnius, Street Musician Day. By coordinating the performances of different local bands, this event gives everyone a possibility to express him/her self in music;

• The Netherlands, Eindhoven, Graffiti Galerie. A place in the city centre where graffiti artworks are allowed. Tolerating the spraying of graffiti in certain places, even promoting the artistic value of the works, is a way to prevent vandalism;
that organizes tango nights in the heart of Milan and in the surrounding area gathering a number of dancers in public spaces temporarily equipped with hi-fi music players;

• Italy, Milan, The Public Design Festival, Duepercinque. An initiative launched in 2009 by the group esterni, to collect and show ideas about how to temporarily use parking lots for purposes more oriented to public wellbeing and benefit.

To express a political position, through activities and/or art performances – public space as a context of constructive protest, cultural and social engagement, where proposals are presented through “demonstrative prototypes” of possible improvements: e.g. guerrilla gardening, reforestation initiatives;

• Italy, Milan and Turin, Guerrilla Gardening. Free gardening attack (mainly in the night time) in different places of the cities, aiming to embellish neglected or forgotten areas with plants and flowers;

• Italy, Milan, Darsenapioniera. April 2010. A group of active citizens gathers to envision new possible uses of a very popular public place in the centre of the city, in order to subtract it from building speculation;

• Italy, Milan, Sorridi, ti stanno filmando! - Smile, you’re on air! January 2009. An intervention by the group esterni to think about social control in public space through video-control. It is a guerrilla action placing new road signs at the bottom of CCTV cameras, similar in size and graphics to real ones but with the message: “Smile, you’re on air”;

• Turkey, İzmir, Balçova Afforestation Society. Afforestation of drought areas and care of plants in the Balçova district by people living in the area.

To enhance living contexts – public space as an everyday panorama calling for quality, beyond the distinction between public and private: e.g. loan gardens cultivated by neighbours; cleaning days and public space maintenance by the inhabitants, open museums and galleries;

• The Netherlands, The Hague, Neighbourhood Shares. Inhabitants improve living conditions in their neighbourhood by taking over responsibility from local authorities for certain neighbourhood maintenance tasks;

• The Netherlands, Utrecht, Loan Gardens. Public green maintained by the residents makes a neighbourhood more beautiful and welcoming;

To improve security, safety and efficiency – public space as concierges and infrastructures maintained by the inhabitants: neighbourhood watch, collectively managed infrastructures and maintenance services;

• Finland, Helsinki, The Bearpark Sponsors. Elderly people, the police and the municipality networking for the benefit of public space, with the aim of promoting the participation of local people in taking care of their surroundings;

• Germany, Cologne Mühlheim, MFG Mülheimer Fahrrad Gruppe – MFG Cycle Association. Paths and services for urban cyclists are better maintained thanks to the care and surveillance of the residents;

• Turkey, The Kerkenes Eco-Center and Environmental Studies. The Kerkenes Eco-Center is in a village called Sahmurati, in Yozgat. By 2003 the eco-center established a concept of researching and promoting renewable energy and sustainable village life, where inhabitants actively contribute.
These cases present public space as an inseparable unity of meaning and spatial context, and of social and technical conditions, breaking the conventional boundary between private and public goods. Social innovation and public activism systematically transfer behaviours and purposes between the two realms of the household and the State.

It has been argued (Murray et al. 2008) that today social innovation stems from many sources: for instance, new forms of mutual action between individuals within the household economy – whether in the form of open source software, or web-based social networking around specific issues - are increasing in number and importance. Generally speaking, the household is becoming a fundamental cell of social innovation (Leadbeater, 2008). Moreover, the development of social enterprise operating within the market has been noticeable (Jégou & Manzini, 2008; Murray, 2009). Reaching beyond the limitations of the old categories, we discover that the Market can, to some extent, meet the goals of the social economy.

Networking and connecting

During our research path, we’ve registered the presence of groups of active citizens in different urban contexts, working to foster awareness of the local community around the topic of public space. We acknowledge to these creative groups the role of hero in the stories, even though they simply perceive in advance what will later become a common opinion.

Given the blurred boundary between production and consumption of public space, we can borrow Alvin Toffler’s term ‘prosumer’ (Toffler, 1980) to define the new kind of aware citizen who knows best what the right solutions are for his/her local situation. Without their action, the mere existence of physical public space is as useful as a piece of hardware without software. The community is the context to orchestrate this plurality of voices, through a democratic process that recognizes equal opportunities to all members, allowing their desires to guide the creation and implementation of solutions.

The present stage of transformative innovation would not be possible without the spread of networks and global infrastructures for communication and social networking. We have already mentioned the circular relationship between physical space and people living in it, but public spaces are now being redefined and extended thanks to a third applied force: ICT technology. Flash mobs, street festivals, condo and street TVs, meet-up groups of all kinds are the new high-tech actors of the wired public space. Terms like peer-to-peer (distributed networks of equal entities mutually available), de-mediation (taking away the middlemen from retailing), wikis (websites open to easy and collaborative creation), collaborative platforms (on-line or off-line contexts which allow participation), open source (practices that allow contents created to be available to everybody) have moved from the lexicon of distributed systems to every-day life repertoire. It is interesting to observe the shift toward new habits, when people are given the enabling tools to do things together, without needing traditional top-down organizational structures.

