Interreg CENTRAL EUROPE

Co-funded by the European Union

SOSPHERE

Report on stakeholders working groups‘ results

A.1.3, Deliverable 1.3.1

Version 1

10 2026



Table of Contents

Introduction 2
About SOSPHERE 2
1. Stakeholder Working Group approach for defining the one-stop-shop 3
1.1. Rationale 3
1.2. Composition of the local Working Groups 4
1.3. First working group meeting: structure and discussion topics 4
1.4. Second Working Group meeting: structure and discussion topics 5
1.5. Recommendations for implementation 6
2. Results from the local working groups 7
2.1. Working group in Labin (Croatia) 7
2.1.1. Participants of the local working group 7
2.1.2. Results from the local working group: barriers, priorities and opportunities 8
2.2. Working group in Santa Bona District of Treviso (Italy) 9
2.2.1. Participants of the local working group 10
2.2.2. Results from the local working group: barriers, priorities and opportunities 10
2.3. Working group in Beltinci (Slovenia) 12
2.3.1. Participants of the local working group 12
2.3.2. Results from the local working group: barriers, priorities and opportunities 12
3. ANNEXES 14

Introduction

This *Report on stakeholders working groups' results* is developed within Activity 1.3 "Local Stakeholders working groups to define one-stop-shops for service delivery" of the SOSPHERE project.

The report aims to document the outcomes of the local stakeholder working group meetings carried out in each pilot site during September 2026. The meetings were organised to support the definition of the future local one-stop-shop models, with particular attention to identifying their key characteristics and preferred location within each local context. In addition, the working groups provided an opportunity to engage the local ecosystem of stakeholders, fostering dialogue, collaboration and synergies among public authorities, health and social care providers, civil society organisations and community representatives. Through this participatory process, the activity sought to strengthen local cooperation and contribute to the development of more responsive support systems capable of addressing the needs of the target populations.

The first chapter of the report describes the approach adopted for the establishment of the local stakeholder working groups and the implementation of the meetings. It presents the rationale underpinning the process, the composition of the working groups, and the structure and facilitation of the two meetings organised in each pilot area. The chapter therefore provides an overview of the process that guided stakeholders towards the definition of the local one-stop-shop models.

The second chapter focuses on the results emerging from the consultations conducted in the three pilot sites. For each local context, it presents the main barriers, priorities and opportunities identified by stakeholders. Particular attention is given to the local challenges affecting access to health and social care services, the resources and strengths available within each territory, and the opportunities for collaboration that may support the future implementation and sustainability of the one-stop-shops.

About SOSPHERE

The SOSPHERE project (Solutions for Optimal Service Provision and Health Equity in Remote Environments) addresses a long-standing challenge faced by many regions in Central Europe: the uneven and often inadequate access to essential health and social services in remote, peripheral, rural, and socio-economically disadvantaged areas. Although such services may formally exist, citizens frequently do not make use of them due to fragmented information, limited digital skills, a lack of coordinated support systems, complex administrative procedures, and, in some cases, low levels of institutional trust.

In response to this, SOSPHERE introduces a codesigned model of local one-stop shops, created in close partnership with public authorities, service providers, civil society organizations, and community members. The project seeks to reduce inequalities in access to services of general interest by offering tailored information, guidance, referral pathways, and a welcoming space where people can find clear answers and meaningful support. Additionally, SOSPHERE aims to reinforce the ecosystem of actors involved in health and social care, fostering transnational knowledge exchange and strengthening governance structures across regions.

1. Stakeholder Working Group approach for defining the one-stop-shop

This chapter describes the stakeholder working group approach that guided the process leading to the definition of the one-stop-shop models in the pilot areas. Building on the outcomes of the service mapping activity (A.1.1) and the insights gathered during the transnational workshop (A.1.2), the working groups were conceived as a collaborative space to engage key local stakeholders in identifying the most suitable conditions, locations and operational characteristics for the future one-stop-shops. Through a structured participatory process, the activity aimed to collect diverse perspectives, foster dialogue among relevant actors and establish a shared understanding of local needs, priorities, barriers and opportunities.

The chapter presents the rationale for establishing the working groups, the proposed stakeholder composition and the overall structure of the engagement process. Particular attention is devoted to the design of the two working group meetings, which were conceived to progressively identify local needs, priorities, barriers and opportunities, and translate these findings into concrete indications regarding the location and characteristics of the one-stop-shop. To support active participation and facilitate discussion, partners were encouraged to adopt a *World Café* approach whenever the number of participants was particularly large, organising stakeholders into smaller discussion groups to explore key questions. The chapter concludes with a set of practical recommendations aimed at supporting the implementation of the meetings across different local contexts while ensuring a common methodological framework across all pilot areas.

1.1. Rationale

The stakeholder working groups were established as a participatory process to support the identification of the local one-stop-shop characteristics and location, building on the evidence collected during the service mapping activity (A.1.1). By bringing together representatives of public authorities, service providers, community organisations and target population groups, the working groups created a structured space for dialogue and joint reflection on how access to health and social care services could be improved at the local level. The establishment of working groups offered the advantage of bringing together different perspectives, experiences and knowledge and potentially build more effective solutions.

The working group process was organised into **two complementary meetings**, each serving a distinct but interconnected purpose. The **first meeting** focused on discussing and validating the findings emerging from the mapping activities (A.1.1), allowing participants to collectively reflect on existing services, identify unmet needs, analyse barriers to access, and highlight local priorities and opportunities for improvement. This initial phase laid the foundation for a shared understanding of the local context and fostered dialogue among stakeholders who often operate within different sectors and organisational settings.

