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1. Executive Summary of WP5 Findings

Since the 1990s, governance for sustainability has aimed at an integrated consideration of environmental aspects and social justice. However, contemporary political processes are often still rather narrow in how they frame problems and possible solutions. How might we overcome this, and how can we learn from others who have done so?

Building upon the previous work done in UrbanA to map approaches for sustainable and just cities (WP3) and to identify drivers of injustice in urban sustainability governance (WP4), WP5 focuses on how to improve governance for sustainable and just cities.

This deliverable contains a record of the work done by UrbanA partner, the University of Freiburg (ALU-FR), on WP5. This includes: a brief background on governance for sustainable and just cities, WP5 methods, final WP5 outputs (including Governance Interventions, Governance Scenarios and Enabling Governance Arrangements), and further insights on translocal learning, additional governance themes, and next steps in the UrbanA project.

In order to understand how to improve governance for sustainable and just cities, WP5 undertook a series of analytical and co-creative tasks. Starting from a detailed understanding of place-specific Governance Interventions for sustainable and just cities (obtained from case studies of previous EU-funded projects), ALU-FR created Governance Scenarios that aim to imaginatively convey the most striking and unique aspects of the intervention in a generalized way. ALU-FR then identified patterns amongst the Governance Interventions and scenarios, of specific factors that helped enable their success. The synthesis of these factors resulted in a set of Enabling Governance Arrangements (published on the wiki together with their respective presentation videos and vignette illustrations). While by no means an exhaustive list, these Arrangements highlight some important things to consider in the governance of both municipal and community-led initiatives for sustainable and just cities.

A series of interactive online events were central to WP5. First, a Community Conversation (23.06.2020) introduced the UrbanA Community of Practice (CoP) to the topic of governance for sustainable and just cities. Then, a Pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar (23.02.2021) on translocal learning sought out feedback on the Governance Scenarios. Next, a “New to UrbanA” event (10.03.2021) welcomed “Berlin” Arena invitees to the UrbanA project. Finally, the “Berlin” Arena\(^1\) (18-19.03.2021) facilitated discussions on various governance themes and translocal learning, but mainly revolving around the Enabling Governance Arrangements.

After their review during a project meeting (14.10.2020) and at the Pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar, the Governance Scenarios were found to have good potential for sharing insights from the specific interventions with actors in other contexts. In response to feedback, ALU-FR made improvements to the scenarios’ readability, and increased each scenario’s tie back to its respective case study, meanwhile maintaining the generic and imaginative style. Although a promising method for

---

\(^1\) The event was originally to take place in Berlin, but occurred online due to Covid-19. Still, Berlin-based examples anchored Arena discussions.
knowledge-sharing between places, there remains a difficult tension between offering context-
specific and generic, transferrable insights from each intervention.

The Enabling Governance Arrangements, meanwhile, were able to better address this tension
between context-specificity and transferability. After several reviews by the UrbanA consortium
(09.2020 and 10.2020), the main feedback indicated that the Arrangements had struck a good
balance between general insights and context-specific illustrative examples. Participant inputs from
the “Berlin” Arena event, including critical points and complementary experiences, were later woven
into the Enabling Governance Arrangements. This served to further enliven them and increase their
legitimacy.

Moving forward, the outputs of WP5 will contribute to UrbanA’s next steps in two ways: they will be
included in WP6’s “keys” for sustainable and just cities, and ALU-FR will package them in a final
booklet of Enabling Governance Arrangements, policy briefs, and two academic articles.

In conclusion, the WP5 process has emphasized that it is not possible, nor desirable to directly
transfer solutions from place to place. Rather, transparently sharing processes, structures, and
governance arrangements are central to cross-context learning efforts. While this was clear to WP5
event participants, much of the source material from previous EU-funded projects did not provide
such information. As an important outcome of the UrbanA project, we believe that more attention
needs to be given to improving knowledge-sharing while crafting project outputs.

This finding calls for a reform of European Union Research and Innovation funding schemes to both
incentivize more systematic learning about governance arrangements within projects and provide
opportunities for direct and interactive learning based on project findings. In order to enable
upscale, wider adoption or even individualized adaptation of innovative EU-funded initiatives,
project documentation needs to include a frank analysis of governance arrangements, including
required preconditions and detrimental context factors. Projects should also have an increased
capacity and funding for interactive, continuous learning opportunities between cities. Our WP5
outputs (namely the scenarios and Enabling Governance Arrangements) provide a modest starting
point for this endeavour.
2. WP5 in the UrbanA context

UrbanA - Urban Arenas for Sustainable and Just Cities is a 3-year project to map, assess, distill and communicate a portfolio of solutions to city-makers to support them in transforming their cities into inclusive, sustainable, and thriving urban and peri-urban environments. The focus is on synthesizing and transferring knowledge, breaking silos and building new networks for transformative change.

After a process of mapping the different approaches towards sustainability and justice evidenced and studied in Europe through an initial sample of 350 EU-funded research projects (WP3), UrbanA aimed to assess and distill information from the existing database (Deliverable 3.2) in order to deepen those insights related to:

a) Drivers and manifestations of urban injustice (WP4);

b) Urban governance towards just and sustainable cities (WP5).

WP4 has built on the previous assessment and distillation work by means of an in-depth and qualitative meta-analysis of 43 projects selected by the UrbanA Consortium as those with the richest focus on issues related to urban injustice (Deliverable 4.1).

WP5’s objective is to support governance for just and sustainable cities by an in-depth analysis of well documented real-world Governance Interventions that aimed simultaneously for improvements with regard to environmental effects and justice.

Building on all the work done previously within UrbanA (“approaches to just and sustainable cities”, D3.2, and “drivers of injustice”, D4.1) this document presents the final outputs from our in-depth analysis of eleven most insightful Governance Interventions.

These outputs include eleven detailed descriptions of Governance Interventions according to a governance heuristic (see section 4.2), eleven Governance Scenarios meant as a tool to channel interest towards the respective Governance Interventions (see section 4.4), and six Enabling Governance Arrangements that show a high potential for transferability (see section 4.5).

These outputs are the products of multiple rounds of discussion and feedback within the UrbanA consortium and Community of Practice (CoP) during project meetings, Arena events, and other communications. The Enabling Governance Arrangements in particular will feed into the development of WP6 Keys for Sustainable and Just Cities. In the upcoming months, a policy brief will be based on the content of WP5 outputs. This will contribute to the final policy recommendations from UrbanA.
3. Governance, or how to achieve more just and sustainable cities

3.1 UrbanA’s understanding and study of governance

Governance:

When we write in the following about “governance”, unless we specify any other of the many common meanings, we relate broadly to all formal and informal political processes (involving state and non-state actors) that aim to enable and direct collective action. We hence use governance in a descriptive sense, and – unless noted explicitly – do not aim to convey any normative judgement by doing so (Benz 2004; Pierre/Peters 2000). We are principally inclined to an institutionalist perspective on governance and appreciate both a) actors’ leeway to act in different ways and b) the enabling or constraining role of structures (cf. Kooiman 2003, Hajer 1995). Of particular interest to governance for sustainable and just cities is the often networked character of contemporary governance (Rhodes 2007).

This project has identified a set of real-world political initiatives that combined ambitions regarding environmental sustainability and justice, and which were observed and/or supported by EU-funded projects.

Firstly, UrbanA’s database of existing approaches to tackling unsustainability and injustice in cities was developed in WP3 by the consortium and Community of Practice (CoP) from knowledge and insights generated in previous EU-funded projects. Then, WP4 assessed this database to identify the drivers and manifestations of urban injustice that are related to sustainability efforts.

A selection of initiatives from these databases provided the groundwork for WP5. To some extent, they had an experimental character and aimed to prepare the ground for justice-oriented sustainability governance beyond a single urban context. To qualify for a re-analysis within WP5, they had to be well documented regarding actor constellations and institutional settings. The Governance Interventions analyzed are the empirical basis for both the Governance Scenarios and the Enabling Governance Arrangements.

Governance Interventions:

A set of real-world initiatives analyzed by UrbanA that simultaneously promote environmental sustainability and justice, and which were observed and/or supported by EU-funded projects.

Besides detailed descriptions and governance-focused re-analysis of the eleven real-world Governance Interventions, the UrbanA-wiki also presents eleven Governance Scenarios, each of which is a short summary of key aspects of one of the real-world Governance Interventions. These scenarios have been developed in a systematic way, summarizing key information of the cases based on a pre-set framework (see Annex 2). Yet, they are short and written in a storytelling style, in order to attract the attention of city makers are seeking inspiration on specific problems, and to draw their interest to the respective descriptions of real-world Governance Interventions for attaining more contextualized information and contacts to people who might have made the very experiences that could help them solve their specific problems. Discussions were held at UrbanA’s pre-”Berlin” Arena
webinar in February 2021 on this set of eleven Governance Scenarios, along with a general assessment of the scenario method as a translocal learning tool.

**Governance Scenarios:**

A set of abstract narratives, based on individual Governance Interventions, which aim to a) inspire city makers to think outside the box, and b) point them to detailed, context-specific information on the intervention.

Another round of analysis of these eleven Governance Scenarios and their respective interventions allowed the identification of six Enabling Governance Arrangements showing a great potential to serve as ‘principles’ or ‘guiding visions’ and seem to be applicable in many different places. In other words, these arrangements help *enable* sustainable and just cities. Discussions and amendments to this set of six Enabling Governance Arrangements were achieved at UrbanA’s third arena in March 2021.

**Enabling Governance Arrangements:**

A combination of actor constellations and institutional settings that has proven a potential to support urban governance towards just and sustainable cities in several cases of real-world Governance Interventions.

Both the Governance Scenarios and the Enabling Governance Arrangements emphasize positive institutional processes and stakeholder interactions that could be inspirational and potentially ‘translated’ across contexts, in various cities, to build sustainable and just urban futures. However, possible dangers or trade-offs associated with these arrangements are communicated as well, most explicitly in the descriptions of real-world Governance Interventions.

### 3.2 Why and how to appreciate context specificity and avoid solutionism

Research into urban governance keeps finding that no context resembles any other to the extent that findings about successful interventions could be easily transferred between them. For example, Boulanger and Nagorny (2018) explicate how the uniqueness of urban contexts (i.e. regarding their laws, governance systems, and infrastructures) principally constrains the successful replication of best practices. Reflexive practitioners repeatedly support these findings.

The factors enabling a particular re-arrangement to work in one context and disable it or lead even to negative outcomes in another are so manifold. Generalizations about “success factors” very rarely stand a critical scrutiny. However, the promise to identify “best practices” and to convey transferable lessons continues to drive countless initiatives, including many EU-funded projects (Boulanger and Nagorny 2018; Nagorny-Koring 2019).

UrbanA aims at carefully exploring the potential and limitations to the identification of generalizable knowledge regarding governance arrangements that may support just and sustainable cities. Discussions with practitioners of urban governance at UrbanA’s first arena event strongly confirmed the notes of caution that also dominate the scientific literature on policy or governance learning. UrbanA’s assumption is, that it is in fact impossible to generalize findings from one urban context to another, since the number of context factors - that had to be controlled for ensuring that such a transfer is justified - is principally huge and out of reach.
What can and does happen, however, is that actors in search for a specific solution to their very specific problem search for inspiration in other contexts. To what extent an experience made elsewhere can be reproduced in another context, and what adaptations are needed to ensure a positive outcome and avoid unintended effects is left to the judgement of those people, who know their local contexts very well. A maximum of collective learning can be achieved, in our view, if people from distinct contexts, say contexts A and B, discover that in context B a problem exists for the solving of which some experiences made in context A could serve as an inspiration.

This needs the direct and bi-directional interaction of somebody very well familiar with context A and somebody very familiar with context B. Collections of so-called ‘best practices’ can at best facilitate the meeting of such pairings of people. The Governance Scenarios of UrbanA are therefore designed in a way that reflects exactly this limited ambition: to draw practitioners’ attention to potentially meaningful experiences and to people who may be able to engage in a productive dialogue about them.

Generally, we take a very careful approach to the generalization of findings from our analysis, especially on the way ahead to formulating ‘keys’ of governance for sustainable and just cities in the next work package. By juxtaposing real-world Governance Interventions which aimed at and partly succeeded to improve an integrated governance of environmental and justice concerns in particular cities, we identified potentially Enabling Governance Arrangements, the observed application of which in multiple contexts indicates some extent of universality.

To what exact kinds of contexts such applicability extends can never be identified in detail and with certainty. However, as detailed in section 5.2.2 and 5.3.1, we have explored together with the UrbanA consortium and Community of Practice the transferability of Governance Scenarios and Enabling Governance Arrangements between different places.
4. Methods

WP5 adopted a three-step approach in creating its final outputs - Governance Interventions, Governance Scenarios, and Enabling Governance Arrangements - as illustrated in Figure 1, below.

Figure 1. Process and outputs of WP5 (yellow) related to outputs of WP4 (red) and WP6 (green)

4.1 Selection of real-world Governance Interventions

Our selection of real-world Governance Interventions was sampled from previous and on-going EU-funded projects, based on the database of projects produced in WP3 (starting from >350 projects and reduced to the “UrbanA Short-list” of 112 projects most relevant for urban sustainability and justice). In WP4, the list of projects was further shortened to 43 based on their relation to urban injustice. This material for WP5 analysis was used as a starting point for our selection of interventions. Following a request by ALU-FR, researchers from UAB even included dedicated codes in their WP4-related coding of project materials in order to identify interventions of interest to WP5. Out of the material coded in WP4, the following H2020 and JPI Urban Europe projects in particular contained helpful information on governance: TRANSIT (2014-2017), TESS (2013-2016), AGAPE (2014-2016), GREENLUUS (2016-2021), SMARTEES (2018-2021), and GUST (2014-2017). However, there remained an insufficient number of interventions described with detailed information on governance within the material studied for the drivers of injustice. Therefore, we had to return to the “UrbanA short-list”.

We then scanned this broader sample of projects in order to identify a selection of real-world Governance Interventions to provide an empirical base to increase our understanding of governance aspects of urban justice and sustainability.

Our four main criteria for selecting particular interventions for WP5 analysis were:
The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g., city)
This context is in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded)
The intervention considers to a large extent sustainability and justice (the latter at least implicitly)
It is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on transferability (i.e., ‘de-contextualizability’)

Additionally, we aimed at compiling a diverse portfolio with respect to domain (i.e., energy, mobility, nature-based solutions), geographic location, and type of actor implementing the intervention (i.e. municipality-led, community-led).

As a preliminary finding from this process, well-documented interventions were more challenging to find than expected. Despite there being many projects to choose from, the limiting factor for our final selection of interventions was the availability of detailed information required for our analysis.

After a preliminary list of ten interventions was selected for focused study by the core WP5 team, it was then enriched by calling for additional suggestions from members of the UrbanA consortium.

This resulted in an additional six projects which had not made it into the final (WP3) database due to earlier exclusion criteria not related to governance but were highly relevant to this analysis.

After full review, we decided to include an eleventh additional intervention. Calls to the Community of Practice (CoP) for their input on Governance Interventions were put out at our Community Conversation on June 23 as well as in our June 25 blog post which introduced the new focus on governance within UrbanA.

Table 1. Governance interventions analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of intervention (links lead to respective Wiki-pages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bottom-up resistance against gentrification in Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Citizens rescuing and sharing food in Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Community led affordable housing in Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dealing flexibly with and learning from resistance in Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Biodiversity protection and social justice in the Barcelona Natural Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Inner-city community energy in London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Citizens share in Berlin Energy Grid for sustainable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Public-private partnerships for sustainability infrastructure in Athens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance interventions in the shaded boxes of the table above originate from EU projects that have not been coded in the context of WP4.
4.2 Analyzing real-world Governance Interventions in depth

We next developed an analytical framework for characterizing the above Governance Interventions for sustainable and just cities in rich detail. Our aim was to gather as much information from these project documents as possible for use in the creation of scenarios and Enabling Governance Arrangements. The preliminary framework was created in an iterative and reflective process within the ALU-FR team. This process also drew on conceptualizations of governance and learning across contexts from previous EU-funded projects. For example, important parts of our conceptualization of social learning occurring in such interventions was borrowed from the FOODLINKS project (the notion of social learning as being understood through the learning context, content, and process, see FOODLINKS 2013, D7.1, p.14). The framework also connects to previous work done in UrbanA by relating the interventions to approaches identified in WP3 and drivers of injustice elaborated in WP4.

At the project meeting in Lisbon on February 13th, 2020, the UrbanA consortium provided feedback on the analytical framework. The final framework that we applied to eleven cases can be seen in all detailed descriptions of Governance Interventions in section 5.1 and Annex 3. It is structured into the following sections: a) basic characteristics b) actor constellations and governance modes c) supportive framework conditions d) obstacles/ barriers e) institutional work to overcome obstacles f) observed (and expected) outcomes g) assumed transferability and potentials for learning and g) (concluding) reflections on important governance concepts.

The framework acted as a series of guiding questions to answer while looking through project documentation such as case study reports and final deliverables. This documentation was obtained mostly from project websites and the CORDIS database. Some documents were added after contacting people who had been involved in the projects. The selected documents were added to internal file management libraries including the project’s online Zotero library of documents as well as in the project’s online storage (BOX > WP4 > Coding material). These documents are referenced in the detailed descriptions such that readers can trace information back to its original source.

To present and compare the detailed descriptions from all cases, they were organized into a large summary table (for a partial reprint, see Annex 2). This exercise helped identify patterns and to decontextualize governance elements which were considered in the Governance Scenarios and Enabling Governance Arrangements.
4.3 Qualitative interviews

After completing a first round of collecting relevant project information guided by the heuristic described in 4.2 and a related code-list, we identified those interventions where it would be most beneficial to follow-up with in-person interviews. This was because either the project was of interest to learn more about, some questions were raised about our interpretation of the work project documents, or interventions were new, so limited information was available.

Reflecting these criteria, we selected key informants to interview with a focus on learning more about governance and learning aspects of the identified interventions. We employed semi-structured interviews with 10 informants, which were all highly involved postdoctoral researchers, research coordinators, or project proponents in the selected projects. These WP5 specific interviews were all conducted by ALU-FR researchers. All available transcripts or summaries of interviews conducted by other researchers in the context of WP4 were systematically scanned for relevant information too.

A generic interview protocol (see Annex 1) was set up in order to structure and guide the interviews, but specific themes/questions were adjusted to each interviewee according to their background and knowledge in relation to the project’s various research interests. Interviews were conducted both in person and via online calls and documented in written form (full transcripts or concise summaries).
After completion of the interviews, the detailed descriptions were completed with the additional insights.

In addition to the interviews conducted specifically for the purpose of creating a detailed description and the interviews conducted in the context of WP4, we also benefited from more general interviews with experts on urban sustainability governance. For example, extending an interview conducted for WP4 interview with Dr. Michael Hodson from Manchester University, we explored more generally the challenges of facilitating translocal learning through sharing lessons from urban sustainability interventions. In another in-depth interview, we spoke with Prof. Niki Frantzeskaki about this topic.

Furthermore, five interviews were conducted by an ALU-FR researcher with a variety of project researchers, academics, and a municipal practitioner on the topic of how translocal learning can be facilitated via EU-project documentation. These interviews also echoed Dr. Hodson’s view of this endeavor as being challenging, and possibly undesirable, due to the context specificity of solutions. Overall, these additional interviews confirmed our critical approach regarding the transferability of specific solutions for just and sustainable cities.

4.4 Creation of Governance Scenarios
The scenarios were created as a short and partly abstracted summary of the detailed descriptions of Governance Interventions for sustainability and justice. For example, the detailed description of Inner-city community energy in London was used as source material for a short scenario on urban community energy. The scenario still reflected context factors of the situated example it was derived from, but was reduced to a short and supposedly inspirational summary of the governance arrangement. It provided access to the contextual information by means of a link to the detailed description of the Governance Intervention in the UrbanA Wiki, as well as a few introductory sentences about the intervention. More details on the scenarios themselves can be found in section 5.2.

We considered it important to incorporate general findings from the interviews on the challenges of learning across contexts into the thinking behind our scenarios. As previously mentioned, the scenarios are not aimed at communicating one specific intervention with the hope that it is transferred to other places. They rather aim to convey, in an imaginative way, the most striking and unique aspects of the intervention in a more generalized way such that it can provide inspiration to city-makers in a variety of contexts who may be experiencing similar problems. The goal for these scenarios was for them to be a pleasant, attractive read, which direct interested readers back to the detailed descriptions should they wish to learn more.

The first draft of Governance Scenarios was created by the ALU-FR team by selecting elements of each intervention’s detailed description to feature in an inspirational decontextualized narrative. These elements were chosen from the summary table (see Annex 2), and had already been decontextualized to the extent possible. Each scenario contains at least one element selected from each category of our detailed description framework. For example, in the Inner-city community energy intervention, it was stated as important that the local council provided support in a variety of ways, therefore this was included in the scenario as it was a crucial interaction between actors which
enabled the intervention to emerge (section b of our framework). However, the specific details of this interaction remain in the detailed description, which readers can access if interested.

The Governance Scenarios were then shared with and reviewed by the UrbanA consortium. Particularly important feedback was received from UAB who reviewed them additionally in terms of how they were linked to the drivers of injustice as identified in WP4. A second round of review occurred at the online project meeting on October 14, 2020. Please see section 5.2.1 for a summary of this feedback and how we addressed it in our final scenarios. Lastly, these final scenarios were presented and discussed with the UrbanA CoP at the pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar on February 23, 2021. This input provided a helpful external assessment of our general approach of scenarios as a method to share governance knowledge between contexts. Please see section 4.6.2 for more details on the webinar, and section 5.2.2 for a summary of this assessment.

4.5 Synthesis of Enabling Governance Arrangements

While the Governance Scenarios were designed as a possible method of sharing interventions across contexts in an inspirational manner, we were also able to utilize them to identify important patterns in actor constellations and institutional settings. These patterns are called Enabling Governance Arrangements due to their potential to support urban governance towards just and sustainable cities, which has been demonstrated in our scenarios.

To create the Enabling Governance Arrangements, we asked “What key governance elements from each intervention enabled them to come to fruition?” as an operationalized sub-question of our overarching interest in guidelines city makers can apply when designing governance processes for just and sustainable outcomes.

We reviewed each scenario and the corresponding long description to identify the core governance elements that supported it. Multiple ALU-FR researchers reviewed each intervention so that a variety of perspectives were considered and not accidentally excluded. These elements were then grouped into clusters and more comprehensive categories, which finally were developed into the descriptions of Enabling Governance Arrangements that you find in section 5.3.2. While this list of arrangements is certainly not exclusive, many of the Enabling Governance Arrangements turned out to reflect concepts that were also raised by the CoP in our June 23, 2020 Community Conversation, and later on in our March 18-19, 2021 “Berlin” Arena event.

These categories were described in greater detail and exemplified through excerpts from the original interventions. Each Enabling Governance Arrangement was initially structured as follows: description of its general ambition, examples from the Governance Interventions it was drawn from, relation to justice in urban sustainability governance, critical reflection, and connection to the Covid-19 pandemic.

During September 2020, the UrbanA consortium gave very detailed feedback on the collection of six Enabling Governance Arrangements via an online document. The feedback generally called for greater consideration of drivers of injustice, as well as many other specific comments. Consequently, the ALU-FR team expanded on the Enabling Governance Arrangements’ relation to injustice, among other things, and another review of the outputs was done by the consortium at the online project
meeting on October 14, 2020. Please see section 5.3.1 for a summary of this feedback and suggestions on how we addressed it.

These updated Enabling Governance Arrangements were the focus of multiple sessions at the virtual “Berlin” Arena on March 18 and 19, 2021. Afterwards, participant insights were harvested from the online note taking boards and incorporated into the final versions of the Enabling Governance Arrangements. More information on the types of inputs from the Arena can be found in section 5.3.2, as well as details of how the inputs shaped the final Enabling Governance Arrangements. To improve readability and accessibility for a wide audience of city-makers, three consortium members outside the ALU-FR team closely reviewed the final Enabling Governance Arrangements. They flagged any confusing or unclear concepts and redundancies. As a result, the final texts have been made more concise and accessible, without sacrificing too much nuance and complexity.

4.6 Engaging with the consortium and the Community of Practice (CoP)

4.6.1 General engagement

As highlighted in the previous sections, throughout the process of detailed description elaboration, scenario creation, and the creation of Enabling Governance Arrangements, we strived to engage with the UrbanA consortium and CoP. Within the consortium, this consisted of multiple rounds of feedback, which has proven very valuable in the development of WP5 outputs thus far. Regarding the CoP, this consisted of our June 23 Community Conversation, our open invitation to co-edit our wiki pages, interactions at the first two arena events, and at the February 23 pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar and the third arena event, the March 19/20 “Berlin” Arena.

Furthermore, a series of videos on the Enabling Governance Arrangements (see section 5.3.2), blog posts summarizing these events (see section 4.6.2 and 4.6.3), as well as two podcasts exploring initiatives for sustainable and just cities were created by ALU-FR and shared with the consortium and wider CoP. Both podcasts highlighted key governance elements like participation and learning in networks in real-life examples. The first podcast, ‘Participation and the distribution of public space’, featured the Changing Cities initiative, which was present at the “Berlin” Arena. The second podcast, ‘Food Sharing’, featured the German food sharing movement which was described in one of our Governance Interventions. Both podcasts can be found here: https://urbanarena.eu/resources/#podcast.

