

International, transdisciplinary and place-based academic activities: education, research and third mission.
The experience carried out in Sant'Eusanio Forconese (L'Aquila, Italy)

Sarra Kasri
Université de Mons
kasri.sarra@gmail.com

Giovangiuseppe Vannelli
Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II"
giovangiuseppe.vannelli@unina.it

Abstract

This contribution refers to a cooperation between ENSA Paris-Belleville and University of Naples Federico II concerning the Build Back Better of the Italian hamlet of Sant'Eusanio Forconese that was struck by the 2009 earthquake.

Considering the complexity determined by the current multiple crises, the reconstruction process has to be rethought. Within these transformation processes and their corresponding temporalities, place-based academic activities – e.g., through living labs – merging together education, research and third mission can represent a tool for activating, boosting and guiding public engagement, strengthening networks and renovating policies. Since the “*Intervenir dans un territoire à risque: vulnérabilités, enjeux, opportunités*” workshop experience, universities will be proposed as game changers.

Keywords: Build Back Better, living-lab, territorial sustainability, third mission, time-based design.

Introduction

This contribution refers to a cooperation between ENSA Paris-Belleville (France) and University of Naples Federico II (Italy) started in 2023 and concerning the case study of Sant'Eusanio Forconese (L'Aquila, Italy). The activity focused on the Build Back Better of this Italian hamlet that was destroyed during the 2009 earthquake, a seismic event that struck 56 villages.

Both academic partners carry out research related to risks investigating the topic through a design-based approach to understand risks' repercussions in terms of landscape transformation – both in its material and immaterial dimensions – and operational innovation. Such an approach aims at a broader territorial sustainability that takes into account the multiple factors of crisis and especially the time parameter.

The paper in the first part outlines the crisis condition of the territorial system analysed in the research, describing the peculiar overlapping of crises that characterises the inner and marginal Italian territories also referring to a significant historical progression. Furthermore, with reference to two main post-disaster phases, the contribution will provide a synthetic institutional analysis aimed at describing the responsibilities and relationships of the various players involved. Finally, it highlights how the complex coexistence in space and time of multiple crises determines the need to rethink in both theoretical and operational terms the project within the post-disaster design. In this multi-crisis context, the needs to step back from the dominant techno-centric approach and to create opportunities for innovation arise with strength. In the second part, in the light of the framework previously outlined, the teaching and in-field research

experience – considered as an arena of innovation – carried out in Sant'Eusanio Forconese is presented in terms of methodology and outcomes. In the end, what has been mentioned above will be the material discussed in the theoretical and methodological proposal that is advanced in the third and final part of the contribution.

Which context? The definition of a peculiar geography of risk

The Italian territory and its history are atavistically marked by hazards, but more importantly, the relationship between progress, project and risk finds specific conditions of existence.

Moreover, the areas exposed to greater seismic risk in Italy are the Apennines, which constitute a complex territorial system in which infrastructure and urban settlements, with varying degrees of density and intensity, define ever-changing conditions of co-existence with a topography that varies its characteristics along the entire peninsula. In this sense, the classification of Italian municipalities proposed by the DAStU of the Politecnico di Milano is interesting, by means of 13 classes it interprets characteristics such as: the degree of rurality of the territories, with a gradient ranging from the most inner territories to the most urban ones; geo-morphological condition, identifying mountainous and coastal areas; and population density, from the most sparsely populated municipalities to the most densely populated metropolitan areas (Curci, Kërçuku, Lanzani and Zanfi, 2023). The classification proposed by the Politecnico di Milano enables a finer and broader reading of Italy's territorial polycentrism, which is by now constrained too much by the normative definition identified in the National Strategy for Inner Areas (Barca, Casavola and Lucatelli, 2014).