Building on this common knowledge base, the **second meeting** shifted the discussion from the identification of challenges to the exploration of possible solutions. Stakeholders were invited to translate the priorities identified during the first session into concrete proposals regarding the characteristics, functions and potential location of the one-stop-shop, while also reflecting on operational aspects that could enhance accessibility and user experience. The two-step process ensured that the proposed solutions were grounded in local needs and informed by the expertise and perspectives of different actors.

To promote active participation and encourage the exchange of diverse viewpoints, partners were invited to adopt a ***World Café*** inspired facilitation approach whenever the number of participants was particularly large. Through discussions in smaller groups centred on specific guiding questions, participants were able to explore different aspects of the future one-stop-shop in depth while contributing to a broader collective reflection.

1.2. Composition of the local Working Groups

The composition of the local stakeholder working groups built upon the outcomes of the service mapping activity (A.1.1). During this preliminary phase, services relevant to the target population groups in each pilot area were first identified through desk research and subsequently explored through interviews with service representatives holding managerial and operational roles, as well as through focus groups involving citizens. This exploratory work enabled the identification of key stakeholders occupying strategic positions within the local health, social care and community service ecosystem.

These stakeholders were invited to participate in the working groups. Participation was sought from **representatives of the services** identified during the mapping phase, preferably involving both **managerial and operational staff** whenever feasible. **Representatives of the target population groups** were also encouraged to take part, ideally drawing on individuals who had previously participated in the focus groups conducted during Activity 1.1.

In addition, pilot partners were encouraged to involve **decision-makers and public authorities** with responsibility for, or a direct interest in, the health and social care sectors. Where relevant, partners were also invited to engage **representatives from organisations** active in the fields of care, community support and social inclusion, including volunteering and third-sector organisations that could potentially contribute to the future development and operation of the one-stop-shop.

No predefined number of participants was established for the working groups. However, partners were advised to maintain a manageable group size to facilitate focused and productive discussions. Special consideration was given to engaging representatives from services and organisations where opportunities for collaboration were considered most promising.

To ensure continuity throughout the process and enable a progressive refinement of ideas, pilot partners were recommended, whenever possible, to invite the same participants to both working group meetings.

1.3. First working group meeting: structure and discussion topics

The first working group meeting represented the starting point of the collaborative process aimed at defining the local one-stop-shop model. Partners were recommended to organise a session of approximately 90 minutes, providing sufficient time to present the results of the preparatory activities, validate the findings with local stakeholders and initiate a collective reflection on priorities and opportunities for action. To support a consistent implementation of the activity across pilot sites, EnEA developed a script that served as a practical guide for organising and moderating the meeting (see Annex 1). The meeting was structured around four main phases.

The first phase focused on **opening and introduction**.

During this stage, participants were introduced to the objectives of the SOSPHERE project and to the rationale behind the development of the local one-stop-shop models.

The second phase was dedicated to the **presentation of the service mapping results**.

Within this stage, the methodology adopted during Activity 1.1 was briefly described, including desk research, interviews and focus groups, before presenting the main findings. Emphasis was placed on identifying strengths, barriers and recurring challenges emerging across services rather than focusing on the performance of individual organisations. This session provided participants with a shared evidence base to inform the subsequent discussion.

The third phase centred on **collective reflection and prioritisation**.

Stakeholders were invited to discuss and validate the mapping findings, share additional insights derived from their own experience and collectively identify the most relevant needs and challenges affecting the target population. The discussion aimed to facilitate the selection of a limited number of priority areas that could realistically be addressed through the future one-stop-shop. Participants were also encouraged to explore opportunities for collaboration and integration among local service providers, identifying potential synergies that could strengthen the effectiveness and accessibility of services.

The fourth and final phase focused on the **identification of the location for the one-stop-shop**.

Building on the priorities previously discussed, participants explored potential premises that could host the future service. Whenever applicable, different options were presented and discussed, allowing stakeholders to assess their strengths and limitations in terms of accessibility, visibility and acceptability for the target population.

1.4. Second Working Group meeting: structure and discussion topics

The second working group meeting was conceived as a continuation of the collaborative process initiated during the first session. Its primary purpose was to build upon the priorities, challenges and opportunities previously identified and translate them into concrete proposals for the future one-stop-shop. An indicative duration of approximately 90 minutes was recommended. As for the first meeting, EnEA developed a script for pilot partners to guide and moderate the discussion (see Annex 2). The meeting was structured around four main phases.

The first phase focused on **opening and introduction**.

Participants were welcomed and provided with an overview of the objectives and structure of the session. Emphasis was placed on the transition from problem analysis to solution development, highlighting how the second meeting built upon the outcomes of the previous discussion.

The second phase was dedicated to a **review of the key outcomes of the first working group meeting**.

This session provided an opportunity to review the priorities, needs, barriers and opportunities previously identified and to validate them collectively before moving forward. The discussion helped ensure continuity between the two meetings and reinforced the shared understanding developed during the first session. Where relevant, the preliminary indications regarding the potential location of the future one-stop-shop were also recalled and discussed.

The third phase focused on the **identification of potential solutions**.

During this stage, participants were invited to explore concrete actions, services and organisational arrangements that could be implemented through the one-stop-shop. Discussions were encouraged to remain practical and implementation-oriented, with particular attention paid to feasibility, available resources and local capacities. The objective was to move beyond the identification of problems and define realistic solutions capable of improving service accessibility, responsiveness and user experience.

The fourth and final phase addressed **synergies and stakeholder collaboration**.

Participants were invited to reflect on how the proposed solutions could be supported through cooperation among organisations, services and institutions operating within the local ecosystem. The discussion explored potential complementarities, opportunities for coordination and areas in which stakeholders could contribute to the implementation of specific actions. This session aimed to identify realistic forms of collaboration and establish a shared understanding of the roles that different actors could play in the future development of the one-stop-shop.