4.6.2 Pre-“Berlin” Arena Webinar

The pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar on February 23 was an online Zoom event focused on the topic of translocal learning for sustainable and just cities. It was hosted by ourselves, ALU-FR, with facilitation assistance from ICLEI. Over 40 people attended. At the event, a presentation on the merits and challenges of learning between cities was given as a background for why a tool like Governance Scenarios may be helpful. Then participants - UrbanA fellows and others - were invited to review the Governance Scenarios and provide their feedback on them as a tool for translocal learning. This occurred in small breakout groups where they were asked to answer the following questions about one scenario:

- What do you like about this scenario?
- What could be improved? E.g. What would it need to look like to be useful to you personally?
What are your thoughts on scenarios as a tool for learning between cities?

They were next asked to read a scenario which was a less-positive example of governance for sustainable and just cities, and were asked the question:

- Compared to the more positive scenarios, do you find examples of ‘cautionary tales’ helpful? Why or why not?

There was then a plenary discussion on the individual groups’ insights. All responses were written by participants on a set of harvesting slides. Please see section 5.2.2 for a summary of this webinar feedback. Lastly, a blog post was composed to summarize the event (Link here: https://medium.com/urban-arenas-for-sustainable-and-just-cities/the-promise-and-challenge-of-learning-between-cities-urbanas-community-of-practice-engages-with-7b3d39f444cf) and a final call was put out to the CoP to give feedback on the scenarios via email.

4.6.3 “Berlin” Arena

The virtual “Berlin” Arena on Governance for Sustainable and Just Cities was hosted by ALU-FR on March 19/20, 2021 with facilitation and technical assistance from the UrbanA consortium. This event was a central component of WP5 engagement with the CoP and was essential in informing its final outputs. Over 60 individuals from different sectors and disciplines attended (more information on participants in section 4.6.3.2).

4.6.3.1 Purpose, objectives, approach and framing questions of the “Berlin” Arena

The arena event provided opportunities for fruitful exchange among a diversity of European scholars and practitioners who aim to make cities more sustainable and just. In particular, we addressed the how of collective action towards more sustainable and just cities. We put our findings about “Enabling Governance Arrangements”, that have proven to support initiatives for just sustainability in cities, up for discussion and aimed to test in discussions with the participants our hypotheses about how learning across cities can be fruitful.

The event was designed to address four objectives:

1) Facilitate focused discussions on governance arrangements for sustainable and just cities by giving tangible, situated examples (mostly from Berlin).

2) Allow for the CoP to engage (as directly as possible) with practitioners (from social movements and governments).

3) Encourage participants to share additional illustrative examples of Governance Interventions, thus helping us to consolidate our findings.

4) Collect participants’ views on actions needed to be undertaken (by different actors) to support initiatives for sustainable and just cities (towards keys/ an agenda).

In response to feedback from past Arenas, we wanted the “Berlin” Arena to be an opportunity for both our CoP and local practitioners to interact as directly as possible.

Despite the necessity to conduct it online, the Arena built on three initiatives for sustainability and justice from Berlin as a common frame for reference (Changing Cities, BürgerEnergie Berlin, and
Donut for Berlin). After hearing how these initiatives partly succeeded and partly failed in promoting new rules for greater sustainability and justice in the fields of mobility and energy in Berlin, participants from across Europe were able to reflect on their own experiences and constructively comment on our findings regarding six fields of Enabling Governance Arrangements. In a dedicated session, they were also invited to share experiences with helpful or fruitless attempts to support learning between cities.

The “Berlin” Arena was oriented around three overarching questions:

1) What types of governance arrangements are supportive of sustainable and just cities?

2) How can learning from city to city be fostered?

3) What concrete action should be taken to improve governance for sustainable and just cities?

4.6.3.2 Preparation for the event

Preparations for the “Berlin” Arena event took place over the course of half a year, in parallel to the development of other WP5 outputs.

A preliminary concept and agenda was developed by the ALU-FR team with keen attention to the evaluation of the previous arena. For example, at Arena 2, online, participants appreciated reconvening in plenary to summarize discussions. It was also valuable to begin sessions with concrete examples before continuing with more theoretical discussions. The previous arena also taught us that participants desired longer times in breakout rooms to avoid cutting conversations short. Additionally, more time and spaces for networking were desired. All of these lessons were taken into consideration for the development of Arena 3 (see section 4.6.3.3 for the Arena agenda).

Furthermore, the Arena 3 concept and detailed schedule underwent several rounds of review and revision from the consortium.

This review included assigning and specifying roles for the Arena, including, for example, Zoom hosts, facilitators, and note takers. Each role was filled by a consortium member, by volunteering UrbanA fellows, or colleagues within UrbanA partner organizations. Each role-taker was provided with a comprehensive document outlining their responsibilities and ALU-FR hosted a preparation session to clarify any questions.

The consortium was also invited to provide feedback on the Arena notetaking boards on the miro platform. This helped simplify the boards and make them more user friendly.

Based on the positive feedback regarding Arena 2 preparatory materials (booklet of drivers of injustice and explanatory videos), the ALU-FR team prepared a booklet on the Enabling Governance Arrangements and a series of videos to explain each arrangement. The booklet can be found in Annex 4, and the playlist of videos can be found through this link: https://youtu.be/u0GtehQ11ts?list=PLjbNPZqbaFXwt_deW0zn2EQuNJTP_OBdn. These materials were dispersed to participants in the weeks leading up to the event so they could familiarise themselves with the main themes.

To further prepare participants, and especially welcome those new to the UrbanA project, ALU-FR and ICLEI hosted an interactive “New to UrbanA” webinar on March 10, 2021. Participants were able to get to know the UrbanA project and ask any questions they had.
4.6.3.2.1 Participant selection process and local “hubs”

The selection of participants for the “Berlin” Arena was very time intensive and careful. It aimed at a wide variety of perspectives, including some that have been heard less for structural reasons, while also ensuring that all participants bring the social and language skills required for a focused and productive exchange. The selection process of the third Arena Event was taken care of by a small selection committee consisting of several members of the UrbanA consortium. The aim was to invite 25-30 participants to the Arena event, besides the fellows, the representatives of the Berlin initiatives, the EC officer and consortium members. The selection process was adapted and systematized based on recurring discussions on how to increase the diversity of the group of participants, and particularly how to include marginalized voices. A separate working group was assigned with the task to think of ways to address these issues. The output of these discussions informed the design of the selection process. In this paragraph we describe the different steps of the selection process.

First, we created a longlist of applicants that was complemented with suggestions made by the consortium. All consortium members were invited to provide several targeted invitees who specifically represent marginalized voices through their work with community-based organizations. Then we deleted non-eligible candidates (e.g. non-EU, accidental double entries, fellows who have applied accidently). The final long list consisted of approximately 150 applicants.

Second, the applicants of the long list were divided among the selection committee members. Each applicant was ranked by 2 reviewers. The applicants were reviewed based on the selection criteria developed in task 2.2. These criteria included 1) level of contribution to the event, 2) level of interest (actively engaged, motivation, transdisciplinary interest, committed, direct stake) and 3) other personal aspects (like transformative potential, expertise and agency). Next to these individual criteria the reviewers assessed the extent to which the applicants represented marginalized voices (e.g. race, class, gender, migration status and special disability.) Which resulted in ‘a marginality score’ for each applicant. Since it was not possible or desirable to assess and/or ask participants directly if they represented any features of marginality (e.g. is someone part of a LGBTI community?), we rather assessed whether participants represented these categories on the basis of their work and affiliations. E.g. what is their field of expertise and what topics are they addressing in their research, activism, policies, etc. (e.g. do they have a focus on feminism, rights to the city, housing rights, etc.)? For each applicant we created a final rank based on the average of the scores given by the two reviewers. Additionally, each reviewer had the opportunity to nominate one person who would end up on the shortlist automatically.

The third step was to create a proposal of a short list of invitees. This was done by ALU-FR and DRIFT. We took a sample of 30 applicants by selecting the people that ranked highest based on the final rank. We checked whether the sample included the jokers and the people that were suggested by the consortium members. If not, we added those applicants to the sample. Then we checked the diversity of the sample based on the sample criteria developed in task 2.2 (e.g. institutional background, sector domain, knowledge & experience, gender, geographical diversity, age). We added an additional criterion based on whether people were new to or familiar with UrbanA. We aimed at creating a sample with 50% new participants and 50% recurring participants. Also, if certain categories were underrepresented, in our case policy and political actors, men, and people from Eastern Europe, we would check the longlist to see if there would be eligible candidates that could be added to the sample. Similarly, we would double check the type of applicants that were overrepresented and avoided inviting people with similar affiliations and backgrounds (for example female researchers working in the built environment). These applicants were moved to a back-up list. Next, we did the ‘marginality check’ of the sample based on the following central question: in how...
far are marginalized voices/subjectivities (indirectly) included? Based on this marginality-check we assessed what type of marginalities were absent in the sample. We also checked whether all applicants on the longlist with a high marginality score made it to the sample. If not, we would re-assess those applications and add them to the sample.

Lastly, the shortlist was discussed with the full selection committee which resulted in a final list of 33 invitees.

It was initially desired that some of these participants could take part in local “hubs”, in which they gathered physically with other participants from their city and together virtually joined the online Arena. However, Covid-19 precautions did not allow for such a “hub” format. In its place, there was an option of virtual, city-based hubs. One group of individuals composed a ‘Lisbon Hub’, which attended breakout rooms together and have ongoing endeavours outside of the Arena itself. Several community-led initiatives, including Bela Flor Respira in Campolide, Locals in Ajuda and Res do Chão in Marvila, are engaging in discussions together about what a sustainable and just Lisbon looks like. They have so far together composed a book chapter and academic article on the UrbanA process, particularly within a wider context of urban transformation.

4.6.3.3 Structure of the event

The “Berlin” Arena was held entirely online using Zoom for video conferencing and miro and a Google document for notetaking. Its structure was designed to fulfill the objectives of focused discussions on, and consolidation of, the governance arrangements and engagement of the UrbanA CoP with practitioners. The overacting question of how translocal learning can be fostered also played a central role. As mentioned, the Arena took into consideration feedback from previous arenas, for example to allow for longer breakout room discussions and more virtual networking and mingling space.

The Arena was structured in seven sessions over the course of two days, March 18 and 19, 2021. Group energizers, check-ins, and breaks were interspersed throughout the sessions to ensure that participants and hosts alike had fresh minds and high spirits. For a condensed overview of the “Berlin” Arena agenda, please see Annex 5.

To provide a concrete starting-point for later discussions, Session 1 featured two initiatives from Berlin: BuergerEnergie Berlin and Changing Cities. The prior is an initiative focused on remunicipalisation of the Berlin energy grid and the latter is focused on low-carbon mobility and public space. Representatives were interviewed live about governance themes, which were readily linked to the Enabling Governance Arrangements. Afterwards, participants discussed these examples of governance for sustainable and just cities, specifically regarding the themes and whether (and how) they had encountered them during their own experiences.

Session 2 offered an opportunity for personal exchange in informal breakout rooms with the Berlin practitioners from Session 1, as well as a third initiative called Donut for Berlin (a local rendition of the Donut Economics Action Lab focused on ecologically and socially sustainable societies).

Day 1 concluded with Session 3, in which collective insights were shared from the previous sessions, followed by a presentation of the six Enabling Governance Arrangements, and then by small breakout rooms to discuss each arrangement (according to the preference of participants). In these breakout rooms, two guiding questions were asked:
● Using examples that you know: Which parts of this Enabling Governance Arrangement do you consider important for making cities more sustainable and just?

● What are the barriers faced by city-makers who are trying to implement this Enabling Governance Arrangement? Also think about context-specific barriers (e.g. between wealthy/poor, big/small, eastern/western cities etc.)

Afterwards, the following, more-generic question was posed in order to reach beyond our six initial Enabling Governance Arrangements and gather additional themes:

● Beyond the governance arrangements introduced in this session, what are other ways to support governance for sustainable and just cities?

Day 2 opened in the morning with an informal mingling session (Session 4) in which participants were in randomly generated 3-person breakout rooms (“chat roulette style”) with each other.

Session 5 first addressed the topic of translocal learning with a presentation on the merits and challenges of translocal learning for sustainable and just cities. This presentation also shared the main feedback on scenarios as a tool for translocal learning from pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar. Next, participants were invited to join a “Listening” room to hear about the Donut for Berlin initiative and its take on learning from other cities for the governance of sustainable and just cities. Alternatively, most participants were encouraged to join “Talking” rooms where they discussed the following guiding questions:

● Why is it important (or not) to learn from other places?

● What has helped you learn from another place? What was not useful? (aka site visit, case study, webinar, phone call....)

● What support do you need for translocal learning (e.g. from EU funding schemes)?

Insights from both the “Listening” and “Talking” rooms were then shared in plenary.

Session 6 was another informal mingling session where participants could gather in virtual groups according to a shared topic or location of interest.

The final session, Session 7, aimed at reflecting on the previous sessions’ discussions and gathering more action-oriented governance items. In this session, a practitioner from the Donut for Berlin initiative who had attended the entire Arena presented a synthesis of his key takeaways. Next, the same groups from Session 3 reconvened to continue their discussions on the Enabling Governance Arrangements and beyond:

● From your perspective, WHICH ACTORS (e.g. municipalities, civil society, private sector) could do WHAT ACTIONS (e.g. create supportive structures) in order to support initiatives for sustainable and just cities?

● Let’s get specific: How exactly can these actions be initiated (by us in our different roles)? (If time permits, ask groups to select the 3 most important actions)

Finally, the “Berlin” Arena concluded in plenary where participants and consortium members were invited to share insights from their discussions and their important actions. A brief wrap-up set the scene for upcoming UrbanA activities in WP6.
4.6.3.4 Documentation of the event

Good documentation of the event was crucial for ensuring that participants’ insights and experience were incorporated into WP5 outputs - predominantly the Enabling Governance Arrangements.

All sessions were documented on miro frames by both consortium members and participants. A comprehensive miro board was designed so that every breakout room had its own frame for collective note taking. After the event, the pre-chosen notetakers for each breakout room were also asked to summarise their miro notes in a Google doc for easier comprehension by event organisers later on. For one of the mingling sessions, the miro board also enabled groups with similar interests and/or cities to locate each other and join in a shared virtual room.

Figure 3: Example miro board of a breakout room at the “Berlin” Arena

Furthermore, all plenary presentations and interviews with Berlin practitioners were audio/video recorded so that those who were not able to attend the Arena would have access to them. The video playlist can be found at this link: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MQ-BZ9sC170&list=PLjbNPZqbaFXzmQ9RvuXr9p3OhhTRAWNX&ab_channel=UrbanA-ArenasforJust%26SustainableCities](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MQ-BZ9sC170&list=PLjbNPZqbaFXzmQ9RvuXr9p3OhhTRAWNX&ab_channel=UrbanA-ArenasforJust%26SustainableCities).

As a follow-up after the Arena, two blog posts were written. The first gave a general overview of the event and contained the video recordings (Link here: [https://medium.com/urban-arenas-for-sustainable-and-just-cities/governance-for-sustainable-and-just-cities-looking-back-at-the-berlin-arena-64549ff9b329](https://medium.com/urban-arenas-for-sustainable-and-just-cities/governance-for-sustainable-and-just-cities-looking-back-at-the-berlin-arena-64549ff9b329)).
The second blog was more content-focused and summarized the main themes that were discussed over the two days (Link here: https://medium.com/urban-arenas-for-sustainable-and-just-cities/collection-building-blocks-for-sustainable-and-just-cities-insights-from-the-berlin-arena-6ce9b69839a2)
5. Final WP5 outputs: Governance Interventions, Governance Scenarios, Enabling Governance Arrangements

As illustrated by previous sections, strong efforts have been made to develop WP5 outputs in a co-creative manner. Where appropriate and constructive, WP5 outputs have incorporated input from UrbanA consortium and Community of Practice (CoP). The following section offers a summary of the input received throughout the course of WP5, including at project meetings and the two Arena events. It also contains, or points to, the final outputs themselves. All of the final Governance Interventions, Governance Scenarios, and Enabling Governance Arrangements are available on the UrbanA wiki.

5.1 Governance Interventions

While UrbanA is not a research project, a detailed complementary analysis of real-world Governance Interventions from previous EU-funded research has been conducted in order to build an empirical basis for the generation of recommendations on how to organize governance for just and sustainable cities. Please see our definition on page 4 and sections 4.1 to 4.3 above for details on methodology.

Table 1. Governance interventions analysed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of intervention (links lead to respective Wiki-pages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bottom-up resistance against gentrification in Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Citizens rescuing and sharing food in Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Community led affordable housing in Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dealing flexibly with and learning from resistance in Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Biodiversity protection and social justice in the Barcelona Natural Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Inner-city community energy in London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Citizens share in Berlin Energy Grid for sustainable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Public-private partnerships for sustainability infrastructure in Athens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After input from a consortium member, Governance Intervention number 11, Public-private partnerships for sustainability infrastructure in Athens, was claimed to be a contentious case. It thus serves a slightly different purpose to the others, which feature more positive instances. The Athens case demonstrates possible pitfalls when developing sustainable infrastructure in a public-private partnership. This intervention, extracted from a Southeastern European setting, outlines the partial success of Governance Interventions and encourages caution about the externalities of public-private partnerships (especially in the context of austerity that may increase in the post-COVID era).
Other than this slight re-framing of Athens intervention, there have been no changes to the Governance Interventions, since the recent focus of consortium and CoP input has been on the scenarios and Enabling Governance Arrangements.

To illustrate how our guiding questions from the governance framework (see section 4.2) have been answered in the various cases, we include one example of such a detailed description here in the main body of this report. The other ten detailed descriptions can be found in Annex 3 and on the UrbanA WiKi (click on titles in the list above). As the foundation for further work, these detailed descriptions remain unchanged since the versions printed in WP5 Deliverable 5.1.

5.1.1 Sample rich description of a Governance Intervention - Inner-city community energy in London

GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 7:
Inner-city community energy in London

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]


Repowering is a cooperatively owned community energy initiative for multi-unit residential buildings. It began with one project in Brixton, and later became an organization called Repowering, which now actively creates and manages replications of the original project throughout London, and also helps support other community energy projects in London (PATHWAYS_03:4).

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

Energy. More specifically, the policy fields of (renewable) energy policy, community energy policy, and fuel poverty policy.

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

Repowering is trying to promote the small-scale generation and use of renewable energy among communities in London as well as facilitating energy efficiency initiatives, meanwhile aiming to reduce energy poverty in its project regions and build skills and knowledge about renewable energy via (paid) internships for local youth. The key goals as stated by the group include: start generating renewable energy in Brixton, develop opportunities for a community investment vehicle, increase resilience by reducing dependence on big energy companies, use retained profits to educate residents about energy efficiency, tackle fuel poverty, and provide training and employment for local people. (TT Brixton)
4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?

The formation of the original Brixton Energy group and the planning and implementation of the three projects, BES1, BES2, BES3, occurred roughly between 2011-2013 (PATHWAYS_03:6). Since BES3 until present day, Repowering London has continued to create its own, and engage with others’, community solar initiatives. In May 2018, Repowering installed the world’s first blockchain energy trade on a national grid.

5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)

Non-government led and implemented. The case is characterized by the leadership of non-government actors, community members. However, the Lambeth Council was very supportive (helped build connections and hold regular meetings in the beginning stages, provided knowledge in energy and project management, assisted with planning permissions for the projects, financially supported projects through a small fund) (PATHWAYS_03:8) and the Council and other local governmental organizations are official partners of the intervention (Repowering website, ‘our partners’).

6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?

This intervention is a good example of a successful initiative studied within an EU-funded research project that connects sustainability and justice in an urban setting, and demonstrates the role of local initiatives in energy transitions.

7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) Governance Intervention?

PATHWAYS’ in-depth case report on Brixton Energy (PATHWAYS_03) and the current Repowering website (Repowering website) are the main source of information. They are in the zotero library. An interview in July 2020 with Agamemnon Otero, Co-Founder Brixton Energy complimented the information found from these sources.

b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:

   a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

This intervention was documented as a case study within the PATHWAYS project (2013-2016) (PATHWAYS_04). PATHWAYS explored the transition pathways to sustainable, low carbon societies through analysis of select cases using integrated assessment modelling, socio-technical transition analysis, and initiative-based learning. Initiative Based Learning (IBL) was used to study the evolution of Brixton Energy, a cooperatively owned solar energy project in London, England, and the UK’s first inner-city renewable energy co-operative. PATHWAYS studied the gestation, development and implementation of the initial program, and analysed its potential for replication and transfer across contexts and scales.
b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.

Energy and Mobility solutions, Governance and participation processes, Policies and practices for inclusion of disadvantaged groups, Sustainable households. Brixton case was explicitly highlighted in (Impact) evaluation and assessment framework.

9. Problematization and priority:

a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

The problematization of energy poverty, and the desire for education, employment, and projects for estates came directly from listening to community needs (Otero interview).

Inequality is most directly shown on Repowering’s website through the concept of energy poverty. Energy poverty occurs when a “household suffers from a lack of adequate energy services in the home” which includes “adequate warmth, cooling, lighting and the energy to power appliances are essential services needed to guarantee a decent standard of living and citizens’ health.” (EU energy poverty observatory). Since energy poverty is a consequence of low income, healthy standards of living in urban dwellings can be positioned as a social inequality. A more specific component of energy poverty is fuel poverty, which refers to the inability to keep a dwelling adequately heated.

This specific problematization appears to be raised by Brixton community members during the early stage of the first solar initiative. The team discovered, through door-to-door consultations, that the most important issue for residents was their electricity bills. Therefore, the initiative became more focused on trying to address this via the Community Energy Efficiency Fund (PATHWAYS_03:11).

Repowering also recognizes the need for skill building, employment, and engagement in the area, which has high unemployment and low income relative to other London boroughs.

b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?

Yes, addressing energy/fuel poverty and increasing opportunity in the neighbourhood is a strong and explicit motivator behind the intervention, as seen in the intervention’s goals (Q3).

c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address? (see Database of drivers of injustice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No.
2. Material and livelihood inequalities
3. Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization
4. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration
5. Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns
6. Unfit institutional structures
7. Limited citizen participation in urban planning
8. Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities
9. Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism
10. Weak(ened) civil society

c) Actor constellations

10. Who initiated the intervention?

It was born out of a Transition Town initiative, TT Brixton, in 2007. There was a specific working group on ‘Buildings and Energy’ whose members (locals with an interest and knowledge about renewable energy) began to meet and discuss possibilities of a local solar project (PATHWAYS_03:8).

11. Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)

The benefits are concentrated in the local community, for any individual who wishes to be involved in the project (either through being a shareholder, recipient of community energy efficiency funds, or a youth employed by the project). However, it could be argued that there are larger scale benefits of renewable energy generation regarding climate change mitigation. Additionally, since the intervention has gained attention from, and is working directly with (up to) national-level policy makers, the benefits could be even more widespread, if their influence enables more similar projects.

12. Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor types</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Actor name and role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid/ 3rd sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Platforms

NGOs

Social movements

Political parties

Media

Unions

Social entreprises

Transition Town Brixton (community interest company, provided initial platform for the intervention),

Core Brixton Energy team, later the Repowering team (spearheading the intervention, now performing administrative and other organizational tasks)

For profit enterprises

Simmons & Simmons (legal advice)

HSBC (tax help) Southern Solar (installation assistance)

Local/regional government

Lambeth Council’s sustainability unit (Running the Low Carbon Zone group)

Regional organizations

Various housing boards (i.e. United Residents Housing and the Loughborough Estate Management Board were consulted with, gave permission for the projects)

National government

Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy (formerly Dpt. Energy and Climate Change), gave Repowering funding from the DECC’s Community Energy Peer Mentoring Fund

Otero was involved in writing national community energy policy

Supranational government

International networks

Community members (each project is run by a separate community benefit society),

Other initiatives

Community non members (participate in outreach events, receive energy advice etc. even if they are not a shareholder) Other local community groups (helped form the intervention, collaborate with it) Carbon Leapfrog Charity (enabled initial networking with sustainability professionals)

13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

Enabling configurations for community renewable energy (Stakeholders include the federal government):
The beginning of the UK’s Feed-In-Tariff (FIT) program in 2010 created a more friendly environment to small-scale, community-based renewables. This is an indirect impact.

Enabling configurations for community engagement/collaboration (Stakeholders include Lambeth Council and the Brixton team/Repowering):

The local government, Lambeth Council, which had a small group running a Low Carbon Zone served as an intermediary organization in the beginning which helped the team organize themselves and contact other relevant groups. The enabling configuration is the connectedness of this Council to various groups in the area. However, this group was small and had minimal capacity.

14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?