Indeed, it is becoming increasingly important to recognise that this territory corresponds to a multitude of landscapes, although the most common imagery is that of small hamlets (Barbera, Cerosimo and De Rossi, 2022) perched on hilltops or lying on slopes. Yet these more historic urban settlements are flanked by territories defined by: small and medium-sized enterprises, the largest industrial or productive landscapes, the urban sprawl of recent decades, the landscapes of illegal building and large non-places that have become cornerstones of the ever-expanding peri-urban. In these territories, social relations and communitarian interactions, the production of culture and quality of life, economic conditions and productive activities, the perception of distances and modes of travel, and the ways in which the territory is transformed and built are profoundly dissimilar to what we are used to experiencing in Italian cities. Although the idea of an inevitable concentration in metropolises that is beneficial to everyone still seems too common (Barca, 2018), the characters of exceptionality and difference referred to above are also a necessary premise in order to recognise in these territories resources and opportunities that have found in the Covid-19 pandemic an exceptional opportunity for new narratives (Fenu, 2020).

Within this complex system made up of large territorial disparities (Coppola, Del Fabbro, Lanzani, Pessina and Zanfi, 2021), particularly interesting for the research and educational activities to which this contribution refers is the trans-regional territorial system that has been hit several times by disastrous earthquakes in the last twenty years. Considering the earthquakes of the Umbro-Marchigiano Apennines in 1997, of L'Aquila in 2009, of Emilia Romagna in 2012 and of Central Italy in 2016, we have inherited – almost seamlessly from the Emilia Romagna region, in the north, to the Lazio region, in the south – a territory that still displays considerable traces of these events as much in the reconstruction sites as in the temporary heritages that still remain.

Furthermore, the fact that a large part of these territories lies in those project areas identified by the National Strategy for Inner Areas – defined by the lack of basic facilities such as education, health and infrastructures – renders the overlapping of a geography of risk with an Italian geography of physically inner and socio-economically marginal territories. In this sense, the disastrous seismic events that have followed one after the other have considerably aggravated

the crisis condition of the Italian internal landscapes (Guidoboni and Valenise, 2012). These phenomena have acted as accelerators of the depopulation processes that characterise these territories and have damaged – sometimes completely compromising – those material and immaterial heritages of which inner Italy is a rich witness. In this sense, the risk related to seismic phenomena in inner areas is increased by the general ageing and obsolescence of the built heritage – of which depopulation is a concomitant cause – which has as a direct consequence a condition of serious widespread vulnerability (Dolce *et al.*, 2020). Therefore, in this paper the territories described so far are observed through the lens of seismic risk, which is mainly investigated with reference to the two main phases of the territorial transformation: the early recovery phase, to which generally correspond temporary housing and equipment settlements, in its actual and potential relations with the long reconstruction processes of the heritage damaged or destroyed by the earthquake.

Central Italy: a land of disasters and multiscale reconstructions

The multiplication of crises is exacerbated and therefore even more tangible in those territories where there has been a recurrence of the event in a short period of time. Moreover, this condition enhances the plurality of narratives that could contribute to defining the histories of these places and events. In cases of temporal recurrence and spatial proximity, there is an amplification of the possibility of getting the same story by adopting the point of view of multiple actors (inhabitants, municipal administrations, representatives of national institutions, etc.). This is useful in order to compare, on the one hand, the processes and projects carried out, and on the other, the relationship of stakeholders with the inequalities and disparities that the emergency condition determines or exacerbates by suddenly questioning previous balances. So, we will mainly consider the earthquakes of 1997, 2009 and 2016 and then outline an institutional analysis in relation to the last two.

Following the earthquake that struck the Umbro-Marchigiano Apennines in 1997, the Civil Protection promptly mobilized in the first emergency phase, being able to rely also on a considerable number of volunteers who reached the affected areas. Yet the vulnerability of the historic buildings, on the one hand, and the settlement pulverization, on the other, were elements that put a strain on the early recovery phase for the provision of mobile housing modules such as prefabricated shelters and containers to that part of the population that did not have habitable housing anymore. This condition was made even more complex by the desire not to uproot communities from their places of belonging, which on the other hand represented an important psychological advantage for those affected by the loss of their homes that are places of individual memory and family life, but also a basic economic value (Guidoboni and Valenise, 2012). It is also considered significant that during the 1997 earthquake, for the first time, technical guidelines were provided for the realization of the urbanization works of housing settlements understood as urban systems capable of ensuring the reconstitution of the primary functions necessary for communities: for the first time, in order to reduce the vulnerability of urban systems, it was decided to intervene in an integrated way on entire parts of cities (Imbroglini, 2018). Ultimately, on the 1997 earthquake, Guidoboni states: “the form of housing assistance provided was internationally unsurpassed in terms of implementation time, scale and quality” (Guidoboni and Valenise, 2012, p. 374).