1.5. Recommendations for implementation

This section provides a list of practical recommendations that were shared by EnEA and agreed among project partners for organising, managing and collecting information from the working group meetings.

Preparing the working group:

- Make sure to inform timely the different stakeholders you would like to have in the working group. Present clearly the objective of the encounter and the duration. We warmly invite you to anticipate the fact that there will be a second meeting of the working group and, if possible, the hypothetical period in which the second meeting will be held.

Conducting the working group:

- Whenever possible, it is preferable to hold the meeting of the working group in person, as face-to-face interaction generally leads to more effective participation. That said, an online format can be advantageous for people with mobility challenges or those who have difficulty to move around. In any case, you're invited to choose the format that better suits the circumstances and needs of your context;
- If you opt for an in-person meeting, it is advisable to host it in a venue that is well known and that is easy to reach also on foot or by public transport, and that meets accessibility requirements;
- It is important to adhere to the agreed time-schedule, both to avoid overburdening participants and to respect the time they are voluntarily dedicating to the activity;
- It is advisable to have at least two people from your organisation managing the working group: one to facilitate the discussion and another to assist and take notes. However, you are free to organise the session in the way that best responds to your needs and possibilities;
- You are encouraged to adapt the proposed structure of the working group meeting to your local context, needs, and target audience. The script is intended as a supportive guidance tool to assist you in designing and facilitating the meeting. The only requirement is that you remain aligned with the core areas to be addressed and passages to be done;
- Make sure that participants are informed about the activity's compliance with GDPR regulations and that informed consent is signed prior to starting the meeting. The project information sheet and related informed consent have been prepared by CEI. You are invited to translate it into your country language and adapt it whether necessary to better meet your national regulation and/or specific requirements of your organisation.

Collecting information from the working group:

- It is not mandatory to record the meeting of the working group, but it can be done it helps with gathering information;
- Use the template provided to organise the information collected;
- Keep the original notes in your organisation's repository.

2. Results from the local working groups

This chapter presents the results generated through the stakeholder working groups conducted in the three pilot areas: Labin (Croatia), Santa Bona District, Treviso (Italy) and Beltinci (Slovenia). Building on the common working group approach described in the previous chapter, each pilot site engaged local stakeholders in a structured discussion process aimed at identifying priorities, barriers, opportunities and potential solutions to inform the development of the local one-stop-shop model. The outcomes of these discussions contributed to defining the most suitable location, scope and operational characteristics of the future one-stop-shops, while reflecting the specific needs and contextual conditions of each territory.

To ensure consistency in data collection and reporting across all pilot sites, EnEA developed common reporting templates for each meeting. They served as structured tools for documenting the results of the discussions, including the main priorities identified, the opportunities highlighted by stakeholders, the proposed characteristics and location of the local one-stop-shops. The templates used for data collection are provided in Annex 3 and 4 to this report.

The information gathered through the local working groups was subsequently shared and discussed among project partners during project meeting. This exchange enabled the comparison of experiences across pilot areas, the identification of common challenges and context-specific needs, and the exploration of opportunities for mutual learning.

The following sub-chapters present the results for each pilot area individually, highlighting the key findings emerging from the working group discussions. Particular attention is devoted to the priorities, barriers and opportunities jointly identified by stakeholders, as well as to the solutions and collaboration opportunities considered most relevant for strengthening access to health and social care services within each local context.

2.1. Working group in Labin (Croatia)

The local working group activities in Labin were carried out through two working group meetings held on 17th and 23rd September 2026 at the City of Labin *Grand City Hall*.

The meetings allowed the identification of several challenges affecting access to health and social care services, together with a shared vision for the development of the future one-stop-shop. Discussions highlighted the need to improve citizens' awareness of available services and rights, simplify access to information and administrative procedures, and address accessibility barriers affecting older people and individuals with reduced mobility. Stakeholders also emphasised the importance of strengthening coordination among local organisations and service providers, building on existing community resources and collaborative initiatives. The working group process resulted in the identification of the City of Labin as the preferred location for the one-stop-shop, complemented by outreach activities and support points aimed at improving accessibility for users facing mobility or transportation barriers.

2.1.1. Participants of the local working group

The local working group involved a broad range of stakeholders representing different sectors and perspectives within the Labin service ecosystem. The first meeting gathered **15 participants**, while **16 participants** attended the second meeting. Participants included representatives of local public authorities, public institutions, non-governmental organisations and citizens, including individuals previously involved in the focus groups conducted during the service mapping activity. Among the organisations represented or actively involved in the discussions were the *City of Labin*, the *Labin Red Cross Society*, the *Labin Healthy City Association* and the *Labin Nursing Home*.

2.1.2. Results from the local working group: barriers, priorities and opportunities

The results from the working group meetings revealed a broad consensus among stakeholders regarding the added value that a local one-stop-shop could bring to the existing service ecosystem. Overall, stakeholders described a territory characterised by the presence of a diverse range of health, social and community-based services, as well as a strong tradition of collaboration among local organisations. At the same time, participants recognised that the availability of services does not automatically translate into easy access for citizens. The local geography, the distribution of services across the territory, and the coexistence of multiple providers and administrative procedures may create difficulties, particularly for older adults and other vulnerable groups requiring support from different organisations. Participants recognised that many of the difficulties experienced by citizens are not necessarily linked to the absence of services, but rather to the complexity of navigating a fragmented system in which information, procedures and responsibilities are distributed across multiple organisations. This situation can make it difficult for users to understand where to seek support, especially when their needs span different domains such as healthcare, social care and community services. Within this context, the one-stop-shop was perceived as an opportunity to improve accessibility and strengthen collaboration among local actors.

The following sections summarise the main barriers, priorities and opportunities identified during the stakeholder consultations.