Citizens have been the founders and drivers of the intervention from the very beginning. The intervention’s cooperative structure relies upon community engagement in order to function (financial investment, regular meetings, decision-making etc.) and the intervention engages with a wider community base in order to address energy poverty and provide opportunities for employment and learning (Repowering website_home).

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

Each project (BES1, 2, 3) is run by a separate cooperative and Repowering is a community benefit society where decision-making power is horizontally distributed and participatory: “The society is run by its members and a board of directors who come from the local community. Governance of the society is truly democratic as each member has one vote, regardless of the amount they invest” (Repowering website_our model). The larger-picture strategic operations of Repowering and its various projects are run by a full staff team.

16. Exclusion:

   a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?

This intervention operates under an inclusive model, since it is a community benefit society, and it reinvests in, and engages with the community. However, those who could not afford to invest in the projects would at least be excluded from their financial return.

   b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?

It is necessary to raise capital in order to finance the projects, so this can have exclusionary effects. An impact of this possible exclusion is that only those who are financially capable of investing in the projects are able to receive their benefits (return on investment) and have a formal say (vote) about them. However, the threshold investment to be a member is relatively low (investment pledges for current projects begin at £50), and it is less expensive for a resident to invest than an outsider, so that barrier may not be unsurpassable. Also, the intervention has community workshops and open general meetings, which reduces exclusion. Therefore, exclusion is minimal overall due to open project meetings and community initiatives for those that do not have the means to invest.

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)
As mentioned, the Transition Town Brixton initiative, which had a specific working group on buildings and energy, triggered the formation of the original community group, ‘Brixton Energy’. There are also a set of broader context conditions which may have triggered the intervention, with the establishment of the FIT scheme likely being influential.

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)

Municipal level: Various planning and licensing requirements.

National Economic policies: the UK’s Feed-In-Tariff program (enacted in 2010 and cancelled in 2019) was essential for ensuring investor security and therefore the financial viability of the projects.


European Regulatory policies: European Union Renewable Energy Directive 2009, requiring member states to fulfil at least 20% of their total energy needs with renewables by 2020, listed Feed-In-Tariff schemes (such as the one that supported Brixton Energy) as a type of support scheme that could help achieve this target.

Note that only the FIT and the Low Carbon Transition Plan were explicitly mentioned in the documentation (PATHWAYS_03).

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country’s constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

There is no single UK constitution, rather a collection of statutes, case law, and other decisions. Under UK law, London is the only city with its own assembly (Greater London Authority Act 1999). Its powers, functions, funding, and responsibilities are determined by laws passed by Parliament. The London Assembly (including Lambeth borough) has limited power over transport, environment and housing among others. Lambeth Council’s authority/responsibility to regulate renewable energy projects may be linked with the constitutional powers and responsibilities given to the London Assembly, however more in-depth research is needed to determine this.

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policy makers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation etc.)

Out of necessity, project proponents interacted a great deal with both local and national governments. According to Otero, relations with the Local Lambeth Council and the national authorities were tough and frustrating, but necessary in order for the intervention to function.

Although the Council’s sustainability unit was supportive, it was under-funded and had limited capacity: "They [Council] put good ideas and engaged people in a tower and locked them up and we
basically found our way to the crevices and dug away with our fingernails to get through the door. It was really tough.” Meanwhile, project proponents’ perception of national government was decidedly less positive. The national policy landscape surrounding community energy was initially non-existent, so Otero helped write several national policies: “They put us on every board you could imagine, they gave us MBEs, and then changed their minds! I wrote policy for all three governments, they would listen and say yes yes yes, and then pull the teeth out of it that held the whole thing together, put the pretty pictures that we got on there, then launch it and then not give anybody anything.” Additionally, the national government was seen as somewhat of an adversary, since it made several unfavourable policy changes (FIT reduction than cancellation, cancellation of the seed enterprise investment scheme, and unfavourable re-definition of cooperatives).

These views of and interactions with both national and local governments may have ultimately supported the intervention in an unexpected way: “Since the policy was so unstable, we had to continuously look for new innovation. The only reason why we came up with all these innovations is because I wasn’t going to go out like that! What, because the government changes, and everything is changing, I’m going to roll over and die? No. You gotta come up with better solutions.” (Otero interview)

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

The intervention is financed by a cooperative business model. Community members buy shares in the cooperative, which then funds the purchase and installation of renewable energy assets. The returns from these assets (aka from generating energy) are given back to the shareholders, and/or invested in a community fund (for community energy projects). (Repowering website_our model)

The FIT program was a significant contributor to the financial viability of the projects in this intervention. It provided a guaranteed return on investment for a period of 20 years, which then made investing more attractive. While current projects are not impacted by the FiT phase-out, it will force Repowering to find other funding sources to rely on (PATHWAYS_03:16). Some examples, from BE1 and 3 project manager, Andre Pinho: “ 1) finding seed money through different funding schemes and grants, knowing that these will eventually dry up; or 2) finding councils and local initiatives with money to invest in Repowering London’s expertise.” (PATHWAYS_03:16) The intervention has also received funding from various sources, such as the previously mentioned Community Energy Peer Mentoring Fund.

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

As mentioned, the FiT program was phased out rapidly and then cancelled, which makes the financing scheme for future projects less viable (since the export tariff and feed-in tariff won’t exist). Other regulatory supports (e.g. seed investment scheme) were also cancelled. Therefore many of the initial enabling conditions for the intervention no longer exist.

Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

- a. Regulatory framework
The volatility and eventual cancellation of the national FIT program was a central challenge for the intervention (PATHWAYS_03:16) (see part d). Same with the seed investment scheme cancellation and the re-definition of cooperative such that Repowering was required to identify as a Community Benefit Society instead. Local government regulations (like required planning permissions) were also reported to be an obstacle (PATHWAYS_03:10).

- **b. Legitimacy**

Legitimacy “Obstacle - legitimacy” This is a novel intervention in a (low income) inner-city context and needed to be proven in order to be seen as a legitimate business model. The newness created investor uncertainty, see part d. Gaining planning permission for the installations from local councils required convincing them that they were a good idea, without any proof, for BES1 (PATHWAYS_03:17).

- **c. Public awareness**

A rapidly changing national political landscape reduced trust in federal support for interventions like Repowering, and consequently reduced the faith of local authorities in Brixton’s success. See part d. Engaging the community also proved difficult at first, since the Repowering team had limited experience with it (PATHWAYS_03:10).

- **d. Finances**

One notable obstacle was the difficulty raising funds (£58,000) for BES1 from community members. Since it was a new project, with no track record, individuals were hesitant to invest. Additionally, while many made pledges, this proved not to be a reliable indicator of actual financial support. Once BES1 was established, it was easier to find investors for the others because the community had more trust in the organization and had seen an instance of success (PATHWAYS_03:13). Another financial obstacle was the need to work quickly to meet deadlines imposed by the FIT program. The FIT program drastically lowered its tariff rates in early 2012, so Brixton rushed to accredit BES1 under the scheme before this happened. Otherwise, the project would have been guaranteed much lower returns over its 20-year lifetime (PATHWAYS_03:13). In addition, there are regulatory barriers to the community energy model because the current energy framework requires the projects to sell their energy to big suppliers at wholesale costs, but becoming a licensed independent energy supplier themselves so that they could sell directly to customers is very costly (PATHWAYS_03:19).

- **e. Others (please name)**

Other identified barriers included navigating “the legal aspects of the scheme” and “defining the company structure and statutes” (PATHWAYS_03:10).

f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles

**24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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1. Unstable/cancelled FIT program

Some reported options include: Repowering looking for private partners to invest in community projects, and also applying for Repowering to become a licensed electricity provider (PATHWAYS_03:16). There is also a recent pilot project for a peer-to-peer energy trading system in Brixton to see how decentralized energy production could be financially viable in a post FIT landscape (Peer-to-peer Energy Trading in Brixton).

Work was done to improve relations/trust with Lambeth council, and Lambeth council helped them navigate through planning permissions. “The main hurdle is often convincing the council’s corporate risk and legal teams. This is best overcome by demonstrating strong fundamentals for a project: financial acumen, social deliverables and resident support. Commitments to social cohesion, education, and reducing fuel poverty are mandated in every political party. Showing that [a] project helps the council to address these issues can bring council support and partnership” (Otero interview Brixton Energy).

They also proved that the business model was viable with BES1: “The greater local exposure to the technology along with Repowering’s positive reputation and credibility through earlier demonstrations further benefited local acceptance and funding for the projects.” (PATHWAYS_03:18)

They improved over time by making efforts to listen to local needs and priorities, and got support from the experienced Transition Town group (PATHWAYS_03:11). Engaging residents (youth) with solar panel-making workshops increased engagement with the overall project. Offering payment for their internship program increased participation. It was also essential to engage with “Estate Mamas”, middle aged women who lived there and were engaged in the community. “By supporting them, we could count on them with our projects and provide for the community. That is the only thing I have really learned and they were my greatest teachers.” (Otero interview)

2. Initial difficulty gaining trust and navigating planning permissions from local council, stemmed from a lack of proof of concept, creating legitimacy concerns

3. Community engagement

They improved over time by making efforts to listen to local needs and priorities, and got support from the experienced Transition Town group (PATHWAYS_03:11). Engaging residents (youth) with solar panel-making workshops increased engagement with the overall project. Offering payment for their internship program increased participation. It was also essential to engage with “Estate Mamas”, middle aged women who lived there and were engaged in the community. “By supporting them, we could count on them with our projects and provide for the community. That is the only thing I have really learned and they were my greatest teachers.” (Otero interview)

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

The initiative has resulted in economic gains for the community, although their extent/significance is not clear. These include a 3% return on investment (mainly financed by the FIT program), hiring locals to assist with installations, and training young people in paid internship positions (Repowering website). The general objectives of the initiative regarding sustainability, as listed in Q1, were to a) start generating renewable energy in Brixton, b) increase resilience by reducing dependence on big energy companies, and c) use retained profits to educate residents about energy efficiency. To date, Repowering has made progress towards these goals and achieved the following: 532kWp of installed...
solar capacity, 447,358 kWh electricity generated annually, avoided 114 tonnes of GHG emissions annually, and has raised £154,500 for communities to spend on related energy initiatives like efficiency measures (Repowering website_home). Objectives regarding inequality include a) tackling fuel poverty, and b), providing training and employment for local people. Progress on these general objectives is not easily measurable, however Repowering has thus far, engaged 123 paid interns and employed a handful of locals for the installation of each project. It is unclear what percentage of Repowering’s full time staff are local. The community energy fund amount of £154,500 will have gone towards reducing energy poverty, with unknown (but expectedly positive) impacts.

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

Please fill in any information on social learning that has occurred in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project)[4]. Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context
(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

- a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city…) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

BES1 was the first intervention of its kind (inner-city renewable energy cooperative) in London (PATHWAYS_03:23). The intervention built off of the Transition Town movement/network, specifically Transition Town Brixton. The intervention also benefited from various community initiatives: Lambeth Council’s Green Community Champions initiative (iv: visibility and identity by providing a platform for Brixton Energy to hold meetings and build connections) (PATHWAYS_03:8), and the Hyde Farm Climate Action Network in London (reported as “establishing links with other sustainability initiatives”) (PATHWAYS_03:9). However, since it was a unique intervention, most specific learning was up to the proponents: "It wasn’t like we got an answer from other people and they helped us out. It was the other way around. We trailblazed the whole sector." (Otero interview)

- b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

In its development, Brixton Energy was reportedly advised by other successful models of small-scale community renewable energy, i.e. Ovesco in Sussex. The initiative’s location (inner-city) and business model were unique, but they were still able to benefit from practical advice (mechanism iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support) (PATHWAYS_03:8). However, according to Otero, this advice was minimal and not extremely helpful. Rather, an individual from another company shared a template of how to set up community energy and introduced proponents to other community energy groups in a series of three meetings. However, most learning came directly from listening to community members and through interactions with specific individuals at Lambeth council’s sustainability unit (Otero interview).

Learning content
27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?

- a. from previous experiences in the same urban context

Nothing has been reported on this regarding experiences outside of the intervention, however, BES2 and BES3, and later projects have all been at least partial replications of BES1 and each other. They used accumulated experience to form a systematic project design and management process, which reduced trial and error and sped up the process for later projects. Learning which promoted replicability reportedly included both hard skills, like how to handle the technology, to soft skills, such as how to work effectively with the local council to speed up permitting processes, or how to engage with community members (PATHWAYS_03:18).

- b. from inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere

No reports on specific knowledge gained from peer-to-peer learning with Ovesco and other community energy projects, other than “practical advice” (PATHWAYS_3:10). As Otero indicated, there was not too much peer learning due to the project’s trailblazing nature.

- c. from other knowledge gathering/research

Some reported areas of learning during the implementation of BES1 included: project management and legal issues, energy and financial projections, and supplier contacts (PATHWAYS_03:9). Other important learning experiences included understanding the community members’ priorities and interests (for example, door-to-door campaigns revealed that reducing electricity bill costs was important) and that the key to community engagement was the co-production of ideas such that residents felt involved and empowered (PATHWAYS_03:11).

Learning process

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?

According to the PATHWAYS documentation, Repowering reportedly adapted the model of previous community energy initiatives in the UK to consider its inner-city location and a different financial model (PATHWAYS_3:10). However, Otero reported that the project was entirely unique, and therefore not adapted to the circumstances but entirely built from the bottom up to suit them.

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?

Overcoming (or currently handling) obstacles such as the FIT program, via experimenting with new business models such as peer-to-peer trading, highlights the need to be adaptive and resilient in the face of national policy instability. Gaining trust, familiarity, legitimacy with the community and local government likely helped speed up the learning and implementation process per replicated project (the first project reportedly took 8-9 months, the second 3 months, and the third 1 month (PATHWAYS_3:18).

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote) and the actors involved in using them.
No specific tools were used, however the team has regular meetings and structures for reflection and learning. The team has Monday meetings where they discuss issues, raise questions, and everyone has three minutes to explain what they’re doing and highlight any problems they’re having, whether it is a systemic issue or a personal team issue. “This way we can lance any boils together once a week.” Then monthly, they do a deep dive to go into any problem areas. Then the volunteer directors will come in and scrutinize any issues that have been raised and spend a couple days working through them (Otero interview).

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

- a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]

Yes, replicability has been central to the intervention, since BES2 and BES3, and later projects have all been at least partial replications of BES1 and each other (PATHWAYS_03:18). Suggestions have also been made by the operators of the peer-to-peer trading pilot (EDF Energy and University College London) that the new business model could be scaled up in the UK and in Colombia (Future energy systems; Transactive energy).

- b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?

The projects have all been replicated in Lambeth borough, London. Additionally, the intention of forming Repowering out of the Brixton Energy initiative was to be able to replicate and scale up the community energy solutions. It currently supports similar projects throughout London (PATHWAYS_03:10). The newer peer-to-peer model is seen as transferable to communities in dense urban areas worldwide (Future energy systems).

- c. Who has made the claims?

Project proponents, the press, and actors in the peer-to-peer pilot.

- d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?

As of 2014: “Repowering believes that the viable penetration of community energy (to its estimated potential of powering 1 million homes in the UK by 2020 (DECC, 2014) will require professionalization; an operating body that can develop at a larger scale; and the streamlining of processes (both community and energy aspects)” (PATHWAYS_03:16). From this, limits to transferability could be: a) a lack of a more powerful organizational body to coordinate upscaling, and b) learning/implementation processes are too experimental/messy still. The latter of these two limits may have been more recently overcome, since the model has been replicated more times in a variety of contexts within London.

32. In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?[6]

PATHWAYS’ case study report of Brixton had a section called “Replication, learning, and scaling up”. It contained details on how the model was replicated into many projects, and how accumulated
learning (about soft and hard project aspects) contributed towards a more systematic process each time. These learning processes were not described in depth.

Regarding how Repowering has made its experience accessible to citymakers, it was very involved in local and national politics - visited by federal energy and climate change ministers and “Through its visibility and praised success, Repowering London has gained access to relevant decision-making processes both at local and national levels. Besides its operational relationship with various councils, Repowering London members have regularly been consulted on national debates about community energy, which additionally promoted urban community energy in the political sphere ...” (PATHWAYS_03:16). Repowering has also historically been involved in the Dept. of Energy and Climate Change’s Community Energy Contact Group, which aimed to identify barriers and solutions for community energy (PATHWAYS_03:16). However, recall that Otero’s reported experience participating in policy writing was frustrating and that the final policy outcomes were not satisfactory.

Repowering also offers its professional services to facilitate other community energy projects (via legal, structural, financial, marketing base to co-produce similar initiatives with community groups), however: “In terms of collective learning and information sharing, there is an on-going debate within Repowering about what the initiative is happy to open-source, hence share openly and freely, and what is considered to be worth protecting and retaining as exclusive expertise (Pinho, Interview)” (PATHWAYS_03:19).

33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

Yes, see Q31a. All documented “replications” or cases of support (or perhaps better called “iterations of various community energy projects”) were in the same urban context (inner-city London neighbourhoods). However, the intervention has gotten a lot of good press and political recognition (PATHWAYS_03:16), and so it has likely inspired other projects. In addition to their own projects, “Repowering has been acting as ‘mentor’ for a number community groups across London eager to replicate Brixton energy’s model in their local areas (Rosendale Energy, Streatham Power, Vauxhall Energy, Hackney Energy and En10ergy)” (PATHWAYS_03:18).

j) Structural learning

34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

There is no strong evidence for durable structural learning. As mentioned, project proponents participated in creating community energy policy, which was "toothless" according to Otero, but may have generally contributed to a national discussion about sustainability and justice. Additionally, Repowering proponents created an intermediary policy body called Community Energy England.
Otherwise, the experiences from Repowering are leading into new initiatives like the Energy Garden (https://www.energygarden.org.uk/), which aims to integrate with more actors and in inter-city partnerships. (Otero interview)

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

The qualities and capabilities of the core Repowering team were particular enabling factors, since they were highly knowledgeable about renewable energy and passionate and motivated (PATHWAYS_03:8). These personal assets, along with a constructive team dynamic, enabled the intervention to successfully emerge. As explained by Otero: "Entrepreneurs are a very specific breed of people, who deal with loss and failure regularly and use it as fuel for success. They will tell you, that until you have lost, you will never succeed. And the successes you will have prior to losing are not worth the success. The only way to change a sector is to be willing to fail, to pivot, and to change throughout."

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

Using accumulated experience, partnerships and community enthusiasm to achieve replication and upscaling aspirations amidst national policy instability.

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance

(from NATURVATION project)

NATURVATION’s NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed “management set-ups”):

- Government-led (Gov)
- Co-governance or hybrid governance (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
- Led by non-government actors (NGO)

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. Self-governing, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. Provision, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. Regulations, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. Enabling, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships

Appendix 2: Policy typology

(from NATURVATION project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Regulatory (administrative, command-&-control) | Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors | Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc. |
| Economic (financial, market-based) | Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable (or unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors | Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance and procurements. Negative incentives are taxes, fees and charges. |
| Informative (educational) | They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change | Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media. |
| Voluntary | Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private actors and/or non-governmental organisations. | Voluntary actions and agreements. |
5.2 Governance Scenarios

As outlined in the methodology section (section 4.4), eleven Governance Scenarios have been derived from the detailed descriptions of real-world Governance Interventions by way of summarizing their key elements (see also the definition on page 5).

Table 2: List of Governance Scenarios (as grounded in Governance Interventions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Detailed descriptions of Governance interventions)</th>
<th>(Brief) Governance scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bottom-up resistance against gentrification in Rome</td>
<td>1 Countering Gentrification: Community Based and Collaborative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Citizens rescuing and sharing food in Berlin</td>
<td>2 Tackling Waste: Community Practices for Food Rescuing and Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Community led affordable housing in Brussels</td>
<td>3 Reimagining Affordable Housing from the Ground Up: Community Land Trust Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dealing flexibly with and learning from resistance in Barcelona</td>
<td>4 Reclaiming Street Space: Cooperation for Neighbourhood Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Biodiversity protection and social justice in the Barcelona Natural Park</td>
<td>5 Negotiating Green Space Development: Balancing Long-Term Sustainability and Short-Term Social Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg</td>
<td>6 Collaborating Across Institutional Boundaries: Co-Creating Sustainable Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Inner-city community energy in London</td>
<td>7 From Electricity to Empowerment: Democratizing Urban Energy Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg</td>
<td>8 Overcoming Silos in Urban Regeneration Projects: Holistic Neighbourhood Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Citizens share in Berlin Energy Grid for sustainable energy</td>
<td>9 Creating a Sustainable Energy System: a Citizen-Driven Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam</td>
<td>10 Nurturing Trust in Community-Driven Regeneration: Continuity amidst Institutional Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Public-private partnerships for sustainability infrastructure in Athens</td>
<td>11 Bringing sustainable infrastructure: Carefully engaging in public-private partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Governance Scenarios have gone through multiple rounds of discussion and review by the UrbanA consortium and CoP. Firstly, feedback from a consortium project meeting in October 2020 provided valuable guidance for how to further improve the scenarios. Then, at the pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar, participants’ input served to evaluate the general method of Governance Scenarios as a way of facilitating translocal learning.

5.2.1 Ways to improve the Governance Scenarios - Summary of consortium feedback

When asking the UrbanA consortium explicitly for feedback on how to improve content, format and usage of the scenarios at a 2-day project meeting in October 2020, the scenarios as a tool for transferring knowledge across contexts were not challenged in principle. However, the general feedback was that the current scenarios could be improved in order to better reach their goals, that is, to inspire readers and contribute to learning for sustainable and just governance in cities. Three
strands for revision emerged. They primarily concern (1) the tone and the content of the scenarios (need for concreteness and for emphasis on fruitful processes), (2) their structure and style (a format that better guides the reader), as well as (3) their linkages to other materials (including UrbanA and other project material).

Regarding the tone and content of the scenarios, which was partly considered too abstract, there were several suggestions to increase their concreteness. The scenarios seemed loosely related to real-world cases, which make it difficult for the reader to identify with and understand the stories. Real and vibrating stories appeal and inspire people better than abstractions. It has been suggested to introduce, in the beginning of each scenario, the real case from which it derives and to explicitly indicate the issue it addresses. Concreteness also consists of explaining and stressing how obstacles to sustainability and justice in cities, as encountered by these initiatives, were successfully overcome. This point directly relates to targeting the reader’s needs. Specifically, we address people already interested in sustainability and justice concerns such as practitioners, activists, policy makers, or researchers. We assume that they seek for answers in terms of processes (how) rather than for explanations of certain situations (why). Since the scenarios aim to provide concrete knowledge about tools and mechanisms at play in real cases, for example the policy processes or organizational resources fruitfully used by initiatives, more emphasis should be put on successful strategies and transferable mechanisms rather than on obstacles and context specific barriers, while still being cautious about transparency in terms of challenges and obstacles. It was also suggested to better situate the cases in a broader (policy) context and to relate them to other initiatives addressing similar issues. Lastly, It was suggested to emphasize more the transformative role and the contribution of non-governmental actors and organizations in sustainable and just urban governance.

A second strand of feedback addressed the structure and style of the scenarios in terms of clarity. First, a more visible structure may guide the reader through the text. Adding headlines introducing each paragraph as well as bullet points on key issues were suggested. As it stands, the format of the scenarios was not found appealing to the reader. It has been highly recommended to add visuals such as graphs on actor constellations or collages of pictures and words that draw the reader’s attention. In addition, the writing style did not receive unanimous support. Titles which were found to be too long and abstract and the introductory sentence “let’s imagine” appeared unconvincing to some of our colleagues. The challenge is to make the story more concrete but also more sensitive, in order to catch the reader’s interest (with emotions) and to provide practical inputs.

A third strand of feedback addressed the relation of the scenarios to other materials and its usage. The scenarios aim to be an entry point to other work and material, both within and outside the UrbanA project, as well as a space for opening the dialogue. It is necessary to stress the linearity of building up knowledge in the UrbanA project: from approaches (WP3) and drivers of injustice (WP4) to scenarios (WP5) and keys (WP6). This relation can be made visible in the text by adding more hyperlinks to other entries of the wiki and possibly beyond. More generally, pointing out other resources for sustainable and just governance in cities could increase the value of the resource. Finally, the scenarios should be a tool for opening up the dialogue. Adding open questions in the end as well as leaving room for writing questions and criticism was suggested.
5.2.2 Assessing Governance Scenarios as a translocal learning tool - Summary of pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar input

Alongside feedback received at the project meeting, input from the pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar has been instrumental in assessing the method of scenarios as a translocal learning tool. As outlined in section 4.6.2, participants were asked to read a scenario and discuss what they liked, what could be improved, and their general thoughts on scenarios, including ‘cautionary tale examples’ like the Athens public-private partnership case.

While much of the feedback was specifically directed towards the intervention itself (i.e. how the intervention could be improved) as opposed to the scenario itself, there were enough comments on scenarios in general to provide an assessment. Overall, the feedback was rather mixed, with some groups being highly enthusiastic about the scenario technique, and others being more critical. On average, the scenarios were seen as having good potential as a learning tool.