On the occasion of the earthquake of 6 April 2009, the largest number of damaged buildings and victims was in the historic centre of L'Aquila, the capital of the Abruzzo region. The Civil Protection Department on this occasion demonstrated great speed in the first aid operations and in the temporary accommodation of the evacuees. On 28 April 2009, the government issued Decree-Law No. 39, which was followed by the allocation of 14 billion 767 million euro for reconstruction – estimated in 10 years – of which about 1/3 for the reconstruction of private buildings and 2/3 for public buildings (Guidoboni and Valenise, 2012). Besides the

management of temporary housing solutions in the tent camps set up, in hotel facilities or in accommodation outside the province, the government financed the C.A.S.E. project (Complessi Antisismici Sostenibili ed Ecocompatibili) with 792 million euro, through which 185 buildings were to be built. These high-quality residential buildings constructed in record time housed more than 12,000 people at the end of January 2010. The post-earthquake emergency was tackled in an unprecedented way by proposing a huge program of new constructions to be completed within the emergency timeframe, these buildings were neither temporary nor permanent but a strange combination of the two (Bassoli, 2010). At the same time, approximately 2,300 inhabitants were relocated in 3,535 wooden houses (Dolce, 2010) built on 141 sites by the M.A.P. (Moduli Abitativi Provvisori) programme, conceived for the purpose of providing temporary housing mainly in small towns outside the municipality of L'Aquila, i.e. villages located in the inner and marginal territories mentioned above. Despite the considerable means and resources employed to address the problem of housing security, due to the mass relocation of the inhabitants, community and work relationships were compromised because the problems of housing continuity and the recomposition of urban life, which is the objective of any reconstruction, were not specifically addressed (Guidoboni and Valenise, 2012). Moreover, the fate of the inhabitants and of that huge programme of new construction completed in record emergency time remains uncertain. These settlements have become a public housing stock that contributes to a public debt that increases year by year. Because of this, and confirming the centrality of the polycritical scenario in which we are immersed, it is interesting to highlight how, through funding allocated under the NRRP (National Recovery and Resilience Plan) following Covid-19 pandemic, possible redevelopment strategies are being outlined for this heritage.

The seismic swarm that occurred between August 2016 and January 2017 affected a wide area, leaving traces in a territory divided between the regions of Abruzzo, Lazio, Marche and Umbria. On this occasion, since the beginning of the emergency phase, the DPC has operated in order to make the evacuees stay as little time as possible inside the tent camps, although due to the perduring seismic phenomenon and the increasingly critical weather conditions, the scenario has progressively become more complicated. To this end, alternative temporary housing solutions were immediately identified: a contribution for people finding a new accommodation on their own (C.A.S. – Contributo per Autonoma Sistemazione), hospitality in hotel and public facilities and the use of empty or underused houses and public assets (Della Valle and Romania, 2019). The housing solutions implemented in the emergency relief phase were followed by the provision of S.A.E. (Soluzioni Abitative d'Emergenza) in favour of citizens previously living in destroyed or seriously damaged and therefore uninhabitable houses.

Starting from these intricate histories of reconstructions and temporariness, it is possible on the one hand to detect advances and trends in terms of planning and processes and on the other hand to identify some municipalities affected during more than one event, determining the coexistence or reuse of temporary solutions from different periods and the overlapping of reconstructive processes.

Central Italy: a plurality of projects, a complex normative framework and networks of experts

In the framework of an analysis of the institutions involved, it is first of all fundamental to clarify that the main post-earthquake design interventions – the provision of temporary housing in the early recovery phase and the reconstruction – in Italy involve different processes, times and actors. In Italy, the provision of temporary post-earthquake housing solutions is a task of the State and is part of the duties of the Civil Protection Department (DPC) – a structure of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers – responsible for managing not only the emergency relief phase but also the early recovery phase. Instead, reconstruction is managed by special

offices in charge through the promulgation of emergency law decrees that follow the occurrence of damage.