Barriers

The discussions held during the two working group meetings highlighted several interconnected barriers affecting citizens' ability to access health and social care services in the Labin area.

A first challenge concerned the limited awareness and understanding of the services, support measures and rights available to citizens. Participants observed that information is often fragmented across multiple organisations and communication channels, making it difficult for users, particularly older and more vulnerable individuals, to identify the most appropriate service or understand eligibility criteria and administrative procedures.

Accessibility emerged as a second major challenge. Stakeholders underlined that geographical distance, inadequate public transport connections and architectural barriers can significantly limit access to services, especially for older people, persons with disabilities and residents of rural or remote areas. Although the City Administration building provides some accessible facilities, its location and physical characteristics may still represent an obstacle for certain population groups.

The working group also highlighted barriers linked to the organisation of the local service ecosystem. Participants reported that citizens frequently face complex administrative procedures and difficulties navigating between different organisations, resulting in discontinuity of support and an increased burden on users and their families. These difficulties are further compounded by operational constraints affecting service providers, including limited staff capacity and increasing workloads, which may reduce the ability of institutions to ensure effective coordination and follow-up of individual cases. Concerns were also expressed regarding the sustainability of volunteer involvement over time and the limited digital skills of some potential users, which could reduce the effectiveness of digital service solutions.

Priorities

Building on the barriers identified through both the service mapping activity and the working group discussions, stakeholders agreed on three strategic priorities to guide the development of the local one-stop-shop.

The first priority concerned improving access to reliable, comprehensive and user-friendly information. Participants recognised that citizens often struggle to understand which services are available, where to

access them and how to navigate administrative requirements. For this reason, the future one-stop-shop was envisioned as a single access point capable of providing integrated information on health, social and community services, as well as on citizens' rights, eligibility criteria and application procedures.

A second priority focused on improving the accessibility of services for those facing mobility, transportation or geographical barriers. Stakeholders emphasised the importance of ensuring that vulnerable population groups can access information and support regardless of their place of residence or physical condition. Particular attention was devoted to identifying practical solutions capable of bringing the service closer to local communities while maintaining strong institutional links with existing service providers.

The third priority related to strengthening continuity of support and reducing the administrative burden experienced by users. Participants considered it essential to move beyond a fragmented service landscape and promote a more coordinated approach capable of accompanying citizens throughout their care and support journey. This included supporting individuals with administrative procedures, facilitating referrals between organisations and improving communication among service providers.

Opportunities

The working group discussions revealed a number of favourable conditions that could support the successful implementation of the local one-stop-shop.

A significant opportunity derives from the existing culture of cooperation among local institutions, service providers and community organisations. Stakeholders expressed a strong willingness to collaborate and recognised the value of creating more structured referral pathways and coordination mechanisms. The process also highlighted the potential contribution of several local organisations, including the *Labin Red Cross City Society*, the *Labin Healthy City Association* and the *Labin Nursing Home*, all of which expressed an interest in supporting different aspects of the future one-stop-shop. Their potential contributions range from volunteer mobilisation and user follow-up to the provision of outreach locations and transportation support for vulnerable residents.

Stakeholders also discussed potential infrastructures that could host the one-stop-shop and human resources to involve. **The City Administration of Labin was selected as the main location for the one-stop-shop** due to its institutional role, access to relevant information and established connections with local services and administrative departments. At the same time, participants recognised that the location of the City Administration in the historic Old Town, on a hill, may create accessibility challenges for some citizens, particularly older people, people with disabilities and people with reduced mobility. Limited parking and transport options can make it difficult for some residents to reach the one-stop-shop independently. For this reason, stakeholders agreed on the importance of complementing the central location with more accessible **community-based points of contact**. In this regard, the availability of premises located in the town centre, offered by the *Labin Healthy City Association,* emerged as a particularly valuable opportunity to reach citizens experiencing mobility difficulties and to mitigate accessibility barriers associated with the main location.

The discussions also demonstrated that many of the identified risks could be addressed through relatively straightforward mitigation measures. The establishment of clear roles and responsibilities, regular coordination mechanisms among organisations, training activities, and the development of a structured volunteer network were all considered feasible actions capable of enhancing the effectiveness and sustainability of the one-stop-shop.

2.2. Working group in Santa Bona District of Treviso (Italy)

The local working group activities in the Santa Bona district were conducted through two meetings held on 7th and 14th September 2026 at the premises of *RACT - Residenza Anziani Città di Treviso*, one of EnEA's nursing home located in the district.

The discussions highlighted the presence of a rich network of care services and community-based organisations, supported by a strong tradition of volunteering and civic engagement. At the same time, stakeholders recognised that citizens, particularly older people and individuals experiencing social vulnerability, often face difficulties in identifying and accessing the most appropriate sources of support. Participants repeatedly observed that many people come into contact with services only when their situation has already become critical, highlighting the need for more proactive approaches capable of identifying needs at an earlier stage and providing timely guidance and support. The working group process revealed a broad consensus regarding the potential added value of the future one-stop-shop as a mechanism for improving coordination among organisations, facilitating access to information and strengthening community outreach.

2.2.1. Participants of the local working group

A total of **11 stakeholders** participated in the first working group meeting and **10 stakeholders** in the second meeting. The working group brought together representatives from local care services, voluntary organisations and community initiatives operating within the Santa Bona district and the wider Treviso area. Participants included representatives from EnEA, namely the EnEA's President, the coordinator of the nursing home *RACT - Residenza Anziani Città di Treviso* and home care services in the territory, the coordinator of the *Specialised Dementia Centre*, and a social worker. The working group also involved representatives from several voluntary organisations, namely *Anteas*, *Volontari Insieme*, *NOI* and the *GAT Senior Club*. Both presidents and volunteers participated in the meetings as representatives of their respective organisations.