Regarding positive feedback, the scenarios were appreciated for being a direct link to interesting best practices in urban sustainability governance. Participants said that the scenarios could help others begin to imagine, discuss, and be inspired by alternative visions of sustainable and just cities. The scenarios were, for the most part, seen as being well-written and readable and striking a good balance between being accessible and detailed (such that they cater to different groups of readers).

Regarding how the scenarios could be improved, participants offered feedback on their presentation and content. For the prior, it was suggested that the scenarios be presented in a more visually-pleasing manner - for example, breaking up the text blocks and adding images. Regarding the scenarios’ content, participants suggested connecting the scenarios with other similar interventions through linking web platforms, relevant social media networks and so on. More fundamentally, some participants indicated that there was not enough guidance for how to apply this intervention in very different contexts and it was challenging to see how the scenario could be applied in another place. No concrete suggestions were made for overcoming this persistent challenge. Finally, some participants were seeking more specific, tangible details of how the intervention unfolded. For example, information on actor configurations or the problems addressed. During the webinar, there may have been confusion, or lack of awareness about the embedded links between the scenarios and the detailed descriptions, which offer this detail and context.

In summary, scenarios were seen as an inspirational and original method for facilitating learning. Some participants expressed a preference for sharing stories in this format over traditional academic case studies. However, concerns over their context-dependency persisted, with several groups claiming that it could be difficult to learn from the scenarios as the differences between cities might be too large. Additionally, for effective translocal learning, participants indicated that the scenarios needed to be accompanied by the more detailed ‘back-story’ and employed in a more interactive way such as through transfer workshops.

5.2.3 Implementation of scenario feedback and final versions of scenarios

The feedback from the UrbanA consortium and CoP highlighted several opportunities for scenario updates, as well as for reflection on the method. In this section, we explain the new changes and justify where we chose to remain with our original approach. The section concludes with the final scenarios themselves.
Many changes were made to the scenarios to make them more ‘real’, more visually appealing, more connected with other UrbanA outputs, and more useful for starting dialogue. Firstly, to relate the scenarios back to their ‘real, vibrating stories’ we directed the reader to the detailed description by adding the following sentence and a hyperlink at the very beginning: “This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.” We then added a brief description of the intervention immediately after the scenario. Additionally, further details were added to the scenarios about how obstacles were overcome. This helped make the cases more concrete and realistic. Secondly, to make the scenarios more readable and visually appealing, we introduced narrative-style questions throughout the text. For example, “How could they [initiative proponents] learn from similar initiatives to get the ball rolling?” The questions gave the scenarios a more story-like flow and broke up large sections of the text into digestible chunks. Relevant images were also added to each scenario. Thirdly, to better integrate the knowledge which has accumulated from previous UrbanA work, we added hyperlinks to wiki pages for the relevant Enabling Governance Arrangements (WP5), approaches (WP3), and drivers of injustice (WP4) at the end of each scenario. Fourthly, two changes helped make the scenarios better dialogue-openers. We added open questions at the end of each scenario which called for input and critique, and we added contact information for the Governance Interventions in the beginning of the detailed descriptions (which were linked at the beginning and end of each scenario).

Some of the scenario feedback was either not desirable or feasible to implement. Notably, while some individuals were seeking more specific, tangible details on the intervention, we chose to reserve these details for the detailed description. This was done to maintain a shorter scenario length and more abstract style such that readers could imagine a similar intervention playing out in their city. Furthermore, beyond encouraging abstract inspiration, we believe it is not feasible to address the challenge of overcoming context-situatedness and concerns over how to apply the scenario in another, dissimilar place. As argued in section 3.2, direct transfer of an intervention between places is not feasible in itself. This is also why we chose to shift emphasis from the scenarios to the Enabling Governance Arrangement, since they are more pattern-based and less context-bound. Thus, we do not wish to encourage this in the scenarios beyond sharing basic inspirational details that open up more personal and dynamic dialogue between readers and intervention proponents.

Over the next pages, you will find a copy of the final Governance Scenarios, including links to the UrbanA wiki content.
Scenario 1: Countering Gentrification: Community Based and Collaborative Methods

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Imagine your city where residents of limited means could live in affordable social housing located in the city-center and peacefully enjoy their neighborhood for years to come.

How do we get there?

This intervention may result from the collective engagement of citizens to resist the gentrification process that occurs in many city centers. Especially in a context of economic crisis, new urban development projects led by and attracting wealthy residents and businesses may be carried out at the expense of selling public real estate and privatizing social housing (Q3). Consequently, the social structure of the neighborhood is likely to change and cater toward more affluent people. As a response, (former) residents, especially from working-class or ethnic minority backgrounds, could initiate a resistance to displacement (Q10). Such resistance may grow and become more visible, eventually reaching other actors including community organizations and local public authorities (Q12).

How do governments come (or not) into play in this struggle?

In such an intervention, the role of public authorities is quite central because privatization in the housing sector is often closely related to governmental regulatory frameworks. Indeed, as national and local governments are running out of public money because of an economic crisis, they may have enforced a set of privatization policies in the housing sector (Q24). Such austerity policies lead to the eviction of working-class dwellers who eventually could launch resistance against it.

What are the actions taken by citizens to resist displacement?

To resist the privatization of social housing and evictions, citizens could voice their right to “stay put” and engage in different actions including occupying housing. Opening the dialogue between resistance fighters and public actors may be central to the success of the intervention. For this purpose, the creation of a citizen platform voicing the claim of citizens to the municipality may be quite a crucial tool (Q13). Indeed, it could raise awareness among local authorities on the
detrimental impacts of privatization policies, and possibly lead to the creation of a set of new policies, including re-housing or the regularization of informal housing (Q24).

**What are the challenges in implementing anti-gentrification policies?**

Although a public response would be welcomed, it may not equally benefit residents, depending on their wealth or social status (e.g. migrants), and as a consequence, create dissensus among them. Eventually, community resistance could be undermined. If governmental policies are not consistent i.e. do not equally protect endangered residents, they could reinforce the social problem initially addressed (Q25).

**What can we learn from this case?**

These governance arrangements between citizens and public actors against gentrification aims at being inspirational. The processes it features may be replicated in other urban settings in a similar context i.e. where the public sector is weakened by an economic crisis. Sharing and discussing these processes between community organizations and between different local and national governments may be quite helpful to support learning about effective tools for resisting gentrification (Q31).

**How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?**

**Do you want to learn more about this scenario?**

Take a look at the detailed description of *Bottom-up resistance against gentrification in Rome* that has inspired this scenario. In Rome, resistance fighters thrive to impeach the displacement of working class dwellers from the city center, a gentrification process which is fostered by pernicious and neoliberal regulations on public housing stock.

This scenario relates to an **Enabling Governance Arrangement**:

- **Build bridges between separate stakeholder groups**: The role of anti-eviction platforms was crucial as they contributed to voice the claim and to represent the interests of evicted/targeted citizens.

This scenario fits under the **approaches**:

- **Reconceptualising urban justice and sustainability**: Alternative conceptual framings are a feature of many and diverse approaches to urban sustainability and/or justice, and in particular their intersections. Arguments in their favour range from the ethical to the instrumental: the moral right of all those living in cities to contribute to shaping their future, to the practical importance of diverse outlooks, ideas and capabilities in working towards sustainability and justice.
- **Right to housing**: This approach indicates the right of all individuals to have access to adequate shelter.

It addresses some **drivers of injustice**:

- **Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration**: This driver refers to the ways in which new urban developments might force trade-offs between the social and environmental goals of urban sustainability projects. It involves public efforts to improve a
neighbourhood’s physical structure and boost its economy by attracting investment, usually in the sectors of real estate and tourism.

- **Material and livelihood inequalities**: This driver refers to the ways that the underlying distribution of economic resources gets expressed within urban sustainability efforts, reinforcing or exacerbating unjust outcomes.
- **Racialized or Ethnically Exclusionary Urbanization**: This driver refers to the ways that historic patterns of segregation, based on race, ethnicity, religion or other identity characteristics, shape the outcomes of urban sustainability efforts.
- **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**: This driver refers to processes of privatization, commercialization, budget cuts and state withdrawal from various sectors and how they can undermine urban sustainability, guided by an ideology of unfettered economic growth which often aligns with austerity policies.
- **Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure**: This driver refers to the ways in which territory, identity, education, knowledge, and information are used to draw lines, privileges, and hierarchies between social groups, and especially to how this leads to an uneven distribution of benefits from urban sustainability efforts.
- **Weak(ened) civil society**: This driver refers to the ways in which collective civic groups that share common interests (other than the state, the market, or the family) are either not constituted and impactful enough to influence and benefit from sustainability efforts or are indeed constrained by interventions that carry sustainability objectives.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 2: Tackling Waste: Community Practices for Food Rescuing and Sharing

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Imagine a city where surplus-food would not be wasted and would instead be rescued and shared among (poorer) communities.

How do we get there?
For this to happen, citizens could have the leading role, identifying pertinent social problems in the food sector such as food waste and food insecurity. While these issues are often regulated by governmental policies (e.g. food waste management and food safety), community-based actions could be undertaken by citizens to complement them (Q10).

How can such citizens’ initiatives thrive?
Such interventions require social resources to develop. For example, relying on a wider-community network could be of great support. Indeed, networks provide social movements with resources (human and material) and legitimacy (in the public opinion and political sphere) (Q13). In addition, community-based initiatives likely have better chances of success while relying on an established organizational structure with well-defined distribution of roles and responsibilities among community members, in tandem with some operating tools (Q15).

What legal obstacles may food rescuers face? And how could they cope?
Such a project could be faced with particular regulatory framework in the food sector that poses an obstacle to operations (Q18). Eventually, a problem may arise when community initiatives are asked to comply with regulatory policies that they often do not have the capacity to meet i.e. food handling
(Q23). Therefore, strict regulations primarily designed for larger food producers and distributors can hinder or even prevent citizens’ initiatives.

Eventually, facing these kinds of obstacles could reinforce opposition between the intervention proponents and governing bodies. A positive effect may be the strengthening of the political line of the movement (Q24) and its establishment as an oppositional power challenging (dysfunctional) governmental policy (Q21). However, legal pressures to comply with the pre-existing framework to some extent reduces the potential impact of such projects.

**How can we learn from such an intervention?**

The different processes featured here could be recorded and shared within community networks (Q29). This allows the movement to spread and develop, facilitated by the local bodies of wider community-networks (Q31). Additionally, activists could actively engage in sharing their knowledge and tools for facilitating the replication of the intervention in other urban contexts. Thus, similar initiatives would be likely to develop elsewhere, either by sticking to the organizational structure of the movement or by inventing different ways of operating (Q33).

**How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?**

**Do you want to learn more about this scenario?**

Take a look at the detailed description of Food rescuing and sharing in Berlin that has inspired this scenario. Foodsharing is a grassroots initiative that thrives to rescue and share surplus food among citizens. Its proponents consider food as a "common good" which has to be exempted from monetary transactions. Check out their website (only in German), [https://foodsharing.de/](https://foodsharing.de/)

This scenario relates to some **Enabling Governance Arrangements**:

- **Tap into existing community networks**: Foodsharing groups tapped into the resources of the national network to develop locally, especially they used the same online platform as well as the same principles and organizational structure.
- **Develop resilient, and self-sufficient financing arrangements**: Foodsharing is run by unpaid volunteers, including developers, foodshares and foodsavers and refuses any public funding or subsidies..

This scenario fits under the **approach**:

- **Sharing and cooperatives for urban commons**: This approach refers to a paradigm shift away from individualistic and exclusivity practices, which are embedded in modern urbanism and urban lifestyles in regards to particular resources and services. Sharing is a central aspect of commoning practices, while commons governance often takes the form of cooperatives.

It addresses some **drivers of injustice**:

- **Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure**: This driver refers to the ways in which territory, identity, education, knowledge, and information are used to draw lines, privileges, and hierarchies between social groups, and especially to how this leads to an uneven distribution of benefits from urban sustainability efforts.
● **Unfit institutional structures:** This driver refers to those aspects or functions of organizations, public offices, administrations and authorities that deal with urban governance and stand in the way of achieving just outcomes in urban sustainability.

● **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism:** This driver refers to processes of privatization, commercialization, budget cuts and state withdrawal from various sectors and how they can undermine urban sustainability, guided by an ideology of unfettered economic growth which often aligns with austerity policies.

● **Weak(ened) civil society:** This driver refers to the ways in which collective civic groups that share common interests (other than the state, the market, or the family) are either not constituted and impactful enough to influence and benefit from sustainability efforts or are indeed constrained by interventions that carry sustainability objectives.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 3: Reimagining Affordable Housing from the Ground Up: Community Land Trust Models

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Source: Community Land Trust Brussels

Imagine a city where residents of limited means co-develop affordable, decent and socially sustainable housing on communally-owned land with the help of public and private support.

How might a city create this future?

It may start with collaboration between housing associations in the city (Q13). Due to a housing crisis causing shortfalls in affordable decent housing for low-income and marginalised groups, such associations are likely to be active and looking for ways to make change (Q9). An idea they might take up is community owned and governed affordable housing. How could they learn from similar initiatives to get the ball rolling?

In dreaming up this idea, they could build on collective experiences in the city with other affordable housing projects, such as a solidarity savings group or a passive solar building to house low income migrant families (Q26a). For further inspiration and advice, a site visit to a successful model of community owned and governed affordable housing in another city should provide more concrete details, such as how to arrange their own governance system (Q26b). The governance system adopted by this initiative should place current and future residents at its core, engaging them in community-based decision making and giving them high levels of responsibility over the development and management of their buildings (Q14 & Q15).

The caretakers of this increasingly concrete idea may wish to promptly use their collective expertise and influence to form a united appeal for the local government’s support (Q13). Such a productive and early engagement of these groups with the local government just might be crucial for the idea to take off, since government endorsement and funding will be essential (Q13).

Where might funding come from?
If the local government recognizes this as an innovative opportunity to provide residents with decent, affordable housing, they could provide financial support to start-up, operate, and grow the initiative. This would likely come in the form of continued grants and investment subsidies (Q21). Revenue from residents’ mortgages would complement this funding source, in addition to non-government grants and donations (Q21).

Are there any risks to this financial arrangement?

Unfortunately, such a heavy dependence on one funding source could be risky for the initiative. Since if government priorities change, the annual investment subsidies may be jeopardized (Q23d). In the event of lost public funding, it would be necessary to turn to alternate sources such as charities and other funding organizations (Q24). Additionally, if all goes well, the affordable housing innovation will grow and need to secure increased reliable funding for its sustained operation into the future without over stretching capacities (Q23d).

How might individual successes grow?

Trusting that government support will be retained, or that sufficient alternate funding is found, the future of a city with innovative governance of affordable housing comes into focus. Momentum builds as more projects are replicated and are able to serve more people in need. Initiative champions may even increase their ambitions to enable a wider movement to bring similar success to cities across Europe (Q31a).

How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?

Do you want to learn more about this scenario?

Take a look at the detailed description of Community led affordable housing in Brussels that has inspired this scenario. The Community Land Trust Brussels is a social real estate developer that builds affordable housing projects on collectively-owned land in Brussels for people with limited means. It purchases land and engages with future residents and community partners to co-create affordable housing. Check out their website, [https://cltb.be/en/](https://cltb.be/en/)

This scenario relates to some Enabling Governance Arrangements:

- **Commit to a meaningful participation process** - Local residents have been both the founders and drivers of this initiative. They informed its priorities (e.g. reducing energy poverty) and guided its actions (e.g. democratic decision-making).
- **Tap into existing community networks** - The self-organisation of like-minded community groups was important for acquiring government support and for learning about previous affordable housing experiences.

This scenario fits under the approaches:

- **Governance and participation processes**: This approach geared toward urban sustainability emphasise defining and addressing environmental problems as well as envisioning the future of cities, mainly based on the co-production of knowledge through innovative, diverse and strategic partnerships.
- **Policies and practices for inclusion of disadvantaged groups**: This approach aims to provide all citizens with equal access into urban life and ensure their right to the city.
● **Right to housing**: This approach indicates the right of all individuals to have access to adequate shelter.

It addresses some **drivers of injustice**:

● **Material and livelihood inequalities**: This driver refers to the ways that the underlying distribution of economic resources gets expressed within urban sustainability efforts, reinforcing or exacerbating unjust outcomes.

● **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**: This driver refers to the ways in which new urban developments might force trade-offs between the social and environmental goals of urban sustainability projects. It involves public efforts to improve a neighbourhood’s physical structure and boost its economy by attracting investment, usually in the sectors of real estate and tourism.

● **Limited citizen participation in urban planning**: This driver refers to the limited involvement and engagement of citizens and citizens’ initiatives in decision-making around the planning, design, implementation and/or evaluation of urban sustainability-oriented interventions.

● **Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration**: This driver refers to unequal exposure to harmful and health-impairing pollutants, conditions and urban environments and/or unequal access to safe and healthy environments.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 4: Reclaiming Street Space: Cooperation for Neighbourhood Transformation

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Imagine your city's streets not being dominated by cars but by people. Streets are a place of social gatherings, a place where children play and neighbours meet, a place of interaction; they are urban hotspots!

How can we get there?

Reaching this reality would mean largely rethinking our transport and mobility system. In many places, cars are the dominant mode of transport, which leads to air and noise pollution, accelerates climate change, and makes urban life less healthy. Combatting these issues is also a matter of justice as poorer people are generally more affected by environmental degradation, pollution, and the effects of climate change. Additionally, streets right now mainly serve as transport routes, but have lost social functions that they once had (Q9). Giving streets their old functions back also means targeting injustices created by urban intensification and the unjust effects of a weakened civil society, such as the exclusion of marginalized groups in urban governance.

How could a municipality address these problems? Who would municipal actors need to work with, who would they have to include?

A complete overhaul of such a deep-rooted problem would necessitate working together with all kinds of local stakeholders, be it local businesses, NGOs, and academia (Q12), but especially crucial seems to have local residents on board (Q13). Such a city-wide transformation would also have to adapt to local particularities. Formalized local working groups that regularly meet and are responsible for designing the process in each neighbourhood could give citizens responsibility and power over their neighbourhood while also including a variety of other actors that want to participate (Q13 & Q15). For this to work, it is necessary that municipalities safeguard their power to govern their local transport system (Q19). Additionally, connecting the process to other local level sustainable development policies and agreements in different sectors can give the project legitimacy and help develop holistic visions for comprehensive change (Q18). The better integrated specific
solutions are into bigger developments of change, the easier it is to believe in grand opportunities of change and the power of a shared vision! (Q19) If this happens, sustainable developments may be achievable even with comparatively little extra spending (Q21).

**In what ways can municipalities deal with and learn from potential local resistance?**

As this process hinges upon working together with citizens, it is crucial that citizens feel they are an integral part of it. Still, municipality-led processes might encounter local resistance, potentially because residents do not believe in the effectiveness of the process and its ability to change the current situation or because they fear potential negative consequences (Q23). For example, some may question whether public transport can provide enough capacity to cushion the reduction of private car usage or worry that commuting to work would take too long (Q23). To address such concerns, it may be important to tackle the substance of the problems, but it could also be important to change the process, especially how participation is organized (Q24).

**Why should municipalities look at similar projects in the past to ensure more just participation in the future?**

Looking at learning outcomes from past projects in your own city can further help the process in overcoming obstacles. This might mean that experiences from past policies in similar sectors, for example making streets more pedestrian-friendly, can prove vital here (Q27). It might even be the case that resistance in the past against other municipality-led projects have voiced the same concerns. This might help in finding solutions for overcoming those obstacles as well as encouraging project proponents to not give up if things do not go as originally planned (Q27). In the end, more general flexibility in how the project develops could lead to improved methods of communication and participation in the future (Q28). Finally, communicating with media about ideas within the project can help pique the interest of other cities and spread knowledge to other urban areas (Q33).

**How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?**

*Do you want to learn more about this scenario?*

Take a look at the detailed description of Dealing flexibly with and learning from resistance in Barcelona that has inspired this scenario. The Superblocks Programme in Barcelona is a mobility concept that tries to restructure the city in 503 so-called Superblocks, lowering the amount of cars and returning public functions such as leisure and neighborhood activities to city streets.

This scenario relates to some **Enabling Governance Arrangements**:

- **Create a comprehensive vision of change**: When creating and implementing so-called “Superblocks” in the city, Barcelona embedded them in multiple city-level policies creating synergies and giving the city a vision for comprehensive change, whereas Superblocks are one of the many means of reaching that change.
- **Commit to a meaningful participation process**: While establishing "Superblocks", the municipality of Barcelona developed a standard procedure for participation in each block. While the original participation process overlooked realities of citizens, over the course of the project, this procedure became increasingly open, putting responsibilities and decisions into the hands of formalised local working groups consisting of diverse local stakeholders.
This scenario fits under the approaches:

- **Energy and Mobility solutions**: This approach cluster addresses technological interventions that can support the transition to a low-carbon society.
- **Right to the city**: This approach refers to the right to make and remake ourselves and our cities.
- **Nature-based solutions**: This approach refers to solutions for urban sustainability that are inspired and supported by nature, which are cost-effective, simultaneously provide environmental, social and economic benefits and help build resilience.

It addresses some drivers of injustice:

- **Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration**: This driver refers to unequal exposure to harmful and health-impairing pollutants, conditions and urban environments and/or unequal access to safe and healthy environments.
- **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**: This driver refers to processes of privatization, commercialization, budget cuts and state withdrawal from various sectors and how they can undermine urban sustainability, guided by an ideology of unfettered economic growth which often aligns with austerity policies.
- **Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities**: This driver refers to the ways in which (access to) useful information and know-how around sustainable urban interventions and their benefits is not shared effectively or equally among disciplines, sectors or social groups, and thus constrain the potential for both sustainability and justice.
- **Limited citizen participation in urban planning**: This driver refers to the limited involvement and engagement of citizens and citizens’ initiatives in decision-making around the planning, design, implementation and/or evaluation of urban sustainability-oriented interventions.
- **Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns**: This driver refers to the ways in which new urban developments might force trade-offs between the social and environmental goals of urban sustainability projects. It involves public efforts to improve a neighbourhood’s physical structure and boost its economy by attracting investment, usually in the sectors of real estate and tourism.
- **Weak(ened) civil society**: This driver refers to the ways in which collective civic groups that share common interests (other than the state, the market, or the family) are either not constituted and impactful enough to influence and benefit from sustainability efforts or are indeed constrained by interventions that carry sustainability objectives.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 5: Negotiating Green Space Development: Balancing Long-Term Sustainability and Short-Term Social Needs

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Imagine your city featured a natural park provides both biodiversity protection and green space for locals to counter rapid urbanization and increasing density.

How might this become a reality?

To address the potential threats of decreasing green spaces and biodiversity loss, municipalities and local and regional governments may come together to actively take measures for the protection of urban ecosystems. These ecosystems could be demarcated and managed for their best use, both for long-term sustainability by protecting the ecosystem and its species, and for immediate social needs (i.e. recreation and health) of the local people (Q10).

What potential policies and laws can support the cause?

The formation of a natural park in a highly dense city can be shaped and supported by some national and EU policies e.g. NATURA 2000 (Q18). It can be further upheld by the constitutional rights of citizens (to a healthy environment) and the responsibilities of governments at multiple scales to provide those services for the citizens (Q19).

How critical is balancing the interests of diverse stakeholders engaged in project management?

For the successful implementation of the intervention, the formation of a governance body comprised of multi-level government agencies and scientific, advisory, and consultative groups (engaging the members of civil society, research institutes, NGOs, and academia) would be crucial (Q9). Yet, striking a balance between different stakeholder visions for the park, particularly, biodiversity protection (for next generations/long term outcome) and social benefits (recreation and green space for present generation) could be a great challenge. It is possible that one vision overshadows the other due to exclusion of some actors at various stages of the park’s management planning process. As in many cases, park managers or other main stakeholders may avoid local
citizens’ participation, fearing further complexity of the planning process. However, to avoid exclusion and to promote legitimacy and equality, effective, non-tokenistic participation of all stakeholders during all stages of the park’s management planning should be ensured (Q23).

**What methods can ensure effective and productive stakeholders engagement throughout the process?**

The park management team may maintain continuous communication about the park’s affairs by holding meetings and workshops, ensuring that the content is comprehensible for all stakeholders. For better decision-making, park authorities can create a network for learning and knowledge exchange between parks within and across regions/urban contexts. Further, learning and knowledge exchange across parks in Europe may help to overcome challenges and adopt more inclusive planning methods to achieve long-term sustainability and short-term social justice goals (Q25).

**How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?**

**Do you want to learn more about this scenario?**

Take a look at the detailed description of Biodiversity protection and social justice in the Barcelona Natural Park that has inspired this scenario. The scenario is based on a Peri-urban Natural Park of Collserola (Serra de Collserola Natural Park) in Barcelona. Barcelona is a highly populated and dense city with relatively few available green spaces. The intervention aims to protect Barcelona’s fragile Peri-Urban ecosystems for both social and ecological functions while preserving biodiversity and providing ecosystem services to nearby residents. Specifically, the challenge being addressed here is maintaining a balance between the use of the park for short-term social needs such as recreation and long-term sustainability needs such as biodiversity protection. To learn more, check out their website (https://www.catalunya.com/en/catalunya-convention-bureau-ccb) and a study conducted by Naturvation (https://naturvation.eu/nbs/barcelona/peri-urban-natural-park-collserola).