The Civil Protection Department acts in accordance with the Civil Protection Code introduced by Legislative Decree No. 1 of January 2, 2018. Six offices with specific tasks and competences report to the Head and Deputy Head of Department. Office III 'Planning and emergency infrastructure interventions' is the one that mainly deals with projects and processes related to temporary facility provision. In addition, various Centres of Expertise deal with specific topics providing services, data, elaborations and technical-scientific contributions in specific fields.

Concerning the M.A.P. project, the supply of the residential units was assigned by the DPC to five companies that won the public tender launched after the earthquake, while the urbanisation works were managed by the municipalities of the earthquake area. Also because of this double assignment of responsibilities, on the one hand, there was a widespread condition of degradation of residential buildings due to inadequate technical and design choices, and on the other hand, at the urban and landscape scale, the interventions turned out to be in most cases unsuitable to determine any form of urbanity, sometimes even compromising the urban systems concerned due to their not effective temporariness.

The S.A.E. residential units, on the other hand, were the object of a call for tenders issued by Consip – on 9 April 2014, therefore in peacetime differently from the M.A.P. programme – which in the framework of a 6-year Framework Agreement established a set of organisational procedures, standards and technical characteristics for the supply of post-disaster temporary housing. The DPC was in charge of selecting the economic operators to be commissioned for the supply of up to 18000 temporary shelters throughout the country and for an estimated value of EUR 1.2 billion. In addition to the supply, transport and assembly of the S.A.E. modules requested by the local authorities, the selected economic operators were required to define the settlement layouts and executive projects of the urbanisation works of the areas – proposed by local authorities – and the foundations on which to install the housing units (Oggioni, Chelleri and Forino, 2019).

From these two recent Italian experiences in emergency management, it can be positively deduced that the approach and strategies identified in 2016 have successfully addressed some of the failures that occurred in the system proposed in response to the 2009 emergency. In fact, on the one hand, a considerable improvement in the technical and architectural quality of the houses provided under the S.A.E. programme can be observed – apart from specific design faults in some of the realised projects – and a major procedural change in the allocation of urbanisation works and residential modules to a single actor can be detected. Although, on the other hand, the neglect concerning the provision of public spaces and the urban quality of the settlements, the failure to relate them to the pre-existing urban structures, and the lack of foreshadowing of possible future scenarios in which these assets do not become waste but resources has remained almost unchanged.

Currently, the DPC, by means of Consip, has a Framework Agreement for emergency housing solutions that in case of disaster will be implemented by the company that won the tender.

One of the main distinctions that can be drawn between the emergency relief phase managed by the DPC and the reconstruction phase – which is instead the responsibility of regional and municipal authorities – is the relationship with the communities. In the emergency relief phase following the disaster, the community is a passive actor receiving support and assistance provided by the DPC, while during the reconstruction phase the local authorities work – in the most virtuous cases, even in peacetime – to structure a vision, i.e. a strategic policy oriented towards the definition of a shared scenario that is more or less predictable. This foresight work – which often matches prevention work – outlines political strategies that increasingly involve participatory practices in which communities are challenged to be active participants in decision-making processes. In this context, there is an intermediate phase – the phase of early

recovery – in which the approach is unclear; the approach described in reference to the emergency relief phase frequently recurs, i.e. the population is subjected to the decision-maker's choices without contributing to the definition of any shared vision. Yet, having now ascertained with a retrospective view that the phase distinguished by the provision of temporary post-emergency buildings is far removed from the concept of temporariness – increasingly tending towards permanence – in the early recovery phase it would be necessary to adopt an approach more similar to that of reconstruction than to the one of emergency relief. In this sense, the need to negotiate the maximisation of the speed of decision-making processes with the ability to assist a collective and strategic vision of future developments is evident (Oggioni, Chelleri and Forino, 2019). Towards this same direction, the new Civil Protection Code also identifies as a strategic objective of the Department the increase of intersections between ordinary planning and prevention.