According to Clay Shirky, a revolution doesn’t happen when a society adopts new tools, but only when a society adopts new behaviours, exploiting these possibilities. This is what Jégou and Manzini define social innovation, meaning the various changes, mainly emerging from bottom-up, in the way individuals or communities act to solve a problem or to generate new opportunities (Jégou & Manzini, 2008). The rise of a distributed organisation model, where innovation and knowledge epicentres are widely dispersed and linked by networks, steps back from the imposition of standardised and simplified solutions from the centre. On the contrary, the network acknowledges local communities and neighbours living at the margins as those who have a sense of specificity of time, place, events and beliefs, a kind of insight that central politicians totally lack (Murray, 2009). Local innovative solutions to everyday life problems can be promoted and circulated in different epicentres of the net, fostering a process of social learning, where even the original promoters of the initiative can improve their solution thanks to the shared experiences.

Strategies and approaches for doing and supporting

How can we, as designers, actively operate to foster such initiatives? How can we intervene in the pattern of society to support or make them flourish? These questions open the debate around the role of the designer in the present context.

It seems to be clear that it’s time to adopt new perspectives. Several authors sustain that one possible role of a designer today is to create conditions for people to use creativity and innovate at the local scale, becoming able to recognise and understand the context in which innovations are born and develop tools and methodologies to support these situations (Sang & Manzini, 2009; IDEO 2009).

We believe it’s time to support people in doing things and to do things with people. Both situations imply a co-designing capacity that must be put into practice with professional skills and tools, and raise more transversal reflections to be developed. Both
require stimulating a positive attitude in people, systematically building competency and encouraging pro-activity.

Questioning the role of the designer today means questioning also those of the client and user, which leads us to think about how and why we can support people in doing things and do things with people. That’s to say that design should become the context of the actions and be better embedded in people’s behaviour.

We believe that how to support people in doing things, is the key question. This first reflection is the result of the observation of a variety of initiatives around the world, going under the title of design for service toolkits to support bottom-up innovation. All this material, currently available on the consultancy websites, is aimed to familiarise non-designers with design thinking. Finally, these kits are, organised combinations of problem setting and solving design tools. They target local organisations or, more directly, communities aiming to implement new activities. In addition to this typology of kits, specific activity toolkits, getting-started and step-by-step instructables are commonly available through Internet for free use and open-source.

In spite of the relative novelty of these toolkits, which makes them almost impossible to assess, they guide us to hypothesise the following conceptual structure for action-supporting kits:

- what to do: this is about the main purpose of the supporting activity. We have identified Observing, Communicating, Starting Up, Engaging, Synergising and Mobilising as the main general purposes of a supporting kit. Each and every activity is a complex task in itself. A kit can address a specific activity or be multipurpose. Then again it could be generic, meaning that it doesn’t address a specific field of activity, or thematic;
- how to do: this is about providing users with specific design tools or tips, organising them into a step-by-step sequence. When the kit is generic, tools are explained in a methodological perspective, when it is thematic they are more likely to be pragmatic tips, coming for the experience of previous users. Within the category of specific tools we can also embrace the different kinds of digital platforms with several aims. These tools emphasize the importance of collaboration and co-creation. This strategy of pragmatic, intuitive do-it-yourself instructions, emphasizing the importance of collaboration and co-creation as key factors of successful initiatives;
- for whom: this is about the users of the kit, and the skills they are supposed to have or acquire. The more the kit is generic and the purpose extended, the more the user is likely to become someone like a professional design facilitator at the local level. The more the kit is thematic and specific, the more the user is an amateur.

These kits allow designers both to support people in doing things and do things with people. Nevertheless, they imply that a sort of “design demand” is diffused within the community, and thus expressed. They imply, eventually, that design was recognised as a context for the action.

We hold that one way to make this happen is through emulation: the power of visionary and radical ideas that so called “local change-makers” (Drayton, 2010) are proposing lies foremost in their ability to touch, attract and inspire other people, so that they wish copy them in some way. Acknowledging this power, we propose that the observation, identification and diffusion in a highly communicative way of cases of social innovation is the first step towards effectively “amplifying” such ventures. And that’s why initiatives such as the Human Cities Festival, SEP- sustainable everyday project and Amplifying Creative Communities rely on widespread communication as a strategy for engaging people in diffuse design thinking.

Concluding, we believe in the importance of showing that firm commitment and hard work does bring a reasonable chance of success and also that design can help initiatives which bravely challenge the traditional way of acting in public space to flourish.

At present, collaboration and networking are the only feasible and effective ways for these initiatives to work: mutual stimulus, mutual support, resource sharing and affective empowerment of groups are the key ingredients of both their existence and their success.

Basically, designers conceive tools to interact with the environment: artefacts that possess utility, function, culture and emotional qualities. What kind of “tools”, whether material or conceptual, can be designed to facilitate mutual support, enable resource sharing and create empathy within the community?

The answer depends on the specific field of intervention but, considering the relational nature of public space and the variety of cases observed so far, we can assume (Leadbeater, 2008) that these tools have to be a peculiar mixture of pre-industrial and post-industrial, with a marked value in “the values”. As we have seen in the abovementioned toolkits, they mix and apply advanced technology support (i.e. digital platforms) and pragmatic, intuitive do-it-yourself instructions, emphasizing the importance of collaboration and co-creation. This strategy of support seems to have the potential to make people feel and be active and engaged in the contemporary world.
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