This scenario relates to an **Enabling Governance Arrangement**:

- **Build bridges between separate stakeholder groups**: Constant coordination and collaboration between municipalities and regional bodies including scientific and consultative committees were very important to the success of the Collserola Natural Park - for instance, in overcoming differences in interests of biodiversity protection vs. recreational activities.

This scenario fits under the **approach**:

- **Nature-based solutions**: This approach refers to solutions for urban sustainability that are inspired and supported by nature, which are cost-effective, simultaneously provide environmental, social and economic benefits and help build resilience.

It addresses some **drivers of injustice**:

- **Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration**: This driver refers to the ways in which new urban developments might force trade-offs between the social and environmental goals of urban sustainability projects. It involves public efforts to improve a neighbourhood’s physical structure and boost its economy by attracting investment, usually in the sectors of real estate and tourism.
● **Limited citizen participation in urban planning**: This driver refers to the limited involvement and engagement of citizens and citizens’ initiatives in decision-making around the planning, design, implementation and/or evaluation of urban sustainability-oriented interventions.

● **Unfit institutional structures**: This driver refers to those aspects or functions of organizations, public offices, administrations and authorities that deal with urban governance and stand in the way of achieving just outcomes in urban sustainability.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 6: Collaborating Across Institutional Boundaries: Co-Creating Sustainable Neighborhoods

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Imagine a green and pedestrianized city district where residents have participated in creating affordable and sustainable housing.

How can we create this reality?

This intervention may be initiated by citizens wishing to live in more sustainable ways. With a common understanding of what a sustainable neighbourhood could look like (i.e. affordable and low-energy housing, green areas, and gentle mobility), citizens from diverse backgrounds could engage in formal urban development processes to bring their vision to life. More specifically, these plans should converge with the municipality’s interest in establishing a new district, in so doing experimenting with innovative measures such as participatory planning and the integration of citizens’ housing cooperatives (Q.10). Success would depend on the collaboration between citizen organizations, which would be progressively professionalized, and the municipality working in partnership to implement the project (Q.13). Indeed, a real co-creation process can only result from the well-defined and (relatively) horizontal distribution of responsibilities between each group (Q.15).

Building on the experiences of previous community projects could facilitate citizens’ participation. Indeed, such background may provide legitimacy to citizen-led interventions and build trust among municipal actors in the capacity of citizen groups to successfully implement projects (Q.20). Additionally, the organizational and human resources from other community networks may be of great support for the project’s proponents (Q.27).

Which problems could arise for such a project?

Undoubtedly, such innovative collaboration may not work smoothly right out of the gate, and some obstacles could be encountered on the way. For example, bureaucratic frameworks usually used by municipalities in urban development projects may not be adapted for such co-creation projects. Eventually, it could constrain citizens’ participation, who may then feel unjustly treated or
disregarded by the municipality (Q.23). Dissensus may also arise between grassroot project proponents that have contrasting visions about the district development (e.g. more libertarian or more institutionalized ambitions).

How can we deal with these obstacles?

Since such obstacles are often related to misunderstandings or a lack of communication, most important would be to openly discuss any frustrations (e.g. about procedures and visions) and appreciating the mutual expectations of the different citizen groups and the municipality. A mediator or the creation of a special council with representatives from both groups could facilitate dialogue and be of great support (Q.24). As roles and expectations are necessarily adjusted and transparency and mutual trust between actors is reestablished (Q.29), the project could be successfully implemented. This intervention on governance arrangements for urban development projects aims at being inspirational for citizens and urban policy makers (Q.31). Eventually, key governance arrangements featured in this scenario may be replicated elsewhere, including in different sectors at the municipal level or/and to other urban contexts (Q.33).

How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?

Do you want to learn more about this scenario?

This scenario was based on the development of the Vauban Eco-District in Freiburg, Germany, where the municipality created a special representative council (Vauban City Planning Council) and collaborated with citizen’s groups (namely the Forum Vauban and co-housing initiatives) to co-create the sustainable neighborhood project. Check out their website to learn more: http://quartiersarbeit-vauban.de/das-quartier-vauban/

This scenario relates to some Enabling Governance Arrangements:

- Create a comprehensive vision of change: Vauban’s prospective residents as well as project proponents developed a shared vision on how to live in a more sustainable way i.e. parking free areas, sustainable mobility, affordable and inclusive housing etc.
- Build bridges between separate stakeholder groups: The “Vauban city planning council” was a consultative committee consisting of municipal actors, local parliamentarians and citizens. It can be considered as an intermediary as it was a place for discussion and mediation between stakeholders.
- Commit to a meaningful participation process: The citizen-led Vauban Forum was invited to participate in the “Vauban city planning council” (a consultative committee within the city council) which indicates that the municipality recognizes citizens as legitimate partners in the project development.
- Tap into existing community networks: Housing Cooperative Networks in Germany inspired to some extent project proponents. Specifically, they benefited from the expertise of the cooperative confederation regarding economy, law and tax policy.

This scenario fits under the approaches:

- Co-living, co-housing & intentional communities: The approach refers to a variety of approaches and movements that aim to provide affordable, ecological or community housing in both urban and rural contexts.
- Governance and participation processes: This approach geared toward urban sustainability emphasise defining and addressing environmental problems as well as envisioning the future
of cities, mainly based on the co-production of knowledge through innovative, diverse and strategic partnerships.

- **Sharing and cooperatives for urban commons**: The approach refers to a paradigm shift away from individualistic and exclusivity practices, which are embedded in modern urbanism and urban lifestyles in regards to particular resources and services. Sharing is a central aspect of commoning practices, while commons governance often takes the form of cooperatives.

It addresses some **drivers of injustice**:

- **Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration**: This driver refers to the ways in which new urban developments might force trade-offs between the social and environmental goals of urban sustainability projects. It involves public efforts to improve a neighbourhood’s physical structure and boost its economy by attracting investment, usually in the sectors of real estate and tourism.

- **Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure**: This driver refers to the ways in which territory, identity, education, knowledge, and information are used to draw lines, privileges, and hierarchies between social groups, and especially to how this leads to an uneven distribution of benefits from urban sustainability efforts.

- **Limited citizen participation in urban planning**: This driver refers to the limited involvement and engagement of citizens and citizens’ initiatives in decision-making around the planning, design, implementation and/or evaluation of urban sustainability-oriented interventions.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 7: From Electricity to Empowerment: Democratizing Urban Energy Systems

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Imagine a city where rooftops are lined with cooperatively owned solar panels, providing much more than electricity. Through collective decision-making, local skill-building, jobs, and reinvestment in marginalized neighbourhoods, this city becomes an emerging energy democracy.

How might a city create this future?

When a community pitches in their time and ideas, and is financially supported by government programs, energy becomes empowerment. A likely beginning would sprout from a small but enthusiastic group of community members, possibly using pubs as meeting spaces, until the local government hopefully recognizes their efforts and joins the game. The government, perhaps a local district council, could act as an important player, connecting this fledgling group to like-minded others and offering a more formal meeting space (Q13).

What possible sources of learning should be sought out?

Riding a wave of new partnerships and legitimization, the team should be sure to look both outward and inward for inspiration. Why both? To be successful, this project can learn from good ideas elsewhere while still centering itself around local needs. In this novel case, where there may be no similar models in the city to learn from, inspiration comes from elsewhere. While examples from other areas may offer practical advice and sample financial structures (Q27), project proponents’ proactive and direct consultation with fellow locals is essential to make sure the initiative is meaningful to them. What are their priorities, their limitations, issues they’d like to see resolved? (Q9) These answers can be used to adapt other models to the community context (Q28).

Even beyond this initial stage, the community energy project should learn from local residents as they provide input at annual meetings and participate in democratic decision-making processes (Q14 & Q15).

How could a resilient financial arrangement benefit the initiative?

Centering the community energy business model around other experiences and local needs will create an engine to drive the idea forward. In this model, share purchases raise money for capital,
which then provides returns for investors, and any extra revenue feeds back into a community fund (Q21). To invest, community members need assurance of reliable returns. Therefore, such a model may only be financially feasible with the support of ongoing government subsidy schemes and grants (Q21).

Although it is tempting to make the most of government financial support, rapidly changing political landscapes will upend even the best-laid plans. Declining or cancelled subsidies can destabilize the entire concept of community energy (Q23a). If this happens, it's back to the drawing board to develop and test a new, more self-sufficient, business model (Q24). This new model could involve peer-to-peer electricity trading, or selling energy into the grid as a licensed supplier.

**What comes next?**

Ambitious proponents of this more durable model can continue to scale it up and enable many more projects throughout the city and beyond (Q33). To do this, learning and implementation processes will need to be less experimental and coordination by a higher institutional body would be very helpful (Q31d).

**How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?**

**Do you want to learn more about this scenario?**

Take a look at the detailed description of *Inner-city community energy in London* that has inspired this scenario. The initiative is a cooperatively owned community energy initiative for multi-unit residential buildings, which, among other things, strives to tackle energy poverty and reduce dependence on big energy companies. Check out their website, [https://www.repowering.org.uk/](https://www.repowering.org.uk/)

This scenario relates to some *Enabling Governance Arrangements*:

- **Build bridges between separate stakeholder groups** - A small group within the local council ran a Low Carbon Zone initiative which served as an intermediary organization in the beginning. It helped the team organize themselves and contact other relevant groups.
- **Commit to a meaningful participation process** - The Repowering team closely interacted with local residents and their inputs shaped the organization's activities.
- **Develop resilient, and self-sufficient financing arrangements** - After the decline and cancellation of the UK’s Feed-In-Tariff scheme, Repowering came up with an innovative new financial model based on peer-to-peer trading.

This scenario fits under the *approaches*:

- **Energy and Mobility solutions**: This approach cluster addresses technological interventions that can support the transition to a low-carbon society.
- **Governance and participation processes**: This approach geared toward urban sustainability emphasises defining and addressing environmental problems as well as envisioning the future of cities, mainly based on the co-production of knowledge through innovative, diverse and strategic partnerships.
- **Policies and practices for inclusion of disadvantaged groups**: This approach aims to provide all citizens with equal access into urban life and ensure their right to the city.
● **Sustainable households:** This approach examines initiatives seeking to improve energy efficiency, namely the energy performance of building as a means of lowering carbon emissions to create carbon-neutral habitats, communities and cities.

It addresses some **drivers of injustice:**

- **Material and livelihood inequalities:** This driver refers to the ways that the underlying distribution of economic resources gets expressed within urban sustainability efforts, reinforcing or exacerbating unjust outcomes.
- **Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization:** This driver refers to the ways that historic patterns of segregation, based on race, ethnicity, religion or other identity characteristics, shape the outcomes of urban sustainability efforts.
- **Unfit institutional structures:** This driver refers to those aspects or functions of organizations, public offices, administrations and authorities that deal with urban governance and stand in the way of achieving just outcomes in urban sustainability.
- **Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities:** This driver refers to the ways in which (access to) useful information and know-how around sustainable urban interventions and their benefits is not shared effectively or equally among disciplines, sectors or social groups, and thus constrain the potential for both sustainability and justice.
- **Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure:** This driver refers to the ways in which territory, identity, education, knowledge, and information are used to draw lines, privileges, and hierarchies between social groups, and especially to how this leads to an uneven distribution of benefits from urban sustainability efforts.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 8: Overcoming Silos in Urban Regeneration Projects: Holistic Neighbourhood Design

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Imagine a city consisting of ecologically sustainable urban neighbourhoods that are inclusive for its residents and resilient against climate change.

How can we create these neighbourhoods?

Creating truly sustainable, holistic neighbourhoods is often hindered by compartmentalized administrations and specialized, inconsistent policies. ‘Breaking down silos’ could mean, for example, that different departments of a municipality work together and with different local stakeholders for comprehensive sustainability projects and taking a variety of issues (e.g. biodiversity, health, inclusivity, climate) into consideration at once (Q12). Additional change is needed in how specific topics are addressed: reducing the energy consumption in a neighbourhood might not just call for the technical improvement of buildings, but may also involve dedicated campaigns for changing energy related behaviour of residents (Q2).

What are some key aspects for this to work?

When pushing sustainable district and neighbourhood developments in your own city, being truly enthusiastic about the projects can be hugely important to get others on board. Individual project champions can play a very important role here (Q13). An area that has a bad reputation, where there is an already an urge for something to be done might be a good area to start a sustainable neighbourhood campaign (Q13). This can apply to neighbourhoods with diverse issues, such as high rates of unemployment, low involvement in politics, or even something as specific as susceptibility to flooding (Q17 & Q25). A typical story of such a sustainable neighbourhood campaign could start with the municipality as an initiator (Q10). If this is to be an integrated effort, however, the municipality would have to involve different local stakeholders, e.g. the municipal housing company, local schools, and most importantly local residents (Q12).

And then, everything is fine?
Developments that try to tackle issues in single sectors (like, mobility or energy) will most likely take a long time to be implemented and could lead to a decline in public interest over the course of the project (Q24). Shifting responsibilities and making residents more responsible over the duration of the project might help with such issues (Q25). If projects aim to address different justice related issues, especially procedural justice, it would be crucial to carefully design participation processes. Such projects should engage residents and incorporate their needs and wishes (Q24 & Q25).

**Where do we go from here?**

A sustainable neighbourhood will only exist if residents feel they are integral parts of it. Trying to push best practices onto the neighbourhood will most likely not work if residents do not understand why these developments are necessary or if they are opposed to proposed ideas (Q31). Still, organizing workshops that convey experiences from other areas might spark ideas for your own neighbourhood (Q26). As a municipality, taking up a perspective that provides guidance in what could be done to improve situations might sometimes be more feasible than telling residents what has to be done (Q34). Embracing such an open perspective as well as overcoming compartmentalized policies might be key in creating sustainable and resilient neighbourhoods.

**How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?**

**Do you want to learn more about this scenario?**

Take a look at the detailed description of Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg that has inspired this scenario. This project focuses on the work of Ekostaden Augustenborg, a holistic neighbourhood development programme including various social, ecological, and economical interventions in the Augustenborg district in Malmö, Sweden.

This scenario relates to some Enabling Governance Arrangements:

- **Make space for adaptation and experimentation**: An experimental approach was crucial for this intervention to flourish; not being too uptight and learning from mistakes. This allowed for a lot of adaptivity in the project.

This scenario fits under the approaches:

- **Governance and participation processes**: This approach geared toward urban sustainability emphasise defining and addressing environmental problems as well as envisioning the future of cities, mainly based on the co-production of knowledge through innovative, diverse and strategic partnerships.
- **Governance for urban climate mitigation and adaptation**: This approach refers to the effort of public institutions to engage the civil society in policy making processes.

It addresses some drivers of injustice:

- **Material and livelihood inequalities**: This driver refers to the ways that the underlying distribution of economic resources gets expressed within urban sustainability efforts, reinforcing or exacerbating unjust outcomes.
- **Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns**: This driver refers to the ways in which new urban developments might force trade-offs between the social and environmental goals of urban sustainability projects. It involves public efforts to improve a neighbourhood’s
physical structure and boost its economy by attracting investment, usually in the sectors of real estate and tourism.

- **Weak(ened) civil society**: This driver refers to the ways in which collective civic groups that share common interests (other than the state, the market, or the family) are either not constituted and impactful enough to influence and benefit from sustainability efforts or are indeed constrained by interventions that carry sustainability objectives.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 9: Creating a Sustainable Energy System: a Citizen-Driven Transformation

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Source: Rupert Richter

Imagine your city was home to a group of highly motivated citizens with diverse expertise, coming together as a cooperative to flag their concerns about unsustainable practices in the metropolitan energy system.

Can such a citizen-led cooperative challenge the neoliberal growth paradigm in the energy market?

It seems that the present energy market has various social and ecological disadvantages that are inflicted by the profit-oriented, monopolized private energy market. This has spurred the engagement of citizens who are increasingly aware of their needs, capabilities, and political landscapes. They may wish to govern local energy systems themselves in ways that are inclusive, accessible, and sustainable in the long run (Q9).

How can financial and human resources be generated for executing a citizen-based initiative?

Such citizen-led cooperatives can be extended and strengthened by acquiring financial and in-kind support from businesses, research institutes, NGOs, students and media (Q12). Cooperatives may also profit from inviting experts with experience in establishing similar interventions for guidance, which may be especially important during the early stages of the process (Q13). Furthermore, awareness campaigns with the help of the media can sensitize the general public and help to earn trust and support from political leaders (Q32).

What major policies and management approaches can keep an intervention relevant and alive?

Supportive EU directives such as the EU Renewable Energy Directive as well as national policies and constitutional rights (for example right to hold plebiscites, right to assembly, and right to form cooperatives) can provide an enabling environment for such interventions (Q19). Moreover, a flexible project management approach (changing with on-the-ground circumstances) without compromising on the fundamental vision and goal of an intervention can keep the intervention relevant and alive.
What actor constellations can be crucial for effective participation, governance, and decision-making?

Governing energy systems as a cooperative could allow for wide participation among the membership. It can have volunteers and cooperative members working in different capacities. General assemblies of the cooperative can allow for the participation of all members at different levels of the decision-making process. However, to ensure accountability, a supervisory board consisting of founders and highly engaged individuals could develop strategic plans and take action (Q15).

How can a citizen-based initiative cope with potential governance, financial, and political challenges?

The intervention may be confronted with various challenges, especially those related to financial arrangements, political culture, and regulatory procedures. Financial challenges could be tackled partly with shareholder/membership fees and partly by attracting donors and sponsors. Political and general public’s opinion can be influenced by running awareness campaigns, engaging with the media, and through outreach to individuals (Q23). Introducing a citizen-driven management partner in the arena of public vs. private management could be highly challenging. However, different paths and approaches can be adopted to realize the overarching goals of this intervention while carefully aligning various stakeholders and securing wide public support (Q32).

How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?

Do you want to learn more about this scenario?

The scenario is based on citizen-driven intervention known as BürgerEnergie Berlin (BEB). It is a cooperative that unites citizens in Berlin - the capital and a city-state of Germany - to work together for a sustainable, climate-friendly, and citizen-owned energy system. The intervention is based at the city level. BEB aims to acquire a share in the energy grid of Berlin and change the energy mix towards renewable energy. It intends to promote and support members economically and build a socially and environmentally compatible, decentralized, inexpensive, and nuclear-free sustainable energy system. Check out their website to learn more: https://www.buerger-energie-berlin.de/

This scenario relates to some Enabling Governance Arrangements:

- **Make space for adaptation and experimentation**: BEB applied for a Berlin grid concession directly. However, the government decided to provide the license to a city-owned public utility and a court case is pending. Consequently, BEB reinvented its plans for achieving a sustainable energy system in Berlin. They have, for example, started implementing solar power projects.
- **Build bridges between separate stakeholder groups**: There have been changes in terms of changing how the energy system can be imagined, who owns it and who participates in it. Political documents, for example, the coalition agreement in Berlin have some changes, particular attention has been given to citizens’ participation in the energy sector.
- **Commit to a meaningful participation process**: BEB would not have been able to establish and grow the way it did without the contribution of volunteers. Most are students, mainly graduates from the field of renewable energies, but there are also retirees who want to use their free time to help the cooperative.
● **Tap into existing community networks**: BEB is supported by a large number of alliances including cooperatives, ethical banks and renewable energy companies. The cooperative expanded fast in numbers and donations through synergies with the networks established by other energy cooperatives and movements in the field of energy and politics.

This scenario fits under the **approaches**:

- **Civil disobedience**: This approach refers to a public, non-violent and conscientious breach of law undertaken with the aim of bringing about a change in laws or government policies.
- **Energy and Mobility solutions**: This approach cluster addresses technological interventions that can support the transition to a low-carbon society.

It addresses a **driver of injustice**:

- **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**: This driver refers to processes of privatization, commercialization, budget cuts and state withdrawal from various sectors and how they can undermine urban sustainability, guided by an ideology of unfettered economic growth which often aligns with austerity policies.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 10: Nurturing Trust in Community-Driven Regeneration: Continuity amidst Institutional Uncertainty

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real world case.

Imagine a city where residents of moderate means can fully enjoy the neighborhood where they are living and collectively engage in community projects that strengthen social relations and improve urban infrastructure.

Which actors can effectively initiate such an intervention?

In this case, persistent social problems related to health, living conditions, and education are likely to have been identified early on by local residents, social workers, and municipal actors (Q9a). But what can be done to address poverty and inequity? A response may be initiated by civil society organizations. Especially those already engaged in local community projects and who are familiar with the context may call on municipal support to address these issues (Q10). These actors should avoid adopting a deficit-oriented portrayal of the neighborhood, instead applying an asset-based approach to reflect how the residents may see themselves (Q23b). Consequently, an urban regeneration project may be conceptualized by the civil society organizations and supported by the municipality. Good cooperation and a common interest between these two bodies would be crucial (Q13).

What do community-driven participatory processes look like? What role does a municipality play in such an intervention?

The project is especially likely to be facilitated if it aligns with municipal orientations. Indeed, to counter decreasing public subsidies for social intervention, local public authorities tend to rely on the engagement of local dwellers to conduct urban regeneration projects (Q17 & Q18). In such a set up, great freedom is likely to be granted by the municipality to local project proponents, which could allow for experimental and innovative participatory methods (Q15). These may include workshops.
enabling residents to collectively envision a desired neighborhood, reflect and discuss on options, and learn about self-organization (Q30). These active participatory methods may prove to be far more inclusive than the more abstract, municipality-driven participatory planning processes of earlier projects (Q16). Within these deliberative settings, citizens could be invited to engage in hands-on activities, such as planning a community center, a shared garden, or other inclusive projects.

**What happens in the face of institutional uncertainty?**

Such an innovative intervention might face obstacles as it emerges. Changes in institutional and political settings, for instance budget cuts or the dismantling of previous social welfare structures may generate ambiguity and insecurity about project development. In this context, a major obstacle to the durability of a Governance Intervention would be shifting municipal actors. If city representatives change frequently over the course of a project, community leaders and residents could lose faith in any meaningful partnerships with or dependence on the municipality for support. Even well-meaning government actors could change their thinking about citizen-driven regeneration projects, but such “enlightened” civil servants would remain fragmented without changing their broader institutional fabric. As previous regeneration projects implemented without regard of the local community may have undermined the residents’ trust in such interventions, shifting municipal actors could generate additional suspicion about the effective outcomes of participatory methods (Q23b).

**How can community leaders respond to these obstacles? How might this affect the success of their intervention?**

To keep out of institutional turbulences, project proponents could decide to operate relatively autonomously, at risk of loosening relationships with institutional actors. Trust and meaningful connections can be fostered between project proponents and community members if proponents have a good understanding of its local history, context, and dynamics (Q24). When successfully developed, such an intervention should enhance community building, empower citizens, and establish new relationships based on cooperation and mutual trust between citizens, community organizations, and public actors (Q25). Defunded projects or lost support due to weakened relationships with governmental representatives could be taken up by citizens, for example in the case of building community gardens. However, even successful, autonomous, community-led projects could lack durability in the face of future institutional fluctuations, and any relationships that were built during the course of the project could erode after a project is over. This threatens the long-term sustainability of such a Governance Intervention.

**What are the implications for this scenario?**

After these governance arrangements are successfully developed and experimented by the project stakeholders, models could be adapted in other neighborhoods. Eventually, this may be the basis for a new participatory and inclusive approach to local urban governance (Q31).

**How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?**

**Do you want to learn more about this scenario?**

Take a look at the detailed description of Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam that has inspired this scenario. It was facilitated by an Urban Resilience Lab in the neighborhood of Carnisse, who engaged with residents, municipal actors, and professionals to collectively address the social problems in the neighborhood. To learn more about how this intervention addressed the project obstacles, see Q24 in the detailed description. Learn more about the Carnisse Resilience Lab at their website: https://www.veerkrachtcarnisse.nl/
This scenario relates to some “‘Enabling Governance Arrangements’”:

- **Create a comprehensive vision of change**: In workshops organized by local organizations, residents were invited to develop a shared vision of the district redevelopment and establish an agenda for transformative and experimental actions e.g. create a community center, a shared garden etc.
- **Make space for adaptation and experimentation**: Project proponents (mostly local organizations) had an overall vision of the project development but it was not set in stone. The idea was to translate an existing methodology about transition management and to make it custom fit to the local context. For instance, the creation of a community center was not planned in advance and was envisioned and initiated by local stakeholders.
- **Commit to a meaningful participation process**: To make the project more inclusive, project proponents developed two types of participation methods and invited residents to engage in a more deliberative one (e.g. visioning the district) and more practical one (e.g. developing activities in the community center and community garden).

This scenario fits under the **approach**:

- **Experimentation labs**: This approach refers to place-based social experiments that test ideas, methods and technologies from different domains in order to better address specific (and complex) urban challenges in a contextualised manner.