Furthermore, the endowment of temporary structures should also be reconsidered in relation to a more synergic and balanced interplay with other measures used during the 2016 earthquake – such as the *Contributo di Autonoma Sistemazione* (C.A.S.) or the temporary use of disused buildings – to be proportioned according to the urban, social and economic specificities of the different contexts affected by the disaster. This desirable interplay of means would first of all foresee a profitable interaction between bodies and strategic actions as well as an interconnection between crises (for instance, the phenomenon of abandonment in the inner and marginal Italian territories) that could represent useful premises for the construction of future scenarios of territorial sustainability.

Instead, the reconstruction phase is managed with a multilevel central governance structure with strong cooperation of the state, regions and municipalities. With reference to the 2016 earthquake, the Extraordinary Commissioner of the government for the repair, reconstruction, assistance to the population and economic recovery of the territories of the regions of Abruzzo, Lazio, Marche and Umbria establishes the overall damage situation and estimates the related financial needs, coordinates the reconstruction and repair of buildings, oversees the support activities for businesses located in the affected territories and the recovery of the socio-economic fabric in the areas affected by the earthquakes, and promotes the implementation of seismic microzoning for the municipalities concerned. Moreover, as a result of the above-mentioned polycritical condition, the Extraordinary Commissioner is entrusted with functions and tasks on the Urgent Measures related to the National Plan for Complementary Investments to the NRRP. In tandem with the Extraordinary Commissioner, the four affected regions have established as many Special Offices to ensure the joint exercise of functions, activities and services in the affected areas. The objective of the special regional offices is to ensure, in agreement with the National Commissioner, that the reconstruction activity is effective and is based on cost-effectiveness and efficiency principles.

In conclusion, these processes and projects bear witness to a long-standing Italian history in the field of post-disaster design – in the broadest sense – consisting of successive verifications and refinements. What emerges is a great competence that certainly sees in the National Civil Protection Department an excellence and in the special offices for reconstruction progressive experiments that reinforce the strength of approaches and processes. In addition, the rootedness of an experimental and evolved technocentric approach, among the most up-to-date in the world, is evident.

At the same time, our intention is to focus on three aspects that are becoming increasingly important and central: the multiple timeframes of the actions implemented and the different temporalities of the institutional and political actors involved in these complex processes is crucial; the complexity of multi-critical scenarios becoming increasingly undeniable determines a necessary questioning of intervention processes and practices due to multiple timeframes and complex challenges; the intertwining and overlapping of policies and funds requires more

rooted and elastic strategic visions that valorise potentialities and projects related to territories and communities.

The USRC: a possible trigger for a game change

In the light of the above, considering the complexity determined by these multiple crises – both local and global – the reconstruction process cannot be considered as a mere reconstruction of the destroyed heritage.

In this sense, the general approach and the procedures developed by the Special Office for the Reconstruction of the Crater Municipalities (USRC - *Ufficio Speciale per la Ricostruzione dei Comuni del Cratere*) constitute a good practice centred on a broader idea of urban regeneration and territorial development, both for the valorisation of local resources and for the strengthening of communities and social relations.

The USRC was established (by Law 134 of 7 August 2012) in December 2012 and has been operating since April 2013. Its establishment followed the end of the state of emergency that arose after the earthquake of 6 April 2009. The USRC supports municipalities in drawing up Reconstruction Plans and provides technical assistance for public and private reconstruction, promotes its quality and carries out financial monitoring. Under the jurisdiction of the USRC are the 56 municipalities in the seismic crater (except for the city of L'Aquila, which is under the jurisdiction of the Special Office for the Reconstruction of L'Aquila) and the more than 100 municipalities outside the crater.

The specific interest for the USRC lies in two interconnected factors: the time gap from the disastrous phenomenon in reference to which it operates and the interpretation it provides of the reconstructive act in terms of sustainable territorial development.

Indeed, in contrast to the sharp fragmentation of competences and temporalities of intervention described above, the USRC is an innovative actor that is currently experimenting with operational methods through which it can build bridges with possible future scenarios.