2.2.2. Results from the local working group: barriers, priorities and opportunities

The discussions conducted during the two working group meetings confirmed many of the findings emerging from the service mapping activity and provided a deeper understanding of the factors influencing access to services within the Santa Bona district. Participants repeatedly emphasised that the challenge lies in the ability to connect people with the right support at the right time, particularly before situations reach a crisis point. Within this context, the proposed one-stop-shop was seen as an opportunity to strengthen coordination among existing actors, facilitate orientation within the local service ecosystem and promote a more proactive and person-centred approach.

The following sections summarise the main barriers, priorities and opportunities identified during the stakeholder consultations.

Barriers

Stakeholders identified several barriers affecting the accessibility and effectiveness of local services. A recurring theme throughout the discussions was the fragmentation of the service system. Participants observed that citizens often struggle to understand which organisation is best suited to address their needs and may face difficulties navigating between different providers, procedures and eligibility requirements. Indeed, participants highlighted that one of the main challenges within the local service ecosystem is not necessarily the lack of available services, but rather citizens' difficulty in becoming aware of them and understanding how to access them. Information about healthcare, social care and community-based services is often dispersed across multiple organisations and communication channels, making it difficult for individuals to identify the most appropriate source of support. As a result, some people may remain unaware of services that could effectively respond to their needs or may struggle to navigate access procedures, eligibility criteria and referral pathways.

This issue was considered particularly relevant because support is frequently sought only once a situation has already become urgent or highly complex. Participants observed that when individuals and families are

already facing significant health, social or economic difficulties, the effort required to understand available options, identify the appropriate point of contact and complete administrative procedures can become an additional burden. Conversely, greater awareness of available resources and clearer pathways to support could facilitate earlier intervention, enabling needs to be addressed before they escalate and reducing pressure on both citizens and services.

A further challenge concerned the accessibility of the service system in a broader sense. While transportation difficulties and physical barriers were recognised as obstacles for some population groups, stakeholders also underlined the existence of organisational and relational barriers. Complex service pathways, limited coordination among providers and difficulties in obtaining timely guidance may discourage citizens from seeking support or create confusion regarding roles and responsibilities within the local ecosystem. These challenges can be particularly significant for older adults, people experiencing social isolation and individuals whose needs require interaction with multiple organisations across the health and social care sectors.

Participants also reflected on a number of contextual factors that could affect the future one-stop-shop. Particular attention was devoted to the risk that certain categories of citizens may not actively seek support unless outreach and engagement activities are put in place. Similarly, concerns were raised regarding the possibility that the service could remain underutilised if it is not sufficiently visible within the community.

Priorities

The working group identified four closely interconnected priorities that should guide the development of the local one-stop-shop. First, participants stressed the need to ensure that citizens have access to clear, reliable and regularly updated information regarding available services and support opportunities.

A second priority concerned the provision of personalised guidance and orientation. Throughout the discussions, stakeholders repeatedly highlighted that information alone is not sufficient unless it is understandable, accessible and tailored to people's actual circumstances. They emphasised that citizens frequently require support in understanding their options and identifying the most appropriate service rather than simply receiving lists of available resources. From this perspective, the one-stop-shop was envisaged as a trusted point of reference capable of accompanying individuals through often complex service pathways and facilitating access to the most suitable forms of support.

The third priority concerned prevention and proactive information provision. Stakeholders emphasised the importance of increasing citizens' awareness of available services, support opportunities and access pathways before urgent needs arise. Participants noted that individuals and families often start searching for information only when faced with a health or social crisis, a moment in which navigating a complex system and understanding who to contact can become particularly challenging and time-consuming.

Finally, stakeholders recognised that none of these objectives could be achieved without stronger collaboration and coordination among organisations. The one-stop-shop was therefore envisioned also as a tool for strengthening relationships among the municipality, care providers, volunteer organisations and community groups.

Opportunities

Alongside the challenges identified, the working group discussions revealed several favourable conditions that could support the successful implementation of the one-stop-shop.

Throughout both meetings, stakeholders demonstrated a genuine willingness to cooperate and recognised the value of creating a more structured network capable of connecting existing services, organisations and community resources. This collaborative attitude was reflected in the explicit availability expressed by several participants to contribute to the future development and operation of the one-stop-shop.

Additional opportunities were identified in the presence of **three potential locations** that could be selected to host the one-stop-shop. While the facility of *RACT - Residenza Anziani Città di Treviso* offers important

advantages, including existing infrastructure, visibility and parking availability, stakeholders also recognised the potential value of more community-oriented locations. Former retail premises made available by *ATER*, public housing management agency, within the neighbourhood were considered particularly promising due to their proximity to areas characterised by a high concentration of older residents and people with migrant backgrounds. Similarly, the premises of the *GAT Senior Club* were seen as opportunities to create synergies with already existing initiatives for older people, strengthening the community dimension of the one-stop-shop.

Finally, stakeholders identified several factors that could support the effectiveness of the initiative. These included the development of strong communication and outreach activities, including the involvement of local associations in dissemination efforts and the use of both digital and non-digital communication channels.

2.3. Working group in Beltinci (Slovenia)

The local working group activities were implemented through two meetings held on 1st September 2026 at the municipal premises and on 16th September 2026 at the *Intergenerational Centre Beltinci*.

The discussions highlighted a local context characterised by an active network of public services, community organisations and volunteer initiatives supporting older people and other vulnerable groups. At the same time, stakeholders recognised that the sustainability and accessibility of existing services remain significant challenges. Many initiatives rely heavily on project funding and volunteer work, while some important services face organisational, regulatory or logistical constraints that limit their capacity to respond to emerging needs. Particular attention was devoted to defining a one-stop-shop model capable of supporting both older residents and their families through reliable information and guidance.