It addresses some **drivers of injustice**:

- **Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure**: This driver refers to the ways in which territory, identity, education, knowledge, and information are used to draw lines, privileges, and hierarchies between social groups, and especially to how this leads to an uneven distribution of benefits from urban sustainability efforts.
- **Material and livelihood inequalities**: This driver refers to the ways that the underlying distribution of economic resources gets expressed within urban sustainability efforts, reinforcing or exacerbating unjust outcomes.
- **Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration**: This driver refers to the ways in which new urban developments might force trade-offs between the social and environmental goals of urban sustainability projects. It involves public efforts to improve a neighbourhood’s physical structure and boost its economy by attracting investment, usually in the sectors of real estate and tourism.
- **Limited citizen participation in urban planning**: This driver refers to the limited involvement and engagement of citizens and citizens’ initiatives in decision-making around the planning, design, implementation and/or evaluation of urban sustainability-oriented interventions.
- **Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities**: This driver refers to the ways in which (access to) useful information and know-how around sustainable urban interventions and their benefits is not shared effectively or equally among disciplines, sectors or social groups, and thus constrain the potential for both sustainability and justice.
- **Weak(ened) civil society**: This driver refers to the ways in which collective civic groups that share common interests (other than the state, the market, or the family) are either not constituted and impactful enough to influence and benefit from sustainability efforts or are indeed constrained by interventions that carry sustainability objectives.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
Scenario 11: Bringing sustainable infrastructure: Carefully engaging in public-private partnerships

This scenario has been developed on the basis of a real-world case.

Imagine a city where urban infrastructure is brought by private actors to degraded neighborhoods, for local residents to enjoy green spaces and cultural activities.

How might a city create this future?

This intervention could develop even in a context of economic crisis (Q9a). In such a situation, the municipality, close to bankruptcy, may not have the capacity to address the social problems associated with a degraded neighborhood. Yet, a private actor may be motivated by these problems to support weakened public authorities (Q3). In this case, such an actor could engage in urban regeneration by conceptualizing an urban renewal project and offering to develop it in the framework of a public-private partnership with the public authorities still owning the land (Q10).

The cornerstone of such a partnership may be its financial arrangements (Q18). Whereas public actors would be weakened by the crisis (Q17), the private actor may be able to cover all project costs and donate it to public authorities after completion. In return, the donor could have the leading role in operating the project (Q13). It could take over the responsibility for decision making whereas public governmental and non-governmental actors would only have a limited agency (Q15).

What are the dangers in giving away responsibility to private actors?

To facilitate the process, the legal agreement linking the public to the private actor may be submitted ready-made to the public authorities (Q23 & Q24). However, letting one actor operate on its own may centralize knowledge and resources (Q30) and would not necessarily provide learning for other actors involved in the project, including municipal agents.

More crucial, a public-private partnership likely entails a high dependency of public authorities on the private actor. Unscrupulous donors could be expecting a financial guarantee for their operation, including reimbursement of some costs if the project is not financially viable once it starts operating.
(Q21). In this case, public authorities may be at risk of sliding even further into debt. Such an example highlights the need to agree on fair terms between private and public partners.

What can we learn from this?

Some public-private partnerships are inspirational while others are informative on what to avoid. However, the emergence of such a partnership may be closely related to a specific context of economic crisis and austerity. In all cases, such partnerships should be clearly beneficial, e.g. as the only possible way of bringing essential services to those in need. The possibility of unintended (long-term) consequences need to be considered, though, e.g. that democratically elected authorities may lose a significant part of their autonomy (Q31).

How could this reality be created in your city? What obstacles would have to be overcome?

Do you want to learn more about this scenario?

Take a look at the detailed description of Public-private partnerships for sustainability infrastructure in Athens that has inspired this scenario. In Athens, a public-private partnership was established to create a sustainable infrastructure hosting a cultural center. However, such partnership established in a context of austerity gives a lot of decision-making power to private investors at the expense of public authorities and risks the privatization of publicly owned space. Check out their website, https://www.snfcc.org/en

This scenario fits under the approach:

- **Nature-based solutions**: This approach refers to solutions for urban sustainability that are inspired and supported by nature, which are cost-effective, simultaneously provide environmental, social and economic benefits and help build resilience.

It addresses some **drivers of injustice**:

- **Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure**: This driver refers to the ways in which territory, identity, education, knowledge, and information are used to draw lines, privileges, and hierarchies between social groups, and especially to how this leads to an uneven distribution of benefits from urban sustainability efforts.
- **Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns**: This driver refers to unequal exposure to harmful and health-impairing pollutants, conditions and urban environments and/or unequal access to safe and healthy environments.
- **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**: This driver refers to processes of privatization, commercialization, budget cuts and state withdrawal from various sectors and how they can undermine urban sustainability, guided by an ideology of unfettered economic growth which often aligns with austerity policies.

What do you think about this scenario? Was it helpful to you? Do you find our approach problematic? Send us an email to Philipp Spaeth.
5.3 Enabling Governance Arrangements

As described in section 4.5, six Enabling Governance Arrangements have been identified by consolidating recurring patterns across the detailed descriptions of real-world Governance Interventions (see also the definition on page 5). In contrast to the Governance Scenarios, which are abstractions of a single intervention, the Enabling Governance Arrangements aim at wider applicability as general principles. In order to facilitate and structure discussions around the following question: How can city makers design governance processes for just and sustainable outcomes? As a result of analysing and juxtaposing this material, we are describing below six Enabling Governance Arrangements (including Wiki links):

1) Create a comprehensive vision of change
2) Make space for adaptation and experimentation
3) Build bridges between separate stakeholder groups
4) Commit to a meaningful participation process
5) Tap into existing community networks
6) Develop resilient and self-sufficient financing arrangements

Background information on the foundational, real-world Governance Interventions, our empirical basis, can be found in our database of detailed descriptions. There are also links to the respective entries of this database below and collections of brief extracts to illustrate each Enabling Governance Arrangement.

The question numbers accompanying the examples, like “(Q18)”, lead to the pertinent section of the respective description of a real world Governance Intervention.

All these Enabling Governance Arrangements were observed at play in several initiatives that were aimed at sustainable and just outcomes, which makes it likely that they can be useful for interventions with similar goals in other instances as well. But while these Enabling Governance Arrangements show a potential applicability in several different contexts, we do not claim that they are the sole factors for bringing interventions to fruition, as the latter will always be embedded in local contexts with place-based factors being important as well.

The Enabling Governance Arrangements have gone through multiple rounds of discussion and review by the UrbanA consortium and CoP. Firstly, feedback from a consortium project meeting in October 2020 provided guidance for how to improve the Enabling Governance Arrangements. Then, at the “Berlin” Arena, participants' input was gathered and has served to further strengthen and energize the arrangements.

5.3.1 Ways to improve the Enabling Governance Arrangements - Summary and incorporation of consortium feedback
The design and content of the Enabling Governance Arrangements was discussed at the October 14 project meeting in 2020. In one session consortium members were asked to give their feedback on their structure, their level of specificity and broadness, their benefits to marginalised groups, and other general feedback.
In general, feedback was rather positive. Enabling governance arrangements are seen as helpful in creating sustainable and just cities. The structure, sections and content, the balance between specificness and broadness as well as the efforts in connecting them to the drivers of injustice (WP4) were appreciated. It was deemed particularly important that the arrangements are accompanied by several real-world examples, taken from the Governance Interventions. These examples serve as an empirical basis and also make the arrangements easier to understand.

Regarding dedicated sections and overall structure of the Enabling Governance Arrangements, overall, it works well: the sections/headlines’ appearance on the wiki is appreciated and there do not seem to be fundamental sections missing.

Enabling governance arrangements must be specific enough to understand the specific context they evolved from connecting them to local particularities, but still broad enough so they can be applied in other contexts as well. This has been one of the main challenges in framing them. Considering the feedback gathered at this meeting, this challenge has been mastered well. Adding examples to the descriptions is key when trying to achieve that balance, especially when trying to understand the specifics of an Enabling Governance Arrangement and imagining it playing out in a real-world setting.

Concerning the question of how underrepresented groups could benefit from individual Enabling Governance Arrangements, there was diverse feedback that is difficult to align and implement. While it was articulated that in principle underrepresented groups can benefit from processes designed in accordance with the Enabling Governance Arrangements, we were also pointed to a lot of barriers in achieving such project design. Projects need to have a detailed understanding of the demographics of an area and to know which groups are found that may be underrepresented in ordinary planning processes. Additionally, it needs to be recognized that different groups face different hurdles and barriers to participate (and benefit) from urban interventions.

Other, more general, feedback for the Enabling Governance Arrangements involved broadening the range of examples. Firstly, the geographical scope could be widened, as most of the examples are from western/central European contexts, while the Eastern European/post-soviet context is mostly missing. Secondly, it was suggested that the range of involved actors/stakeholders could additionally include examples of the private sector. Thirdly, including counter examples from unsuccessful interventions could be given in order to show governance arrangements that were in fact hindering efforts in reaching sustainable and just cities. Finally, it was suggested to use the CoP in finding additional examples by inviting members to contribute to the database of Enabling Governance Arrangements and by adding examples of other contexts (geographically, actor-wise etc.) with which they are familiar.

Another strand of feedback was the wish to visualize the Enabling Governance Arrangements, especially on the Wiki as well as in preparation of Arena #3. Ideas ranged from adding simple visuals on the Wiki pages to developing podcasts, blogs or videos.

Additionally, the usage of terms like “citizens” or “municipality” when describing stakeholders of singular interventions was viewed as too uniform, since in fact they represent very diverse groups of actors. When possible, these terms should be replaced by more precise actor descriptions.
To summarize, much of the feedback targeted specifics of individual governance arrangements. More fundamental feedback focused on the range of examples and actors, the question of how underrepresented groups could benefit from each Enabling Governance Arrangement, as well as the closely connected usage of words like “citizens” that makes diverse groups appear to be more uniform than they actually are. There is also room for improvement regarding the visual presentation of the Enabling Governance Arrangements.

While some of this feedback was actionable, the more fundamental concerns remain a challenge.

Regarding the prior, we were able to address suggestions to build an attractive and accessible media-ecosystem around the Enabling Governance Arrangements. This includes vignettes and videos illustrating each arrangement, as well as several podcasts which highlight various arrangements (see section 4.6.1).

Other actionable feedback included specific suggestions for each arrangement, such as removing examples which did not fit well. Furthermore, the suggestion to diversify the range of examples was not adopted at this stage, but rather left to participant suggestions in the “Berlin” Arena (see section 5.3.2). While we acknowledge it is valuable to have a greater geographical diversity of examples, it was not feasible to include further examples while maintaining the same level of empirical quality as the others. These examples all come from in-depth analysis of real-world Governance Interventions with at least one interview each. Therefore, we called for a different class of examples, which were not studied in depth, but rather brief illustrations offered at the “Berlin” Arena. Concerning the suggestion that counter-examples could be given in order to demonstrate governance arrangements that are, in fact, not feasible for just urban sustainability governance would be inconsistent with our methods. As mentioned, the Enabling Governance Arrangements were derived from initiatives that were aimed at sustainable and just outcomes, which makes it more likely that they can be useful for interventions with similar goals in other instances. Being additionally used in WP6 keys, Enabling Governance Arrangements should only include positive examples. However, to avoid a naive promotion of the arrangements, examples were occasionally used to illustrate concerns raised in the ‘critical reflection’ section.

More fundamental concerns include how marginalised groups could profit from the Enabling Governance Arrangements, and the need to diversify all-encompassing actor groups.

The question of how underrepresented groups can profit from the Enabling Governance Arrangements still remains a difficult task. It is clear that there are a lot of previously described hurdles that one has to be aware of, when trying to design and implement sustainable urban interventions. Implementing the Enabling Governance Arrangements alone will not always benefit underrepresented groups, if these processes are not managed in a way so that they recognise the barriers of those groups in being a part of and profiting from them. It is also clear that barriers are highly contextual, depending on local particularities when actually implementing real world projects in a certain area. This means that the Enabling Governance Arrangements, which are supposed to strike a balance between local particularities and broader contexts, cannot account for all possible barriers that underrepresented groups all over Europe may face in certain situations. It is still very important to connect the Enabling Governance Arrangements to injustices that underrepresented groups may face in their application. As detailed in section 4.6.3.2, we invited informal
representatives of marginalised groups to provide the opportunity to raise such concerns at the “Berlin” Arena. Furthermore, links between the Enabling Governance Arrangements and injustice have been made clear both during ALU-FR presentations at the Arena and within the final Arrangements themselves.

The feedback on the need to diversify all-encompassing actor groups such as “citizens” is important yet difficult to implement, as the Enabling Governance Arrangements come from real-world examples that rarely differentiate the actor groups themselves. We reviewed our source material once again for opportunities to differentiate actor groups in our outputs, but in most cases this was not possible without speculation. For example, the Augustenborg case study documents held clues as to which actor groups were impacted by the intervention, however these were only mentioned in passing. It was stated once in a deliverable document that translators were used to assist those who did not speak Swedish. Otherwise there was no explicit differentiation of impacted actor groups. This is an interesting observation, as it means that urban sustainability projects often use these actor group types, especially citizens, at the expense of greater demographic detail. This again stresses the importance of thinking about underrepresented groups, since there are citizens (e.g. elderly people, people with low income, foreigners, women) who might be forgotten by projects which lump all groups into the same category.

5.3.2 Strengthening and energizing the Enabling Governance Arrangements - Incorporation of “Berlin” Arena inputs and final versions of Arrangements

As described in section 4.6.3.3, much of the “Berlin” Arena was structured around the six Enabling Governance Arrangements. The Arena was an opportunity to strengthen and energize the governance arrangements with participants’ inputs and experiences. In addition to contributing towards the six existing arrangements, several additional governance-related themes emerged (see section 6.2).

Much of the relevant input for the Enabling Governance Arrangements originated from session 3 and session 7. In session 3, participants were asked to share examples related to their breakout room’s arrangement. They were also prompted to discuss challenges in applying the arrangement, particularly in different urban contexts. In session 7, they were asked to brainstorm more concrete actions for how their arrangement could be implemented. After several rounds of review, insights from the miro boards were harnessed and integrated into the Enabling Governance Arrangements. Most of the comments neatly complemented the themes in the arrangements, and their inclusion thus strengthened their legitimacy. Furthermore, especially in response to the ‘challenges’ question in session 3, participants raised concerns about the practicalities and justice considerations when applying the governance arrangements. These concerns were also integrated into the final arrangements within the critical reflection section. This type of contribution is particularly valuable, since it highlights the complex and limited realities of city-makers who are working towards more just and sustainable cities.

In addition to the inputs described above, we also searched the miro boards for additional examples, illustrative and slightly provocative quotes, and other resources recommended by participants. As mentioned in section 5.3.1, it was not feasible to analyse the examples provided by “Berlin” Arena participants with the same rigour as we had done for the original Governance Interventions. However, they have been included in a new section within the Enabling Governance Arrangements.
together with sample action items and resources. The ‘action items’ are participants’ short ideas for how the arrangement could be operationalized. This new section serves to energize each Enabling Governance Arrangement by connecting it with interesting and useful current material. The quotations pulled from the miro boards are featured at the beginning of each Enabling Governance Arrangement. Each arrangement has two quotations, one which is illustrative and affirming, the other which is slightly critical and thought-provoking. Consequently, we think they will help engage the reader quickly and provide ‘food for thought’ right from the onset.

The final structure of the Enabling Governance Arrangements is as follows:

- thought-provoking quotations,
- a vignette visualising the arrangement
- a link to a video describing the arrangement
- links to examples from real world Governance Interventions
- description of its general ambition,
- examples from the Governance Interventions it was drawn from,
- a sample of action idea(s),
- examples, and resources from UrbanA’s “Berlin” Arena,
- relation to justice in urban sustainability governance,
- critical reflection,
- and connection to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Within the text, there are citations to the “Berlin” Arena from which some of the content was drawn. For our future internal reference, ALU-FR holds a copy of the Enabling Governance Arrangements in which the citations lead back to the specific Arena session and sub-group from which they originated. However, for those without access to the miro notetaking boards, this level of detailed citation is not useful. Instead, we opted for the following simplified citation: ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

In the following pages you will find each of the final Enabling Governance Arrangements, accompanied by their illustrative vignettes (By Carlotta Cataldi), as well as links to their respective wiki pages and explanatory videos. This content will soon be consolidated into a final booklet of Enabling Governance Arrangements and shared on the UrbanA website and through the UrbanA social media channels.
Create a comprehensive vision of change

❖ “We need more storytellers to inspire and gather people to build a shared vision of change” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021)
❖ “People in power have to be challenged in the construction of a vision of real change” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021)

❖ Link to an explanatory video
❖ Examples from real world Governance Interventions:
  Barcelona Superblocks
  Biodiversity protection and social justice in the Barcelona Natural Park
  Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg
  Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam
General ambition

A comprehensive vision guides individual initiatives and often highlights links with others to create a wider perspective of change. Visioning can include abstract processes to address fundamental questions, as well as working out practical details. A shared vision is necessary for an initiative’s success ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). A shared vision can be developed at multiple levels of governance, ranging from community to municipality level. While these visions encompass different scales and sectors, positive change is most likely when they overlap and complement each other.

City-wide visions are built by integrating several small-scale interventions from different sectors. Interaction between different scales of urban planning and policy making is key. The comprehensive vision can be reflected in policy and law. Small, tangible successes in the short term can also maintain engagement and motivation for achieving long-term overarching visions ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Community-based organizations generate grassroots visions of change by collecting residents’ ambitions and images of the future. This process fosters personal connections and generates momentum towards positive change.

As guides for the future of our cities, visions need to include as many voices as possible. Inclusive, safe spaces allow for different groups to collectively express their ideas and wishes ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). The arts can help create such spaces and overcome language and education barriers ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

The process of creating a shared vision can be used as a tool for tackling injustice, for example by integrating diverse voices and equity concerns in urban sustainability planning ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). Although different stakeholders may have conflicting visions of an area, or initiative, it is important to avoid zero-sum game situations. Instead, work towards a solution that addresses social priorities without compromising ecological sustainability. At its core, visioning is about balancing different topics and needs of people in creating sustainable and just cities.

Examples

➔ Barcelona Superblocks: When creating and implementing “superblocks”, Barcelona embedded the concept in multiple city-wide policies. For example, the “Citizen Commitment for Sustainability”, signed by over 800 public, private and civil-society organisations, defines superblocks as an action, thus gaining public support. Otherwise, superblocks are connected to different policies e.g the Municipal Action Plan, the Barcelona Mobility Pact (1998), the Urban Mobility Plan of Barcelona (2013-2018), the city’s current Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Plan, and the Barcelona Commitment to Climate, which includes superblocks as one way to fulfil their vision of change. (Q18)

➔ Biodiversity protection and social justice in the Barcelona Natural Park: Striking a balance between biodiversity protection and fulfilling local residents’ demand for greater access to green spaces and recreational activities was very important for the peri-urban park. The Special Plan for the Protection of the Natural Environment and Landscape of Collserola Mountain (PepNat) responds to the challenge of preserving biodiversity while providing much needed
recreational ecosystem services, especially in relation to the high density of population in surrounding areas. (Q9)

→ Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg: Prospective residents as well as project proponents of the Vauban neighbourhood developed a shared vision on how to live in a more sustainable way e.g. parking free areas, sustainable mobility, affordable and inclusive housing etc. (Q.14). This shared vision was possible because of a convergence of municipal priorities and community aspirations for the new district (Q13).

→ Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam: In workshops organized by local organizations, residents were invited to develop a shared vision of the district redevelopment and establish an agenda for transformative and experimental actions e.g. create a community center, a shared garden etc. (Q.14).

A sample of action idea(s), examples, and resources from UrbanA’s “Berlin” Arena (03.21).

→ Use science-fiction in a project with young people to make them imagine a future world (300 years from now).

→ Digital diaries, such as this art-based diary of imagination, capture collective visions of the future: https://tutela.network/diario-colectivo-de-imagenacion/

→ Sets of principles, like the Fab City’s, set out a vision of urban sustainability and livability: https://fab.city/uploads/Manifesto.pdf

That is not all! Additional insights from the “Berlin” Arena are included throughout this Enabling Governance Arrangement.

Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance

Broad yet integrated visions may overcome injustices caused by Unfit institutional structures and Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration.

‘Unfit institutional structures’ refers to the strict top-down approaches which limit knowledge generation and exchange, and rigid bureaucracies and regulatory barriers that fail to address the realities of vulnerable residents. ‘Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration’ refers to the ways in which new urban sustainability developments might force trade-offs between the social and environmental goals.

A comprehensive vision built on integrated planning should help overcome siloed thinking and guide a city in balancing its environmental, social and economic goals. Furthermore, community organizations are particularly well-positioned to include voices of underrepresented groups in their area which are unable to express themselves in other settings.

Critical reflection

Implementing visions is challenging. Especially with broader visions, there may be a gap between their big ambitions and what is actually being implemented on the ground. Economic considerations often
dominate the design and implementation of small-scale sustainability projects, possibly leading to unfavourable justice outcomes. The task then is to not only develop a comprehensive vision of change, but to also consistently empower it to actually shape small-scale interventions and honour the interlinkages between sustainability and justice ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Additionally, developing a comprehensive vision of change is a significant task for community-led organizations. Since it requires investing often scarce financial and time resources, visioning processes require commitment, effort and belief in their value. Community projects that rely on voluntary work might not have the capacity to do this.

As a more fundamental concern, some people believe that current narratives and economic models limit our abilities to develop truly alternative, “out of the box” visions ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

**Covid-19 connection/How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?**

On one hand, collaboratively developing a vision of change can be more difficult under social distancing regulations. Online formats may not offer a good substitute for the spirit cultivated by in-person visioning sessions. On the other hand, Covid-19 provides an opportunity to imagine something new. For instance, a green and just recovery and a realignment of priorities towards more green space and community supports in cities.
Make space for adaptation and experimentation

❖ “Failure is a natural part of experimentation and innovation!” (“Berlin” Arena, 03.2021)
❖ “Experimentation often means risk, who can afford to take a risk?” (“Berlin” Arena, 03.2021)

Link to an explanatory [video](#)

Examples from real world Governance Interventions:
- [Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam](#)
- [Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg](#)
- [BürgerEnergie Berlin](#)
- [Community-led affordable housing in Brussels](#)
- [Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg](#)
General ambition

Adaptability within initiatives for sustainable and just cities means leaving space for careful modifications and detours along their path to fulfilling overarching visions. In other words, initiatives may benefit from continuously and collectively deciding how much they are willing to adapt their plans based on new information and circumstances.

Initiatives should be responsive to both external and internal changes ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). This requires regular internal reflection amongst initiative proponents on shifting political, social, ecological and economic conditions, as well as on new developments and knowledge from within the project. Long-term goals may also need adaptation to reflect the priorities and opinions of different stakeholder groups (e.g. concerns about gentrification from urban greening processes) ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Openness to adaptation entails striking a balance between sticking rigidly to pre-set agendas and a lack of persistence with former decisions. A reflexive approach to adaptability can support initiatives’ efforts to remain viable, gain influence, and stick to their transformative ideas.

In many cases, a basic level of adaptability is required to keep initiatives afloat in difficult circumstances, such as the removal of important subsidies. In others, short-term flexibility may allow initiatives to take advantage of beneficial windows of opportunity.

While this type of adaptability is reactive, many innovative experiences benefit from proactively adopting an experimental approach to project design and implementation. An experimental mindset uses a “probe and learn” approach. It allows room for mistakes and new developments, while still working towards long-term visions. Furthermore, in celebration of “mistake culture”, failure can be normalized as a natural part of experimentation and innovation ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021)! Such a mindset can be embodied in an organization’s culture and structures. A critical mass of initiative supporters who uphold an experimental ethos will allow for more learning opportunities and creative ways to tackle seemingly unchangeable injustices and unsustainable practices.

Examples

➔ Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam: Project leaders of the Resilience Lab had an overall vision of the project development, but it was not set in stone. The project consortium was given a “carte blanche” for developing and experimenting. Whereas most funded projects are predefined and have to follow a pre-established framework, project members had the freedom to progressively develop and adapt their ideas to the local context. This freedom was crucial to the success of the Reliance Lab (Q13). The Resilience Lab was thus a test bed for new methodologies and innovative practices (Q17). For instance, the creation of a community center was not planned in advance and was envisioned and initiated by local stakeholders (Q.27 & 28).

➔ Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg: An experimental approach where project members were not too uptight and were open to learning from mistakes was crucial (Q20).
the beginning, many people shared this experimental mindset. However, when certain individuals were replaced by others (e.g., due to changes in department heads) without this mentality, adaptivity and experimentation started to diminish. There was no longer a critical mass of people who held a shared sense of responsibility, and there was more fear of making mistakes (Q20).

→ BürgerEnergie Berlin (BEB): When energy company Vattenfall filed a lawsuit against the Berlin government’s decision to remunicipalise the city’s energy network, the odds seemed stacked against BEB. To stay relevant and to achieve their overarching goal of green electricity production and provision, BEB is reinventing itself and working on numerous other projects including solar energy production. A BEB representative in an interview said: “…adapting to the circumstances is very important because over time … circumstances change a lot. You have to constantly reflect whether your vision is still relevant and up to date and do we need to adapt and can we carry on”.