The innovative experimentations that the USRC is conducting are rooted in the desire and effort to look towards the end of reconstructive processes by attempting to interpret with a systemic approach the multiple crises that the territories in which it works are going through. The assumption underlying the work carried out by the USRC seems to be the belief in the need to operate in the territories, where managing local change has become more challenging, nuanced, and intricate.

Within this approach, the USRC pays considerable attention to the need to improve urban quality, first of all by rethinking the public spaces of the villages under reconstruction and therefore the relationships between inhabitants, where this category should be reconsidered as a system of multiple social groups that will live these territories within different temporalities. In fact, the involvement of the inhabitants in the reconstruction processes is crucial in order to increase both a culture of inhabiting and a culture of risk. Both require a conscious and updated local culture of the territories to be rethought in the new post-disaster geographies.

In particular, an interesting device identified to frame urban regeneration projects is the definition of four cultural, thematic and historical Routes (*Cammino dei Francescani, Cammino tra i Vestini, Cammino della Baronìa, Cammino Grande di Celestino*). This territorial revitalisation strategy is of great interest for two main reasons. First of all, through the device of the route – that is par excellence a way to appropriate and understand the territory – the USRC seeks tangible and intangible connections with other territories not damaged by the earthquake, and this means the construction of new narratives that transcend risk while addressing it. Secondly, the history and actuality of these places are addressed, reinterpreting them within a contemporary relational system that becomes an opportunity for community building through collaborative methods envisaging participatory processes aimed at analysing and discussing the inhabitants' needs and dreams in order to define sustainable future prospects.

These processes are fostering and triggering the cooperation of actors who were previously not in dialogue, tending towards the overcoming of a mere technical approach and a disconnected sequence of interventions whose temporalities failed to define fruitful synergies.

In this sense, the public sphere and market actors are reconnecting, also leading to an enhancement of the material and immaterial heritage of local communities and an increase of their skills and potential (e.g., in terms of ecological transition or ability to attract and manage funding). However, urban growth and redevelopment often conceal unsustainable social and environmental costs. More and more people are calling for an approach that rebalances urban ecosystems and rebuilds the natural environment. Therefore, the need to rethink design in both theoretical and operational terms in post-disaster planning becomes evident.

The Academic Franco-Italian Partnership: an urban innovation arena

Nowadays, Sant'Eusanio Forconese (AQ) is pursuing the reconstruction process, representing a good practice – among the 56 affected villages under the jurisdiction of the USRC – in terms of the percentage of private housing rebuilt. Although, in addition to the Covid-19 pandemic, which has represented a dramatic event worldwide increasing social and economic vulnerabilities, other phenomena such as depopulation – a typical characteristic of the Italian marginal and inner areas – are overlapping with the crisis caused by the earthquake.

Within this complex scenario, following the Covid-19 pandemic, Italy has been the recipient of “National Recovery and Resilience Plan” funds. In this framework, the municipality of Sant'Eusanio Forconese had the opportunity to implement a design proposal for a strategic building on the site of a former school that coincides almost perfectly with the barycentre of the new urban system configured by both historical and “temporary” settlement. This project demand became the premise for the international, transdisciplinary and place-based academic collaboration we are referring to. The teaching and in-field research experience conducted in the municipality of Sant'Eusanio Forconese is presented in terms of methodology and outcomes, and referring to the several stages in which it has been structured.

- A week-long in situ workshop involving many different stakeholders.

The philosophy behind this academic initiative is to provide an arena for meetings and debates between different stakeholders. Each speaker was invited to give his interpretation of the challenges and vulnerabilities of the Italian territory. The operational experts involved in emergency management following the 2009 earthquake and the reconstruction stakeholders introduced in the previous part of the article presented their projects and discussed them. The participation of researchers in risk management, architecture and the human and social sciences helped to consolidate expert knowledge of the area, and also to take a reflexive view on preconceptions and implemented projects.

Organizing the workshop in situ is a fundamental principle of this initiative. The territory is seen as a player in its own way. Living in the area for the period of the workshop enables students and professors to take account of the multiple realities that coexist. The inhabitants of the villages and their administrators, the existing architecture (of different typologies), the natural ecosystems, the infrastructures and networks make up a mosaic of humans and non-humans that is occasionally undermined by seismic hazards. The representations of these various actors impose multiple temporal and spatial considerations that must be taken into account when thinking about the Italian inner areas.