2.3.1. Participants of the local working group

A total of **13 stakeholders** participated in the first working group meeting and **15 stakeholders** in the second meeting.

The working group involved representatives from the *Municipality of Beltinci*, local service providers, including *Dom Janka Škrabana* care home, residential care services, community-based organisations working with older people and other vulnerable groups, such as *Caritas*, and other local organisations involved in volunteering and social support activities.

2.3.2. Results from the local working group: barriers, priorities and opportunities

The working group discussions provided a comprehensive picture of both the strengths and the challenges characterising the service ecosystem in Beltinci. Participants described a community of longstanding culture of mutual support. Alongside the presence of a range of services and initiatives for older people and vulnerable groups, stakeholders highlighted the growing engagement of younger volunteers in community activities. However, the discussions also revealed that existing resources are not always easy to access or sustain over time. Stakeholders repeatedly emphasised that the future one-stop-shop should not duplicate existing services, but rather facilitate access to them through clear information, coordination and referral mechanisms.

The following sections summarise the main barriers, priorities and opportunities identified during the stakeholder consultations.

Barriers

A first challenge identified by stakeholders concerned the long-term sustainability of local services. Several participants explained that many activities currently depend on temporary project funding or on the availability of volunteers. This creates uncertainty regarding the continuity of support and limits the possibility of planning services over a longer timeframe. Similar concerns emerged in relation to the future one-stop-shop, with participants stressing that a lack of stable funding could undermine its long-term effectiveness.

The discussions also highlighted a number of accessibility barriers. Participants observed that older people and their families are often unaware of the services available to them or struggle to identify the most appropriate organisation to contact. This issue is particularly relevant for individuals who do not regularly use digital technologies or who are reluctant to seek help. Stakeholders noted that some older people only request support once they fully recognise their need for assistance, while family members may be hesitant to involve external services. As a result, support is sometimes sought later than it could be, making needs more difficult to address and increasing pressure on existing services.

Transportation emerged as another challenge. During the first meeting, participants highlighted the absence of home meal delivery services following their discontinuation during the COVID-19 period, noting that transport remains the main obstacle to restoring this type of support. More broadly, mobility limitations can affect both access to services and the delivery of assistance to residents living across the municipality.

Finally, stakeholders identified organisational challenges related to coordination, information management and staffing. Since the future one-stop-shop is expected to function primarily as an information, orientation and referral service, its effectiveness will depend on maintaining up-to-date information about available services and ensuring effective communication among providers. Participants also raised concerns regarding staff recruitment, training needs and compliance with data protection requirements when handling sensitive personal information.

Priorities

The working group discussions initially identified four priority themes for the future one-stop-shop: opportunities for social participation for older people (e.g., creative workshops, yoga and mindfulness, intergenerational activities), food provision and home meal delivery, transport, and access to information on long-term care and other available services. During the second meeting, participants worked in groups to further refine these themes and translate them into a more operational vision for the one-stop-shop.

Discussions highlighted the importance of ensuring the sustainability of the one-stop-shop through a dedicated and appropriately trained staff member, supported where possible by volunteers. However, stakeholders recognised the need for a programme-based rather than a project-based funding. Stakeholders agreed that the primary role of the one-stop-shop should be to provide clear, reliable and easily accessible information about long-term care, social support and available community services. Importance was given to reaching people who may not actively seek help or who are excluded from digital communication channels. However, participants also noted that the one-stop-shop should provide more than information alone, offering personalised guidance, needs assessment and active referral to the most appropriate services. To achieve this, strong cooperation among organisations, clearly identifying contact persons for each service, was considered essential. Discussions also highlighted the need to ensure appropriate working conditions for staff, including compliance with data protection requirements, and to make the service accessible to family caregivers by considering opening hours that extend beyond traditional morning office hours.

Opportunities

The working group discussions revealed several favourable conditions that could support the implementation of the local one-stop-shop. In addition to identifying existing strengths within the local ecosystem, participants engaged in a practical brainstorming exercise to explore potential activities and forms of collaboration that could shape the future one-stop-shop. These proposals reflected stakeholders' willingness

to actively contribute to the initiative and will be further assessed by the pilot partner in terms of feasibility and alignment with local resources and capacities.

One of the most significant opportunity lies in the strong network of organisations already active within the municipality, such as the *Centre for Social Work*, the *Community Health Centre*, home care service providers, *Health promotion Centre*, *Beltinci Pensioners' Association*, *Caritas*, the *Red Cross*, the *Prostofer volunteer transport initiative* and other local organisations. The discussions identified a wide range of concrete contributions that local stakeholders could potentially provide to the future one-stop-shop. These included communication and dissemination through municipal channels, referrals and coordination by service providers, volunteer support for accompaniment and outreach activities, awareness-raising initiatives, and the creation of a network of designated contact persons across organisations. To further strengthen cooperation and information exchange among organisations, participants proposed organising regular coordination meetings every three months.

In addition, after discussing several potential locations, participants agreed on to the future **location for the one-stop-shop**. The **Intergenerational Centre Beltinci** was identified as the preferred location due to its central position and for its visibility and familiarity among older residents. The availability of multifunctional spaces and the regular presence of other users within the building were also considered important advantages.

Stakeholders also reflected on how the one-stop-shop could operate in practice. They proposed the development of a simple protocol to guide the initial collection of users' needs and support the referral of citizens to the most appropriate service or organisation.