→ Community-led affordable housing in Brussels: While they try to develop standardised procedures whenever possible, the Land Trust team finds it essential to reflect and adapt to internal learning and external change: “We are constantly reflecting on things… For every part of the operation we regularly rethink how to do it. This happens at the level of the team, and also on the level of our working groups, partner associations, experts and other stakeholders, and the level of our board.” (Interview with practitioner) (Q26a). Furthermore, from the beginning, the Brussels Capital Region, a major financial supporter of the Land Trust, was responsive to the initiative’s interests, allowing it space to develop its innovative ideas (Q20).

→ Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg: The municipality implemented the principle of “Planning that Learns,” meaning that pilot initiatives would be tested experimentally before being widely enforced. A prime example of this principle is the parking-free area in Freiburg-Vauban, which was established for only a part of the district (Interview with practitioner).

A sample of action idea(s), examples, and resources from UrbanA’s "Berlin" Arena (03.21).

→ At conferences or gatherings, discuss processes, challenges and failures instead of outcomes. This helps learn about adaptability.

→ Ensure that co-creation processes have some structure and flexibility at the same time.

→ Networks like ENOLL (European Network of Living Labs) connect and support 150+ Living Labs which experiment and innovate in real-life settings: https://enoll.org/

That is not all! Additional insights from the “Berlin” Arena are included throughout this Enabling Governance Arrangement.

Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance

Adaptability in project design and implementation allows for responsiveness to changing social and economic conditions and allows initiatives to meet the shifting needs of those it serves. Leaving space for adaptation and experimentation may be a salve for unfit institutional structures. ‘Unfit institutional
structures’ refers to the strict top-down approaches which limit knowledge generation and exchange, and to rigid bureaucracies and regulatory barriers which often result in sustainability policies that fail to address the realities of vulnerable residents. In lieu of risk-averse and rigid project management approaches, experimental mindsets based on ideas from various actors may allow for more innovative thinking around how to tackle injustice.

**Critical reflection**

When initiatives adapt too well to an environment that is structurally unsustainable and unjust, they risk losing their transformative potential and integrity, e.g. as a ‘counter model’. Calls for adaptability can also help to pursue other agendas under the disguise of vague commitments to sustainability and justice.

Furthermore, adaptations of initiative design and implementation can lead to unanticipated costs and challenges. Projects working with vulnerable groups may be more risk averse and try to minimize risk from experimentation as to avoid harming these people (i.e. low income residents developing social housing) (*Interview with practitioner*). Experimentation in social justice initiatives can also be a sensitive topic, since those involved already face discrimination and should not feel like they are being “experimented on”. Instead projects should create arrangements where people can adapt, learn and grow (*“Berlin” Arena, 03.2021*).

Additionally, projects may not allow for real experimentation and adaptation (*“Berlin” Arena, 03.2021*). “No-strings attached” funding is rare, and instead most funded projects are predefined and follow a pre-established framework, consequently limiting adaptability.

Finally, while stoically sticking to a preset agenda might limit creative opportunities for overcoming problems, being “too flexible” could give an impression of incompetence and disarray, therefore reducing stakeholder confidence and commitment to the project. Especially with social media, some project leaders may be afraid of innovating due to negative public feedback (*“Berlin” Arena, 03.2021*).

**Covid-19 connection/How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?**

Adaptability is essential for initiatives operating in the context of Covid-19 – a time of great economic and social uncertainty. The global pandemic necessitates a basic level of flexibility, as adaptation of many aspects, from daily activities to long-term strategic planning, may be essential for an initiative’s survival. Going forward, this situation presents a strong case for building-in opportunities for flexibility by leaving space for contingency plans, and encourages an experimental mindset to explore new ways of flourishing under vastly different circumstances.
Build bridges between separate stakeholder groups

❖ “Building bridges takes a lot of time, it doesn't happen overnight. Often this time is missing.” (“Berlin” Arena, 03.2021)

❖ “To get EVERYONE on board (i.e. people who don’t share our idea) we need to start by understanding them.” (“Berlin” Arena, 03.2021)

Link to an explanatory video

Examples from real world Governance Interventions:
Anti-gentrification resistances in Rome
Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg
Inner-city community energy in London
Community-led affordable housing in Brussels
Barcelona Superblocks
Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg
General ambition

Building bridges between separate groups of stakeholders requires setting up various informal or formal roles (e.g., intermediary, information broker, language translator, etc.) to enable communication, build trust, and increase mutual understanding through “on-site” engagement. At its core, building bridges is about furthering democratic participation on a decentralised, local level.

Such bridging roles can be filled by diverse actors (e.g., a project manager, a committee, a dedicated organization, esteemed community member, etc.) who are sensitive to the needs and perspectives of others, self-reflective of both their own privilege as well as their intermediary role, and generally humble ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Community members, for example, are important intermediaries because they are familiar with the local dynamics and can help to keep things going after a project is over ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). Additionally, civil society groups play important roles as intermediaries and information brokers between local governments and community members by creating ways for sharing knowledge about political activities and community needs and wants ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). In some cases, local governments can serve as intermediaries between different stakeholders in a community.

Bridge-building roles, such as intermediaries, foster efficiency and help to avoid repeating the same mistakes that often come with short term, project-by-project municipal based approaches. Intermediaries who know their city and its history and inhabitants well, for example, carry over knowledge and experience about how things work and what has and hasn’t worked in the past. In this way, communication between residents and municipalities as well as different municipal departments can understand each other better, retain lessons learned when moving between projects ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021), and work together more effectively.

Conferences like UrbanA Arenas, virtual and local forums or platforms, and face-to-face community gatherings (e.g., children’s and neighborhood parliaments, food and arts festivals) all provide opportunities to build bridges: freely share information, build ideas, chat and make new connections (or find comfort in old ones) and enjoy yourself in a safe space ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Examples

- **Anti-gentrification resistances in Rome**: The anti-eviction platforms liaised between the voiced concerns of evicted residents and the municipality as well as the Housing Authority. (Q.13)

- **Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg**: The “Working Group Vauban”, a consultative committee consisting of municipal actors, local parliamentarians and residents, provided a place for discussion and mediation between stakeholders. (Q.15)

- **Inner-city community energy in London**: A small group within the local government, Lambeth Council, helped the team organize themselves and contact other relevant groups despite their minimal capacity (Q.13). Additionally, “Estate mamas”, well respected middle aged women who lived in the area, offered resources and support and helped to establish trust between community members. (Q24)
Community Land Trust Brussels: The Community Land Trust in Brussels is a social real estate developer that builds affordable housing projects on collectively-owned land in Brussels for people with limited means. Collaboration between separate stakeholder groups is integral to the project as its managing board consists of civil society/housing organisations, private firms, social enterprises and the local government (Q5).

Superblocks Barcelona: In several neighbourhoods, multi-stakeholder decision making processes have been formalized in local, regular working groups to design superblocks based on seeking agreements between different stakeholders. These working groups arose in response to the lack of participation processes in the Poblenou neighbourhood and the municipality retroactively realizing that individual superblocks have to be adapted to local particularities. (Q13)

Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg: In Malmö, each city department has its own unit designed for community engagement (e.g. the Highway and Parks department, the Culture department...). On a city level, these units could be brought together through an intermediary organization that connects neighbours, the city, housing companies, and local companies. This would create a path for long-term structured development processes - as an institutionalized intermediary while transferring knowledge in and between cities (Q31) (Interview with practitioner).

A sample of action idea(s), examples, and resources from UrbanA’s "Berlin" Arena (03.21).

❖ Use technology (e.g., open-source digital platforms for community self-organization) to foster dialogue.

❖ Create public spaces where people can informally gather and find common ground.

❖ An open source-platform, such as this one in Barcelona, allows communities to self-organize and facilitates dialogue between policy makers and residents: https://www.decidim.barcelona/

❖ A political body, such as Freiburg’s Migrant_innenbeirat (Migrant Council), can help to represent the interests of the city’s immigrant residents in the city council: https://migrantenbeirat-freiburg.de/

That is not all! Additional insights from the “Berlin” Arena are included throughout this Enabling Governance Arrangement.

Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance

Building bridges between different stakeholder groups may address injustices associated with a Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities as well as Unfit institutional structures.

‘Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities’ means that knowledge is not shared effectively or equally across social groups, sectors or disciplines, making it difficult to go
forward. Building bridges can assure that useful knowledge and pressing concerns about urban development projects, for example, are shared across stakeholders in meaningful ways (especially including perspectives that are often left out). Additionally, translating the different ways of communicating across practitioners, academics, and diverse community members helps to build mutual understanding and respect that make collective action possible. In particular, building bridges opens a channel for disadvantaged groups to express their needs and potential fears around these projects, furthering procedural justice as well as justice as recognition.

‘Unfit institutional structures’ are rigid, top-down, bureaucratic and regulatory constraints that limit learning and policymaking opportunities needed for addressing urban inequalities and challenges to sustainability. Bridging municipal departments gets information flowing, making urban sustainability and justice possible. Having an on-going person designated to translate different languages between municipalities and underrepresented groups demonstrates commitment to a meaningful participatory process.

**Critical reflection**

Intermediaries ideally trust that a good process will bring a good outcome when it comes to urban sustainability and justice. Without this trust, they may steer efforts in certain directions, favoring some voices over others. History has shown that certain entrenched interests easily gain priority at the cost of sustainability and/or justice, especially since it can be difficult to recognise barriers if you come from a position of power yourself. Intermediaries may also be problematic if they overlook differences in objectives between actors (e.g. achieving ‘green growth’ vs. ‘overcoming capitalism’) for the sake of harmony, a feeling of common purpose or the success of tangible projects.

Intermediaries might be biased in favor of certain approaches or particular networks, affiliations, or institutional logics (ways of doing things). Consequently, the intentions of an intermediary may be called into question, causing conflict and undermining the bridging efforts (‘Berlin’ Arena, 03.2021).

**Example**

- **Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg:** Collaboration between residents and the municipality was not always easy because each group had to adapt to the institutional logic of the other. For instance, when a joint working group of city administration, parliamentarians and civil society organisations invited a representative of Forum Vauban to take over a permanent seat in a consulting role, Forum Vauban welcomed this decision of the city as a step of opening up to hear their perspectives. Nevertheless, they were not always satisfied, because the residents were expected to adapt fully to the logic of urban planning as it prevailed in the city administration. (Q23)

**Covid-19 connection/How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?**

Due to COVID 19, it has been difficult to bring people together face-to-face. Switching to online formats can create barriers to participation, especially for those who are not comfortable or familiar with online platforms, don’t use computers or don’t speak a common language well - thus making the work of
bridging roles more difficult. At the same time, the pandemic has made widespread virtual engagement more commonplace, and has possibly increased the capacity for bridging certain groups that would not have otherwise had the opportunity to meet in person.
Commit to a meaningful participation process

❖ “Don’t get *them* to come to *us*, we need to participate in the work of the people we are trying to work with.” (”Berlin” Arena, 03.2021)
❖ In reference to Lisbon: “There is lots of experience with participatory systems and processes, [but they are] never imported into governance. They remain in the experimental realm. We ask communities to participate, give their time, and then [there is] lack of inclusion in the actual process. There are no consequences for failing to follow through. We lose believability.” (”Berlin” Arena, 03.2021)

❖ Link to an explanatory video
❖ Examples from real world Governance Interventions:
  Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg
Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg
Inner-city community energy in London
Community-led affordable housing in Brussels
Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam
BürgerEnergie Berlin

General ambition

Meaningful participation values inclusivity and diverse perspectives to inform urban sustainability and justice in-practice, rather than merely “on paper”. In other words, participants’ inputs visibly shape initiative outcomes, and thus influence the status quo in urban sustainability and justice. Attention to inclusivity and diversity is needed throughout the process and is supported by consideration for race, gender, age, and class among others ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). It can require confronting and accepting multiple points of view and listening to people’s issues, concerns and experiences, thus avoiding feelings of tokenization ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Here, it can also be key to “do rather than say” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). Practical, ‘hands on’ participation opportunities can help make projects more inclusive as they allow for people from diverse backgrounds to contribute. Public participation in the form of volunteering can be crucial for the initiative’s operation and legitimacy. Fun and creative participatory mechanisms such as art, music or games can bring different people together and build trust in a common endeavor ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). This may be especially true for engaging children and teenagers who can make a powerful contribution ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021) and potentially ensure the sustainability of an initiative with their ongoing participation ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Meaningful participation nurtures communities in all kinds of ways, but can also take a lot of time and energy. There should be a clear benefit to those taking part. To maintain enthusiasm and engagement, participation processes can arrange for sharing a meal together ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021), learning useful skills together ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021), keep a positive outlook, and produce concrete and tangible outcomes (e.g., tactical urbanism) ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Municipalities require a culture of participation across municipal departments and councils("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). This type of collaborative governance entails a clear definition of roles, responsibilities and mutual respect as project partners (e.g. between municipal actors, councils and residents). Depending on the issues, participants may be empowered to shape outcomes in various ways. For technical endeavors (e.g. building a storm-water system), for example, residents can share their concerns, clarify understandings and possibly take on shared responsibility for specific aspects. An especially meaningful participation process may include giving decision-making roles to affected groups ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021), for example, as in participatory budgeting processes ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). It is important that people feel a sense of empowerment and ownership of an initiative ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Finally, trust is strengthened through meaningful participation. It can be supported through long-term, steady processes, transparency, clear responsibilities and expectations and a culture of admitting mistakes("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). Time pressure, among others, is a barrier to building trust ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). A long-term commitment to community engagement (i.e., beyond a short project
lifespan) builds up trust and conveys that inclusivity is essential to envisioning and making positive changes (“Berlin” Arena, 03.2021).

Examples

➔ Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg: The citizen-led Vauban Forum was invited to participate in the “Working Group Vauban” (a consultative committee within the city council) making residents legitimate partners in the project development (Q15 & 22).

➔ Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg: Plans were discussed in advance with residents, giving them the chance to comment and agree on next steps together with the municipality. Municipal authorities and 20% of all the residents collaborated together on plans for developing the area including tapping into the knowledge and experience of particular residents. Several of their ideas were implemented into the neighbourhood, such as developing the open storm water system in a more natural process that enhances the area’s urban biodiversity (Q14). Key here was to strike a good balance between short-term change of the area (where residents see fast changes as a result of their own participation) and the long-term commitment of institutions (so residents gain access to the bigger vision behind the project and feel like their time and energy will contribute to something greater) (Q23).

➔ Inner-city community energy in London: From the very beginning, community members have been the founders and drivers of a cooperative structure that relies upon community engagement in order to function (financial investment, regular meetings, decision-making etc.) and the intervention engages with the wider community to address energy poverty and provide opportunities for employment and learning (Q14). Additionally, further consultation with local residents informed the initiative’s problem definition (deliberative approach), and hands-on involvement (practical approach) in the creation of solar panels and internships led to increased interest and participation (Q24).

➔ Community led affordable housing in Brussels: From a very early stage, future building residents participated in visioning and realizing the creation of their future community land trust home. Furthermore, residents make up one third of the Trust’s board members (Q14).

➔ Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam: To make the project more inclusive, project proponents developed two types of participation methods and invited residents to engage in a more deliberative one (e.g. visioning the district) and more practical one (e.g. developing activities in the community center and community garden).

➔ BürgerEnergie Berlin: Based on the participation of volunteers including students (mainly graduates from the field of renewable energy) and retirees, this initiative was able to flourish. According to an interviewee, “Among the most important factors for the cooperative being alive and working to realize its goals is that we have a lot of people as volunteers giving their time and putting in their efforts.” (Interview with practitioner).
A sample of action idea(s), examples, and resources from UrbanA’s "Berlin" Arena (03.21).

➔ Build relationships and trust by finding an organization already working with marginalized communities. Participate in their projects before asking them to participate in yours. In doing so you create a mutual relationship where you can learn from each other.

➔ Institutionalize and promote civil society participation in local government.

➔ Transferable structures such as the Public Participation Networks in Ireland, bring together community and voluntary, environmental and social inclusion groups in local settings: https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/9db5e3-ppn-handbook/

➔ A low-barrier, inclusive community initiative such as the ‘Zusammen Leben’ (Living Together) garden in Freiburg, engages people from 20 different countries: https://zlev.de/

➔ An initiative that supports engagement in sensitive areas, such as the Lisbon City Council’s BipZip program, is a “fantastic tool for change”: https://urbanmaestro.org/example/bip-zip-programme/

That is not all! Additional insights from the “Berlin” Arena are included throughout this Enabling Governance Arrangement.

Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance

Committing to a meaningful participation process should help overcome two drivers of injustice: Limited citizen participation in urban planning and Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities.

‘Limited citizen participation in urban planning’ refers to the limited involvement and engagement of urban residents in decision-making around the planning, design, implementation and/or evaluation of urban sustainability-oriented interventions. By increasing the serious consideration of residents’ needs and desires and the chance to take an active part in shaping initiatives, the status quo of urban sustainability and injustice can be called into question. Reducing barriers to participation for specific marginalized groups, such as single parents or low income individuals, and providing childcare options or some form of financial compensation for their time can enhance procedural and representational justice in urban sustainability governance.

‘Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities’ means that knowledge is not shared effectively or equally across social groups, sectors or disciplines, making it difficult to improve urban sustainability and justice. Providing low-barrier participation opportunities, and knowledge on how to participate is one channel for giving equal access to such information.

Critical reflection

Participation processes can be a driver of injustice if they are not planned very carefully to foster inclusivity and diversity. If participatory processes do not include marginalized voices and priorities, outcomes will not be socially just. In some cases, participation is reliant on the capacity of citizens to self-organize and advocate for their interests.
Project coordinators may need to straddle power differences as not all stakeholder groups have the same capacity, time, knowledge, or accessibility to access or fully engage in such processes ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). Better accessibility through clear information and low entry barriers will help engage new people ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). However, “checking power” extends beyond the immediate participation process itself, where often neighborhood-level conversations get co-opted by bigger actors with a louder voice ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Projects are challenged to reconcile diverse perspectives and be mindful of initiatives that involve trade-offs across interest groups (for example reducing car traffic in cities could result in accessibility challenges for those who rely on it) ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021) or polarized societies where people have very different ideas ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Finally, there are several reasons why those responsible for organizing participation processes might actively avoid more inclusive and diverse participation. From a logistical perspective, meaningful participation processes can be costly and time intensive. Furthermore, some believe that politicians are not genuinely open to listening and acting based on what people or civil society has to say ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). Likewise, public actors may avoid meaningful engagement in anticipation of input or feedback that is inconvenient or seemingly undesirable - for example, “if we consult people they will say no” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021)

Examples

→ Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg: In Vauban, housing is primarily accessible to homeowners rather than to tenants. About 76% of the district is dedicated to homeowners (including cooperatives). However, despite having a highly participatory approach, becoming an owner is not accessible to everyone because it entails very high entry costs. (Q.14)

Covid-19 connection/How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?

Under Covid-19, in-person activities have been severely restricted, which naturally limits or digitalizes participation processes. Online methods such as participation apps, surveys, and video conferencing may make up for some of the loss, and possibly make participation more accessible for some (e.g., mobility-impaired individuals). However, the lack of in-person gatherings makes meaningful and truly inclusive participation processes more challenging. This is especially true for participatory initiatives which include, and/or rely on, collective in-person involvement from volunteers. In some cases, public health measures to combat Covid-19 serve to justify poor public consultations, for example, simply sending out surveys to “check off a box” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).
Tap into existing community networks

- “Tapping into synergies with other groups really helped us to kick-off.” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021)
- “It takes a lot of time to connect with other community initiatives. Even with volunteers we need to train them. And, we have to address wider racism as well.” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021)

Link to an explanatory video

Examples from real world Governance Interventions:
- Citizens rescuing and sharing food in Berlin
- Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg
- Community-led affordable housing in Brussels
- BürgerEnergie Berlin
- Barcelona Superblocks
- Inner-city community energy in London
General ambition

Both longstanding and emerging initiatives can greatly benefit from connecting to and learning from existing community networks that are working on similar or complementary issues.

Tapping into networks can involve sharing tools, resources, and knowledge about organizational structures and problem-solving amongst initiatives both within and between local communities. Emerging projects especially benefit from networks providing important financial and in-kind support ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). They can gain legitimacy and political and public visibility. Established initiatives, too, have much to gain by sharing their knowledge and resources within communities: they benefit from strengthened networks, get a reputation boost, and may receive additional financial support.

Local networks of community organizations are valuable resources for government authorities and larger-scale initiatives seeking to undertake interventions within a city. They are likely to have better knowledge of local contexts and community connections, and can be good catalysts for innovation and change ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). Furthermore, local networks of civil society actors can offer municipalities an “outward view” of what is happening across the city and help develop stronger relationships for future knowledge exchange and collaboration ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). Building alliances and good relationships between municipalities and civil society groups will balance “top-down” and “bottom-up” approaches, and foster more successful and integrated projects in the future ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Examples

- Citizens rescuing and sharing food in Berlin: To develop locally, Foodsharing groups tapped into the resources of the national network. They used the same online platform as well as the same principles and organizational structure. Social resources were also used to gain legitimacy, as Foodsharing is well known in the food sector. This helped regional groups to develop partnerships with food retailers such as supermarkets and possibly to gain support from local actors, such as community centers, as hosts for public fridges (Q13). Moreover, Foodsharing was able to become successfully established in Berlin because there was already a thriving sharing economy in the city (Q26a). Tapping into communities engaged in sharing economies for services, mobility, clothing and other purposes provided Foodsharing with the public engagement it needs. Finally, Foodsharing has been able to extend beyond its organizational network and support initiatives starting up elsewhere. The group YUnity originated from Foodsharing and develops online platforms and tools that enable others to start their own food sharing networks (Q31a).

- Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg: Housing cooperative networks in Germany inspired, to some extent, proponents of the Vauban Project. Specifically, they benefited from the expertise of the cooperative confederation regarding economy, law and tax policy (Q.26-b & Q.27-b).

- Community-led affordable housing in Brussels: The ability of fifteen community associations to self-organize and present a united appeal for establishment of a Land Trust was very important
for the intervention’s emergence. Additionally, the project learned from experiences in experiments for alternative affordable housing both within and outside of Brussels (Q26).

➔ **BürgerEnergie Berlin**: BEB is supported by a large number of alliances, including cooperatives, ethical banks and renewable energy companies. The cooperative expanded rapidly in both numbers and donations through synergies with networks established by other energy cooperatives and movements in the field of energy and politics. Schönau Cooperative was instrumental in the success of BEB, passing on knowledge and expertise. Furthermore, in order to reach out to people and inform them about the cooperative, BEB worked together with the media, joined a network summit called “NetzGipfel”, and took part in demonstrations and other events to inform people about their initiative and recruit participants.

➔ **Superblocks in Barcelona**: The Urban Ecology Agency is led by superblocks visionary Salvador Rueda, and was an important source of expertise in designing and implementing this project (Q15). The City Council also engaged multiple community networks by creating neighborhood working groups to design individual superblocks (Q14), which was critical for gaining public support for the project.

A sample of action idea(s), examples, and resources from UrbanA’s "Berlin" Arena (03.21).

❖ Engage with actors on different governance levels, from neighborhood associations up to the local municipality: Activate networks “up, down, laterally”.

❖ Develop a proper vision and strategy for learning from others, otherwise learning from other places can be more of a hindrance than a help.

❖ Exchange and learning programs like URBACT promote sustainable urban development, largely through networks: [https://urbact.eu/](https://urbact.eu/)

That is not all! Additional insights from the “Berlin” Arena are included throughout this Enabling Governance Arrangement.

**Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance**

Tapping into community networks may overcome injustices caused by **Weakened civil society**, **Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities**, and **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**.

‘Weak(ened) civil society’ refers to the ways in which self-organised civic groups that share common interests (other than the state, market or family) are either not sufficiently present and effective to influence and benefit from sustainability efforts, or are indeed constrained by government- or business-led interventions with sustainability objectives. Tapping into the resources of existing community networks can reinforce and strengthen local organizations, and help broaden and diversify engagement with sustainability efforts. In addition, forming alliances with other movements can help increase legitimacy and public support, which in turn can help overcome regulatory or political barriers.
‘Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities’ refers to the ways in which useful information about sustainable urban interventions is not shared effectively or meaningfully among social groups, sectors or disciplines, which thus constrains the potential for both sustainability and justice. Tapping into the resources of existing community networks includes two-way sharing of information and skills. It allows grassroot groups to stay informed and to learn about sustainable urban interventions, and increases opportunities for them to engage in and benefit from them. Creating spaces and mechanisms for learning to occur can facilitate such connections and improve attention to the variety of local needs, wishes and capacities ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

‘Unquestioned neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism’ refers to processes of privatization, commercialization, budgetary cuts and state withdrawal from various sectors, and how they can undermine urban sustainability and justice, guided by an ideology of unfettered economic growth that often aligns with austerity policies. Creating alliances with other community networks can provide grassroot initiatives with resources (e.g., human, financial or organizational) to which they otherwise lack access. However, in this context, relying on internal community resources may risk reinforcing the rollback of the state, through delegation of government responsibilities to residents and volunteer-run activities.