At this stage of the workshop, the technical, social and sensitive aspects are documented by the student architects taking part at the workshop. Also, some debates are organized with the speakers to give a better account of existing realities and to break down prejudices and any cultural, technical or social ethnocentrism.

- Development of projects in France and Italy and feedback on students' projects from stakeholders in the field to help them reflect on the issues at stake.

The aim of this workshop was to propose projects concerning a "strategic building" on a site suggested by the Sant'Eusanio Forconese village council.

In the framework of this initiative based on the collaboration of two academic teams and the participation of students from two different European institutions, the discovery of the case study and the project site is essential as the approach is based on the specific features of the local area.

A series of projects are proposed following the diagnostic phase developed during the stay in Sant'Eusanio Forconese. On the one hand, these projects question the temporalities of the site in relation to the temporalities of the natural territory (e.g. the seasons), those of human activities (e.g. transhumance) and those of seismic hazards (crisis, prevention and reconstruction). On the other hand, spatial scales are also questioned and challenged: is the project on the scale of a plot, of the village of Sant'Eusanio Forconese, or of a network of villages in the Crater? In this way, the projects question the predefined perimeters of action to propose a new perspective on the challenges and vulnerabilities of the territory. According to these two main topics – the interpretation of time and space – architectural media has been questioned while the use of Art has made it possible to express the multiple sensitivities of humans and non-humans. In this sense, connections have been established between the various narratives of other territories inhabited by the participating students: inhabiting a risky or unsettled territory becomes a kind of shared common heritage. The presence of humans in their ecosystem is questioned. The act of building, discussed by Martin Heidegger (1958) in terms of building, living, being and caring, is at the heart of the discussions on the proposed projects. Finally, the discussion and comparison of projects conceived in the academic context with the expertise of professionals generates very interesting debates around standards, funding, technical possibilities and climatic and environmental issues, and more generally about the contemporary idea of inhabiting. In this sense, the strategic buildings projects developed propose multiple narratives of the area no longer restricted to disaster management.

In conclusion, since this European academic experience, several concepts can be discussed and developed further:

- The project as a medium for consultation viewed through different timeframes;
- The need for a new narrative of the territory and a renewal of approaches to concertation, which must involve citizens more as active players in their resilience, without depriving the city's political players and managers of their missions and prerogatives. This new narrative must also take account of existing architectural and urban typologies, and go hand in hand with a re-examination of the act of planning, to include natural ecosystems as active fundamental components rather than as a support object for territorial planning.
- Taking care of the site: the humans and non-humans who structure it should be the leitmotiv of a Build Back Better approach to this Italian territory. Reflections on the regeneration of nature and also on the socio-economic resources of the inhabitants should therefore be at the heart of the project. In this sense, deconstruction can be an approach for better territorial and social constructions, since it tends to allow the regeneration of nature on sites that are no longer suitable for construction.

Conclusions: the university as a possible game changer

In this multi-risk Italian context, which challenges us with the spatial and temporal complexity of the issues and vulnerabilities, how can universities contribute to questioning approaches to risk management and territorial reconstruction?

Through a multi-disciplinary academic approach, the university aims to create arenas that challenge the dominant technocentric approaches by bringing together a variety of stakeholders, enabling them to share their expertise and take part in the process of intervening in the area (political players, economic players, planning professionals and, lastly, local residents).

In addition, through a European university partnership, this academic approach creates levers for concerted action and for taking a critical view of prejudices and preconceptions about the studied areas. Thus, by playing the role of mediator, the university is contributing to a renewal of questions about reconstruction, risk management and planning.

In conclusion, universities can play a central role as game changers. Within the transformation processes inherent to contemporary transitional landscapes concerned by multiple heritages and their corresponding temporalities, place-based academic activities – e.g., through living labs – merging together education, research and third mission can represent a tool for activating, boosting and guiding public engagement, strengthening networks and renovating policies.