Finally, stakeholders reflected on the conditions required to ensure the long-term sustainability of the one-stop-shop. They highlighted the importance of establishing a stable organisational and financial framework capable of guaranteeing continuity beyond the project. Several participants suggest combining dedicated professional staff with the contribution of trained volunteers, while ensuring regular coordination among providers. Discussions also highlighted the increasing involvement of younger volunteers in activities supporting older residents, indicating a growing capacity for intergenerational cooperation and community participation. Moreover, they emphasised that the sustainability of the one-stop-shop will depend on its ability to operate as a well-coordinated community resource. Effective communication was also considered essential, and participants proposed several concrete dissemination channels, including the municipal newsletter *Mali Rijtar*, informational leaflets, local radio announcements and communication through Sunday Mass.

3. ANNEXES

Annex 1 – Script for conducting the first working group meeting

Annex 2 – Script for conduction the second working group meeting

Annex 3 – Template to collect information from the first working group meeting

Annex 4 – Template to collect information from the second working group meeting

Interreg CENTRAL EUROPE

Co-funded by the European Union

SOSPHERE

A.1.3 Script for conducting the working group meeting

Version 1

04 2026



	SESSION 1: OPENING AND INTRODUCTION (10 mins)
This session aims to briefly present the SOSPHERE project, describe the intention behind the establishment of the one stop-shop and the role of the working group in the frame of the meeting.	
PRESENTING SOSPHERE, THE ONE-STOP-SHOP, THE PURPOSE OF THE WORKING GROUP	*Consider the following introduction as a mere guide. Feel free to adapt or modify it to better respond to your local context specificities and based on the profile of participants in the meeting.* Today's meeting is part of the SOSPHERE project, which we are implementing in collaboration with partners from Croatia, Italy, and Slovenia. SOSPHERE stands for Solutions for Optimal Service Provision and Health Equity in Remote Environments. The project addresses a long-standing challenge: many people, especially older adults and those in vulnerable situations, struggle to access health and social services. Even when services are available, they often remain underused for several reasons. These may include a lack of awareness that the services exist, difficulties finding clear and comprehensive information, uncertainty about the criteria and procedures for accessing them, limited digital skills, or the need to travel long distances to reach them in person. To help address some of these difficulties, particularly those related to the availability of information and clarity around access pathways, SOSPHERE aims to introduce the local one-stop shop, a physical point of reference where citizens can obtain information, guidance, and support. To ensure these one-stop shops effectively respond to real, grounded needs, it is essential to understand the main challenges citizens face when searching for information or trying to access services, and, simultaneously, which are the difficulties service providers encounter when communicating/interacting with citizens. To collect information on these aspects, we've conducted a mapping of the services available in this area, including interviews with service providers. Through these interviews, we've gathered key insights on aspects such as accessibility, the number and types of citizens they serve, and the difficulties that most frequently emerged. Mapping also involved a focus group with citizens, to collect their point of view and direct experiences with services. The objective of today's meeting is to share with you the information collected and to reflect on it together. Through this discussion, we would also like to collectively identify and agree on a number of key areas/critical issues that, in your view, should be addressed as a priority. Finally, we would like to discuss some proposals regarding the physical location that could host the one-stop shop.
INTRODUCING THE STRUCTURE OF THE MEETING	On the occasion of today's meeting, we will: present the mapping and its results; discuss these findings and select the areas where action through the one-stop shop is most needed; present potential locations for the local one-stop shop and select the optimal option.
GETTING TO KNOW EACH OTHER	*Before starting, you may consider inviting participants to present themselves and the organisation they belong to.*

SESSION 2: PRESENTING THE RESULTS FROM MAPPING (20 mins)	
The aim of this session is to provide an overview of the mapping and present the information collected on the mapped services.	
EXPLAIN HOW THE MAPPING WAS CONDUCTED	Introduce this section by explaining how the mapping was conducted in order to provide some background and orientation to participants. You might consider mentioning the three steps undertaken (desk research, interviews and focus group), and the areas investigated (effectiveness and efficiency, accessibility, coverage, quality…).
PRESENT THE RESULTS FROM MAPPING OF EACH SERVICE	Present the results from the mapping for each service, highlighting strengths and critical aspects.
PRESENTAT TRANSVERSAL CRITICAL ISSUES	Present cross-cutting critical issues.

SESSION 3: COLLECTIVE REFLECTION AND PRIORITISATION (30/40 mins)	
The aim of this session is gathering participants' feedback on the results of the mapping, evaluate if there is room to improve collaboration between service providers, and start a conversation on the areas to be prioritised.	
COLLECT FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS	We suggest asking some basic questions to stimulate the conversation, for example: • *Do you feel that the picture that has emerged from the mapping accurately reflects the situation in the area?* • *Do you recognise your experience/ the situation of your organisation in the results presented?* • *Is there anything that you feel has not been captured by the mapping but which you feel it is important to consider in this framework?*
PRIORITISATION	We suggest making a summary by listing the areas that appear to be the most problematic/ on which there is greater interest in taking action based on the discussion. After that, a possible way to proceed with prioritization is to ask participants to assign a score from 1 to 3 to each area, where 1 = not

	relevant, 2 = relevant, and 3 = very relevant. This will make it possible to create a sort of ranking, in which the various critical areas are ordered by relevance.
COLLABORATION	You might sound the potential for improving the collaboration between service providers in order to improve accessibility, by asking specific question, such as: • *Do you think there is room for service providers to join forces to build/improve collaboration in order to favour services accessibility on these priority areas?*

SESSION 4: IDENTIFY THE LOCATION OF THE LOCAL ONE-STOP-SHOP (20 mins)
The aim of this session is to identify the premise of the future one stop shop.
Present some ideas, explaining eventual pros and cons of each (if any) and collect feedback from participants. Besides this, you can consider asking what is needed to make the premise of the one-stop-shop more familiar and welcoming.

Interreg CENTRAL EUROPE

Co-funded by the European Union

SOSPHERE

A.1.3 Script for conducting the second working group meeting

Version 1

09 2026



	SESSION 1: OPENING AND INTRODUCTION (5 mins)
This session is designed to welcome participants, present the objectives of the meeting, and provide an overview of its structure.	
PRESENTING THE PURPOSE OF THE SECOND WORKING GROUP MEETING	*Consider the following introduction as a mere guide. Feel free to adapt or modify it to better respond to your local context specificities and based on the profile of participants in the meeting.* The main objective of today's meeting is to examine potential measures, approaches, and practices that could be implemented within the local one-stop shop to address the priorities that emerged from our previous discussions. Ultimately, our shared goal is to enhance service accessibility and improve the overall experience for users. This meeting builds on the work we carried out during our first session. During that discussion, we collectively identified and prioritised key challenges and needs related to improving access to services through local one-stop shops. Those priorities now provide the foundation for the next phase of our work.
INTRODUCING THE STRUCTURE OF THE MEETING	On the occasion of today's meeting, we will: take a brief look back at the outcomes of our previous meeting to reconnect with the priorities that were identified and ensure that we begin today's discussion with a common understanding of the key issues; discuss concrete solutions and practical actions that could respond to those priorities; explore potential opportunities for collaboration and synergies among stakeholders in the one-stop shop ecosystem.

SESSION 2: KEY TAKEAWAYS FROM THE FIRST WORKING GROUP MEETING (15-20 mins)	
This session aims to revisit the key outcomes of the previous meeting and remind participants of the issues identified as priorities that were identified and agreed upon during the discussion.	
PRESENT PRIORITY ISSUES	We recommend presenting the priorities identified during the previous meeting and dedicating some time to explaining the reasons why they were selected. This step is important to validate the priorities agreed upon previously and to establish a common understanding of the basis for the subsequent phase of the discussion or, if necessary, review the decisions taken during the first meeting by introducing new priorities, refining existing ones, or deciding to discontinue those that are no longer considered relevant.

SESSION 3: IDENTIFY SOLUTIONS (30/40 mins)	
This session aims to engage participants in identifying and discussing practical solutions to the priorities by adopting a collaborative and solution-oriented approach to explore realistic and feasible actions that can be implemented in the frame of the one-stop-shop.	
	We suggest asking some basic questions to stimulate the conversation, for example:

COLLECT FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS	• *What actions can be taken to overcome the barriers and challenges that have been identified?* • *In your view, which activities, initiatives, measures, or tools could most effectively address each of the barriers/ challenges that emerged from the discussion?*

SESSION 4: SYNERGIES AND STAKEHOLDERS COLLABORATION	
This session invites participants to explore whether and how they can contribute to the implementation of the solutions discussed. It provides an opportunity to identify potential synergies, areas of collaboration, and organisations that may be willing to support, co-develop, or align with specific actions.	
COLLABORATION AND SYNERGIES	We suggest asking some basic questions to stimulate the conversation, for example: • *Do you see any opportunities to collaborate in or support the proposed activities, and more generally to contribute to the development and sustainability of the one-stop-shop initiative?*

Interreg CENTRAL EUROPE

Co-funded by the European Union

SOSPHERE

Annex 2

Template to collect information

Version 1

04 2026



Instructions for completing the template

This template has been developed as part of Activity 1.3 "Local stakeholders working groups to define one-stop-shops for service delivery". Its purpose is to collect the information and keep track on the decisions made on the occasion of the working group meeting.

Each pilot site is asked to summarise the main points raised by the working group during the meeting.

Name of the partner organisation: [*insert name*]

General information	
Number and types of participants	[insert number and the profile of participants]
Place	[insert name of the premise hosting the meeting or indicate if it was held online]
Date of the meeting	__/__/____
Participants' feedback on the results from mapping	
[*Please, include a brief summary of participants' feedback on the results from mapping. Max 2500 characters, with spaces*]	
Priority areas	
[*Please, list the areas identified as priority and the reasons behind the choice. Max 2500 characters, with spaces]*	

Synergies and collaboration
[Please, include participants' feedback on potential areas of synergies and collaboration between services providers, if any. Max 2500 characters, with spaces]

Location of the local one-stop-shop
[Please, indicate the decision made on the location that will host the one-stop-shop and the reasoning behind the choice. Max 2500 characters, with spaces]

Additional issues or services to be considered
[Include any additional notes or information, if applicable. Max 2500 characters, with spaces]

Interreg CENTRAL EUROPE

Co-funded by the European Union

SOSPHERE

Annex 2

Template to collect information

Version 1

09 2026



Instructions for completing the template

This template has been developed as part of Activity 1.3 “Local stakeholders working groups to define one-stop-shops for service delivery” and Activity 1.4 “One-stop-shop co-design and evaluation tool development”. Its purpose is to collect the information and keep track on the decisions made on the occasion of the second working group meeting.

Each pilot site is asked to summarise the main points raised by the working group during the meeting.

Name of the partner organisation: [*insert name*]

General information	
Number and types of participants	[insert number and the profile of participants]
Place	[insert name of the premise hosting the meeting or indicate if it was held online]
Date of the meeting	__/__/____
Priority areas	
[*Please list any new priority areas that might have emerged during the second meeting and highlight any changes to, or departures from the priorities and decisions established during the first working group meeting and briefly describe the reasons for these changes. Max 2500 characters, with spaces]*	
Solutions identified	
[*Please, list the activities, initiatives, measures, or tools identified to address each of the barriers/challenges, explaining the reasons behind the proposed approaches. Max 2500 characters, with spaces]*	

Synergies and stakeholders collaboration
[Please list the organisations willing to contribute to the implementation of the proposed actions, outlining how they could collaborate and the role they could assume. Max 2500 characters, with spaces]