References

- Curci, F., Kërçuku, A., Lanzani, A. and Zanfi, F. (2023) 'Italia di mezzo: The emerging marginality of intermediate territories between metropolises and inner areas', *REGION*, 10(1).
- Barca, F., Casavola, P., and Lucatelli, S. (2014), *Strategia Nazionale per le Aree Interne: definizione, obiettivi, strumenti e governance*, Roma: Collana Materiali Uval.
- Barbera, F., Cerosimo, D., and De Rossi, A. (ed.) (2022), *Contro i borghi. Il Belpaese che dimentica i paesi*. Roma: Donzelli editore.
- Barca, F. (2018) 'Messaggio dei sindaci delle aree interne alla classe dirigente nazionale', in S. Lucatelli, F. Monaco, F. Barca, and C. Cretu (eds.) *La voce dei sindaci delle aree interne. Problemi e prospettive della strategia nazionale*. Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino.
- Fenu, N. (2020) (ed.), *Aree interne e covid*. Siracusa: LetteraVentidue.
- Coppola, A., Del Fabbro, M., Lanzani, A., Pessina, G., and Zanfi, F. (eds.) (2021), *Ricomporre i divari. Politiche e progetti territoriali contro le disuguaglianze e per la transizione ecologica*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Guidoboni, E., and Valenise, G. (2012), *Il peso economico e sociale dei disastri sismici in Italia negli ultimi 150 anni*, Bologna: Bononia University Press.
- Dolce, M., Prota, A., Borzi, B., da Porto, F., Lagomarsino, S., Magenes, G., Moroni, C., Penna, A., Polese, M., Speranza, E., Verderame, G. M., and Zuccaro, G. (2020) 'Seismic risk assessment of residential building in Italy', *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*, 19.
- Imbroglini, C. (2018) '50 anni di ricostruzioni', *Abitare la terra*, 48.
- Bassoli, N. (2010) '2010, L'Aquila un anno dopo il terremoto', *Lotus*, 144.
- Dolce, M. (2010) 'Emergency and Post-emergency Management of the Abruzzi Earthquake', in M. Garevski, and A. Ansal (eds.) *Earthquake engineering in Europe*. Cham: Springer.
- Della Valle, C., Romania, V. (2019) 'From shelter to community recovery: a research project on an SAE area', in A. Passerini (ed.) *Disaster Management and Human Health Risk VI*. Southampton: WIT Press.
- Oggioni, C., Chelleri, L., and Forino, G. (2019) 'Challenges and Opportunities for Pre-disaster Strategic Planning in Postdisaster Temporary Housing Provision. Evidence from Earthquakes in Central Italy (2016-2017)', *IJPP – Italian Journal of Planning Practice*, IX(2).
- Heidegger, M. (1958), *Bâtir, habiter, penser, essais et conférences*. Paris: Gallimard.

Acknowledgements

This contribution is referred to education activities carried out at *DSA Architecture et risques majeurs* at ENSA Paris Belleville (1st semester, run by professor Sarra Kasri) and at Laboratorio di Composizione Architettonica e Urbana 4 + Lettura Morfologica at Department of Architecture, University of Naples Federico II (run by professor Angela D'Agostino) also within the institutional collaboration with USRC.

The French AFPCNT and AFPS are also partners in the Round Table carried out with the aim of debating about Italian and French case studies, also with the representatives of Sant'Eusanio Forconese and USRC. Also, another workshop is scheduled in next spring within a Blended

Intensive Programme (BIP) that is widening the network of involved institutions (Université de Mons and National Technical University of Athens).

This initiative is an ongoing process merging different fields and actors; in this sense it is part of the in-field research activities within the PE9-GRINS – Growing Resilient, INclusive and Sustainable founded by NRRP. This study was carried out within GRINS – Growing Resilient, INclusive and Sustainable and received funding from the European Union Next-GenerationEU (NATIONAL RECOVERY AND RESILIENCE PLAN (NRRP), MISSION 4, COMPONENT 2, INVESTMENT 1.3 – D.D. 1558 11/10/2022, PE00000018, Spoke 7 Territorial sustainability). This manuscript reflects only the authors' views and opinions, neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be considered responsible for them.