Critical reflection

While networking is essential for initiatives with limited scope, developing partnerships itself can be resource-intensive. Challenges can also arise between groups with different identities if they are not sensitive to one another. The time, skills and effort needed for meaningful collaboration and open communication can also be a constraint for organizations with limited means ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). Furthermore, connecting closely to already existing initiatives may deprive emerging initiatives of their distinctive and innovative characters or limit their appeal to particular social groups. In addition, it cannot be assumed that initiatives are willing to share their information or distinctive expertise if they perceive others as potential “competitors” (for public funding, participants, etc.). Furthermore, since many initiatives for sustainable and just cities are unique “trailblazers”, the relevance and value of advice from other community groups may be limited. Much learning still has to take place in the context of the initiative itself.

There is also a risk that strong community networks operating in a certain domain (food, housing, etc.) alleviate, and unwittingly enable, state deficiencies. In as far as they replace the state’s responsibility to organize provision, such initiatives may be instrumentalized in line with neoliberal logic by compensating for or even fostering roll-back of the state.

Example

➔ Inner-city community energy in London: As a pioneer organization, Repowering offers professional services such as legal, structural, financial, and marketing aid to other upcoming community energy projects. However, there is an ongoing internal debate regarding what information Repowering is willing to share freely and what they maintain as exclusive expertise that should be protected (Q32). Furthermore, Repowering had access to limited external expertise in the sector from which to draw, and therefore had to learn through their own
process of innovation: “It wasn’t like we got an answer from other people and they helped us out. It was the other way around. We trail-blazed the whole sector” (Interview with practitioner) (Q26).

Covid-19 connection/How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?

In the context of the pandemic, some public institutions supported various economic sectors but did not provide adequate assistance to many social sectors. Civil-society organizations have complemented deficiencies in public social assistance, especially in the sector of food and housing by providing meals or temporary housing for those in need. Tapping into resources of existing community networks provides such emerging local initiatives with ‘internal’ resources (i.e. internal to the community) that the public sector is unable to offer. This support allows community groups to survive and pursue sustainability and justice goals within cities in situations of selective governmental intervention.
Develop resilient and self-sufficient financing arrangements

- “We need to consider the intention behind private investment in just sustainable initiatives.” “Greenwashing, green gentrification, etc. can be a trap.” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021)
- “Proof that alternative economic models can work is important.” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021)
- “[There is a] need to change the funding mechanisms: now we are focusing on innovation and starting something new. Need to be more focused on sustaining and maintaining initiatives.” ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021)

Link to an explanatory video

Examples from real world Governance Interventions:
- Inner-city community energy in London
- Citizens rescuing and sharing food in Berlin
- Community-led affordable housing in Brussels
- Barcelona Superblocks
General ambition

Many community-led initiatives for sustainable and just cities rely on public funding (subsidies, grants, etc.) to carry out their activities. However, changing political priorities and economic crises can restrict this funding. Such intermittent and unreliable funding poses existential challenges to organizations ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

A financing arrangement that contains a well thought-out value proposition, and viable mechanisms for delivery and capture, as well as assessment of risks (such as over-reliance on specific sources of funding), will make an organization more financially resilient in the face of austerity. However, this is no easy task, since many community-led projects serve low-income residents and therefore cannot rely on beneficiaries as a source of revenue. Additionally, since funding sources and business models (often) also reflect the values of the organization using them, community-led organizations and projects may have to think carefully about accepting funding from larger institutions or private sector investors, which might conflict with their own political views and environmental and social goals ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Short-term, conditional funding from governments or larger institutions can also threaten to “projectify” an organization’s work or mission ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). However, high quality interventions can also be relatively low-cost (or even free!), in both start-up and maintenance, which reduces investment risks and administrative burdens without undermining potential positive impacts ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Income diversification (through events, membership fees, etc.) and co-financing are important ways in which organizations can diversify their revenue streams. Some community initiatives are also experimenting with and adopting alternative economic strategies aimed at increasing organisational resilience. These include a variety of legal forms with different social impact models, from cooperatives to community benefit societies, and in some cases demonetization: for example, through resource sharing ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021) or adopting “sweat equity” and time banking schemes ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). There are also expanded definitions of “value” that can validate projects’ social impact: for example, value definitions that take into account externalities (e.g., reduced burden on social safety nets) or economic assessments of non-monetary community resources can help to justify funding ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Governments also have the responsibility to support opportunities for more stable, long-term financing. Through procurement and partnership, governments can provide structures for alternative financial models to thrive and sustain projects over longer periods of time ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021).

Examples

➔ Inner-city community energy in London: After the steep decline and cancellation of the feed-in-tariff subsidy for community energy, Repowering sought out alternatives such as private investment and conducted pilot projects for a peer-to-peer energy trading system (Q.24). Repowering took measures to reduce exclusion of low-income residents by keeping the threshold investment for members relatively low, around £50. By making the project more
inclusive through low barriers to entry, community workshops, and open general meetings, they were also able to increase their community support base. They also created a Community Energy Efficiency fund for non-investors (Q16b).

→ **Citizens rescuing and sharing food in Berlin:** Foodsharing is run by unpaid volunteers, including developers, food sharers and food savers, and refuses any public funding or subsidies. Relying on internal resources is part of the political identity of the organization as it tries to operate without financial transactions. Foodsharing members promote the “free”.

→ **Community-led affordable housing in Brussels:** Although the Brussels Community Land Trust (CLTB) faces obstacles in growing their budget in tandem with their organization, their revenue streams are highly diverse and thus could be resilient enough to maintain stability if one funding source dries up. While 40% of the budget comes from government subsidies, the other 60% comes from a variety of sources: grants, household mortgages, membership fees, ground leases, crowdfunding and donations (Q21). Importantly, in January 2021 CLTB launched the cooperative “Common Ground”, which partners with the social economy sector to attract private and citizen finance for land purchases and management under the Community Land Trust model. Finally, the CLTB’s first project was their pilot, but with a proven business model they are now eligible for additional, long-term support.

→ **Superblocks in Barcelona:** The superblocks interventions are seen as a relatively low-cost, high-impact initiative (Q25). The highest expenditures were on upfront costs for construction and reworking city transport, with few additional costs for maintenance. Furthermore, because the superblocks project is embedded in many other sustainability and development plans in Barcelona, their funding is relatively secure (Q26a).

→ **For interesting examples of business models for Nature-Based Solutions, see the NATURVATION project’s Business Model Catalogue**

**A sample of action idea(s), examples, and resources from UrbanA’s “Berlin” Arena (03.21).**

- Develop guidelines for ethical public procurement supporting sustainable and local circuits of value.
- Use and/or acknowledge beyond-financial assessments of value, like Social Return On Investment.
- Set up time-banking or similar schemes to reward volunteering and/or enable sharing of resources.
- Local coins, such as the ‘makkie’ in Amsterdam, can be issued in exchange for voluntary work: [https://www.makkie.cc/](https://www.makkie.cc/)
- Low-cost models to address urban hunger, like that of Food Not Bombs, are based on collecting leftover food from markets, cooking it, and sharing with those in need: [https://foodnotbombs.net/new_site/](https://foodnotbombs.net/new_site/)
That is not all! Additional insights from the “Berlin” Arena are included throughout this Enabling Governance Arrangement.

**Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance**

Developing resilient and self-sufficient financial arrangements for urban sustainability and justice initiatives may address the consequences of **Unquestioned neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**. This refers to processes of privatization, commercialization, budgetary cuts and state withdrawal from various sectors. While this arrangement does not address the root causes of neoliberal austerity urbanism, it may lessen its impact on urban sustainability and justice by enabling initiatives to remain financially viable and therefore able to continue their operations. However, special care will need to be taken to ensure that these financial schemes do not exclude low-income groups who cannot afford to pay for the benefits of the initiative themselves and are of little interest to potential sponsors.

**Critical reflection**

While developing a financial arrangement that is able to remain viable in the face of public funding cuts and other effects of economic crises may make an initiative more resilient and therefore able to continue delivering benefits to communities, it may set a precedent for underfunding similar initiatives, thus downplaying state responsibility for collective welfare. In other words, public authorities may be tempted to limit public funding and support in the future if they see that organizations can “make it on their own”. This could in turn reinforce injustices associated with neoliberal practices.

Some community organizations may also not have the capacity or flexibility to develop alternative financial arrangements, as they may be restricted to certain operating methodologies ("Berlin" Arena, 03.2021). There is also a risk that projects in low-income communities cannot afford to support initiatives financially nor gain the necessary start-up investment if the project is unproven. Community members may be hesitant to invest in a project without a sense of trust that they will receive a return on their investment.

**Example**

➔ **Inner-city community energy in London:** One notable obstacle was the difficulty raising funds (£58,000) from community members for the first solar project. Since it was a new initiative, with no track record, individuals were hesitant to invest. Additionally, while many residents made pledges, this proved not to be a reliable indicator of actual financial support. Once the project was established, it was easier to find investors for other projects because the community had more trust in the organization and had seen an example of its success (Q23d).

**Covid-19 connection/How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?**

The Covid-19 crisis has highlighted the importance to any initiative of developing resilient financial arrangements. In such a crisis, sources of funding are directed to new and immediate priorities such as health care and social support. In the longer term, economic recovery stimuli may be positive for
urban sustainability and justice initiatives if directed towards a just and green recovery (check out Carbon Brief’s tracking of green recovery plans).
5.4 Policy briefs and academic papers

We will condense the findings that are detailed in this report into two short policy papers and present them to policy makers active on municipal and federal levels across Europe, mostly via national and international networks and mailing-lists as well as social media. One paper will be targeted at the local “city-maker” level with the aim to raise awareness of the Enabling Governance Arrangements. The other will aim to reach EU Research and Development policy makers to suggest reforms to translocal learning efforts from EU-funded research initiatives. In their style and format, these policy papers of 3-5 pages will build on a draft policy paper that emerged in UrbanA’s WP4 (Luger, 2021). It will also be designed in accordance with common expectations and recommendations on how to write a policy brief (French-Constant 2014 and McIvor 2018).

The lessons learned in WP5 of UrbanA will also be put in dialogue with the academic debate in two fields: a) Justice oriented Urban Governance (in general) and b) Ways to foster translocal learning (in particular). To achieve this, two articles will be written and submitted to peer reviewed academic journals. They will link to ongoing debates in the two fields and present the findings of UrbanA, especially with regard to challenges and strategies for systematically exposing processes of urban sustainability governance to justice concerns. Empirically, these articles can draw from the co-production of insights that happened during UrbanA, especially during its “Berlin” Arena, but also from interviews that Sophia Silverton from ALU-FR has conducted in the course of her M.Sc. thesis. By the end of the year 2021, two manuscripts shall formally be submitted.
6. Further insights

While the Governance Interventions, Governance Scenarios, and Enabling Governance Arrangements are the main outputs of WP5, there are further insights and reflections that are important to share here. These include: a summary of inputs on translocal learning from the “Berlin” Arena, a visualisation of additional governance-related themes that arose at the Arena, and how WP5 outputs will feed into UrbanA’s next steps.

6.1 Summary of insights on translocal learning from the “Berlin” Arena

The broader ambition for WP5’s accumulated knowledge is to emphasize positive processes and interactions that could be inspirational and potentially ‘translated’ across contexts, in various cities, to build sustainable and just urban futures. However, as argued in section 3.2, the task of sharing knowledge and lessons between different contexts is not straightforward. To engage with this subject further, at session five of the “Berlin” Arena, participants shared their experiences learning from other places in the past.

Firstly, all of the groups agreed that it is valuable to learn from other places as a starting point for solving problems in their own cities. Translocal learning was seen as a way to gather inspiration, motivation, and build solidarity across places. Participants indicated that it circumnavigated the “need to reinvent the wheel”, and offered a valuable external perspective and enhanced awareness of blindspots. Learning between places was seen as a catalyst for change, but not in a copy-paste manner. Rather, there was a shared emphasis on adapting and tailoring solutions to local contexts. More generic processes, structures, and governance arrangements were seen as useful for transfer and adaptation.

Participants also offered notes of caution regarding instances where learning between places might be challenging or problematic. Notably, findings from this Arena session support the argument in section 3.2 that the uniqueness of urban contexts stands in the way of solution transfer. Several examples were provided, which illustrated how differences in culture hinder the transfer of urban best practices. For example, one participant noted difficulties in implementing bike lanes in Romanian cities due to a prevailing car culture and strong ties of driving to wealth and status. Another participant group (the “Lisbon” hub) noted how differences in collaborative and mistake-sharing culture between countries like Germany and Portugal influence the adoption of initiatives. The group claimed that Portugal does not have an embedded collaborative culture, and that Portuguese individuals often feel more shame in showing mistakes. As a result, initiatives require more time to build trust and implement. Overall, participants stated that similar initiatives face completely different challenges when they are implemented in diverse urban settings. Furthermore, there were concerns over power and justice aspects within translocal learning. For example, the risk of reproducing the big Western city as the ultimate ‘sustainable city’, meanwhile ignoring other urbanization paths. Or concerns over ignoring local needs as an exclusive group chooses which interventions to apply, and in what way. This also means focusing on prescriptive solutions rather than specific problems, and an insistence on certain best practices. Another set of problematizations around translocal learning revolved around more pragmatic limitations faced by city-makers.

Learning between places was seen as time consuming, and possibly more hindrance than help if there is no proper strategy and vision for the knowledge sharing. Additionally, institutional funding for such exchanges was claimed to have specific expectations and limit possibilities. One group even indicated that support is needed at the local level to implement projects, as opposed to funding research that will “hardly be actionable”. Similarly, another group said that reporting from H2020...
projects is often ‘sanitized’ of mistakes and challenges, and there are not many safe spaces for sharing obstacles and challenges. Evidently, despite being an important endeavour, learning between places is mired with complexity and limitations.

Regarding participants’ positive experiences with translocal learning, most groups stressed the value of personal and dynamic learning processes, for example through networks connecting similar initiatives. The UrbanA Arena format was specifically identified as a good space for networking and learning. This affirms our interactive Arena methodology. Additionally, when knowledge is being applied in a new setting, it is seen as necessary to involve all affected stakeholders in an intentional process that adapts the knowledge to their needs and interests. It was also deemed essential to understand the conditions that allowed the initial initiative to flourish. Funding sources designed particularly for partnership maintenance were also seen as very helpful (i.e. paying the salary of a principal investigator or project manager to work as a contact liaison between organizations).

Figure 4. Vignette representing translocal learning (By Carlotta Cataldi)

Moving forward, participants called for several changes to the way that knowledge is generated, shared, and put into action in new places. Among many ideas was firstly an improved research-action-policy interface, with better collaboration between academics, experts, activists and others to adapt an idea to a specific place. Secondly, better knowledge dissemination practices by creating spaces like UrbanA that allow for accessible exchange and learning and to act as safe spaces enabling free communication. And thirdly, a change in mindset that appreciates failure. Sharing lessons from failed projects, including mistakes made or obstacles faced, was seen as a great opportunity for
learning. So-called ‘sanitized stories’ and spaces that exclude this information were regarded as unhelpful. Although regrettably they are still commonly used for sharing sustainability best practices.

In conclusion, outputs from the “Berlin” Arena have reaffirmed that any translocal learning efforts aiming at integrating sustainability and justice concerns in urban governance need to be grounded in community-based methods and include a critical perspective on the knowledge being shared. More fundamentally, translocal learning for just and sustainable cities needs to be structurally supported in response to the experiences and recommendations of city-makers who partake in it.

6.2 Visualisation of additional governance-related themes from the “Berlin” Arena

In addition to participants’ insights on our six specific Enabling Governance Arrangements and on translocal learning, there are several additional themes that arose during the “Berlin” Arena. The emergence of these themes illustrates that there are many different factors which are important for the governance of sustainable and just cities. For example, while our Enabling Governance Arrangements were the focus of our Arena, the list was by no means exhaustive.

In the mind maps below, you will see a visualisation of these themes which complement and add to our initial list. However, they remain in this visual form, since there is too little time within this work package to fully develop the additional themes with the same empirical rigour as the original Enabling Governance Arrangements. Furthermore, many of the new themes are connected with sub-themes (e.g. bridging) that link back to the Enabling Governance Arrangements. All content is derived directly from participant inputs.

Figure 5. “Berlin” Arena mind maps

- Blue bubbles show the main themes, in an imperative, action-provoking style
- Red bubbles show a concept that represents the theme’s gist
- Orange bubbles show sub-themes
- White bubbles show elaborations on the sub-themes
- Yellow bubbles show illustrative examples
6.3 Feeding into UrbanA’s next steps

The next UrbanA work package, WP6, is tasked with consolidating actionable next-steps in the form of policy recommendations. Thus it naturally builds upon previous work done in UrbanA.

Specifically, together with the consortium, the WP6 team is creating “keys” to sustainable and just cities. These keys reflect many of the most important themes covered in UrbanA. Each one links directly back to concrete inspirational examples, relevant approaches (WP3), Enabling Governance Arrangements (WP5), drivers of injustice (WP4) and other UrbanA multimedia.

Three keys have a particularly close connection with WP5’s Enabling Governance Arrangements: “#Participation”, “#Adaptation”, and “#Translocal”. ALU-FR members themselves drafted the first two keys, directly using the main points of the Participation and Adaptation Enabling Governance Arrangements. ALU-FR members also provided input on the Translocal key based on insights from the “Berlin” Arena’s translocal learning session.

The Enabling Governance Arrangements are the most prominent output of WP5 featured in these keys, both through embedded links or direct reflections of some Arrangements themselves. Yet, other WP5 outputs have also been carried forward in the keys. Many of the inspirational examples for the keys are directly derived from the WP5 Governance Interventions. Furthermore, media produced in WP5, such as podcasts and blog posts are also present in the multimedia section of several keys.

Outside of the keys, WP6 is collecting a bundle of policy briefs that have been produced throughout the UrbanA project. Section 5.4 outlines our intention to create two policy papers which condense the findings of WP5. Therefore, WP5 findings will be packaged in a useful format for policy makers at municipal and other governance levels.
7. Final conclusions on sharing knowledge for urban sustainability governance

The aim of WP5 has been to support governance for just and sustainable cities by drawing on the manifold experiences that have been made in EU-funded projects. We have done so by undertaking an in-depth analysis of particularly insightful real-world Governance Interventions, crafting inspirational Governance Scenarios from them, and from there synthesizing six Enabling Governance Arrangements. Our intention has been to explore ways in which positive experiences of governance for sustainable and just cities can be made accessible translocally. However, we recognize the complexity and place-specific nature of these experiences.

Section 6.1 outlines how it is not possible, nor desirable, to directly transfer solutions from place to place, and that sharing processes, structures, and governance arrangements were seen as useful for transfer and adaptation. Thus, our emphasis on Enabling Governance Arrangements has been affirmed by the UrbanA Community of Practice. By identifying and elaborating upon arrangements, which can be applied across contexts to improve governance for sustainable and just cities, we convey the conditions which have helped good practices succeed.

This method of facilitating cross-context learning appears unique compared to the plethora of case study documents studied in the context of UrbanA, which tend to focus on the immediate lessons from the examples. While undertaking our empirical work in WP5, we noted that other EU-funded projects’ case study material on urban sustainability and justice interventions was generally unhelpful for learning purposes. Thorough, detailed and critical reporting was required for our selection of governance cases. Yet it was challenging to find the eleven interventions which served as the basis of our work. Many of the documents we reviewed did not, for example, contain any detail on challenges faced by the intervention, or information on wider context conditions which made it possible. In many of the cases, information about the interventions’ governance was lacking. Furthermore, as mentioned in section 5.3.1, details on actors impacted by interventions were rather generic and undifferentiated. As we have learned in the “Berlin” Arena session on translocal learning (Section 6.1), this type of information is quite important for actors in other contexts who are trying to learn from an intervention elsewhere.

While we understand that the current EU research funding scheme may provide projects with the incentive to produce manifold case studies in less detail, we find that this does a disservice to those trying to learn from them. As an important outcome of the UrbanA project, we believe that more attention needs to be given to improving knowledge-sharing while crafting project outputs. This calls for a reform of European Union Research and Innovation funding schemes to incentivise more systematic learning about governance arrangements and to provide opportunities for direct and interactive learning. In order to enable upscaling, wider adoption or even individualized adaptation of innovative EU-funded initiatives, there needs to be a shift in emphasis towards a frank analysis of required preconditions and supportive or detrimental context factors in project documentation, as well as increased capacity and funding for interactive, continuous learning opportunities between cities. Our WP5 outputs (namely the scenarios and Enabling Governance Arrangements) provide a modest starting point for this endeavour.
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Annex 1: Interview guideline

Interview guideline for WP5 Governance Interventions

Project (and primary ‘instance’):
Interviewee’s name and position:
Date:
Consent form: yes/no

1. Brief presentation of UrbanA (if necessary) and WP5.

The UrbanA project, which will run from January 2019 to December 2021, will map, assess, and distill the knowledge and experiences generated in prior EU-funded research projects, which focus on tackling urban social inequalities and exclusion.

Specifically, WP5 focuses on urban sustainability governance. It aims to identify means for addressing inequality and exclusion and support learning across urban contexts. For doing so, we have selected some interventions in specific urban contexts presenting promising governance arrangements. Our aim is to create inspiring condensed scenarios from these experiences.

We are inviting your contribution to complete these rich descriptions.

2. Selected intervention and selection criterias

- We have selected this intervention... in the framework of the project.... you are a part of.
- We have selected this intervention because.... (Q.6 criterias).

(Q.6) Would you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?

Could you describe your role in the project (proponent/researcher/observer/opponent)?

3. Questions

This section has to be filled in beforehand with the questions we were not able to answer.

Before starting to ask questions, please briefly outline the framework of our questionnaire.

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention
b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work
c) Actor constellations
d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention
e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation
f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles
g) Reported outcomes
h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

j) Reflections on important governance concepts

What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

Additional question on second order learning:

Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?
### Annex 2: Sample images of detailed description summary table

#### First page of table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annex 2: Sample images of detailed description summary table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector of intervention</th>
<th>Overview of intervention goals and strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban energy systems</td>
<td>Promote sustainable energy solutions in urban areas, reducing dependence on fossil fuels and increasing energy efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>Implement integrated waste management strategies, focusing on waste reduction, recycling, and sustainable disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart mobility</td>
<td>Develop smart mobility solutions, integrating public transport, cycling, and walking, to reduce automotive congestion and pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart buildings</td>
<td>Enhance building performance, integrating smart technologies to improve energy efficiency and comfort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water management</td>
<td>Implement sustainable water management practices, focusing on water conservation, efficiency, and resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green spaces</td>
<td>Create and maintain green spaces, promoting environmental sustainability and human well-being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sixth page of table (blue boxes contain ‘de-contextualizable’ elements):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annex 2: Sample images of detailed description summary table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector of intervention</th>
<th>Overview of intervention goals and strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban energy systems</td>
<td>Promote sustainable energy solutions in urban areas, reducing dependence on fossil fuels and increasing energy efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>Implement integrated waste management strategies, focusing on waste reduction, recycling, and sustainable disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart mobility</td>
<td>Develop smart mobility solutions, integrating public transport, cycling, and walking, to reduce automotive congestion and pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart buildings</td>
<td>Enhance building performance, integrating smart technologies to improve energy efficiency and comfort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water management</td>
<td>Implement sustainable water management practices, focusing on water conservation, efficiency, and resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green spaces</td>
<td>Create and maintain green spaces, promoting environmental sustainability and human well-being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Annex 3: Detailed descriptions of real-world Governance Interventions

Table 1. Governance interventions analysed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of intervention (links lead to respective Wiki-pages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bottom-up resistance against gentrification in Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Citizens rescuing and sharing food in Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Community led affordable housing in Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dealing flexibly with and learning from resistance in Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Biodiversity protection and social justice in the Barcelona Natural Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Inner-city community energy in London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Citizens share in Berlin Energy Grid for sustainable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Public-private partnerships for sustainability infrastructure in Athens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 1:
Bottom-up resistance against gentrification in Rome

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]

The selected intervention refers to anti-gentrification resistances in Rome (Italy) with a particular focus on a district called Trastevere. Located at the heart of the city, the district is going through a long-lasting process of gentrification which also applies to the whole city centre of Rome. As a result of the increasing evictions, citizens have started to resist displacement, namely to “stay put” (AGAPE_01: 1)

The intervention has been primarily developed at the local level but tackles different scales. Organized resistances started in neighbourhoods (i.e. by tenant’s union, individual squatters occupying buildings). Anti-eviction platforms voice and convey these claims at the level of the district (Trastevere district). These multiple pressures on public authorities (from the public housing authority, the municipality of Rome, the Lazio region) result in the implementation of regulatory policies at the municipal or the regional level (e.g. sanatoria to regularize squatters).

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in ? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

This intervention is implemented in the fields of housing policies and urban social policies, specifically in a context of austerity policies.

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

The district Trastevere is facing a gentrification process resulting from a roll-back of the state which does not protect the housing stock anymore and privatizes public housing. As a result, the prices of tenancies dramatically increased leading to a severe housing crisis and to the evictions of dwellers by the police forces. In this context, anti-gentrification resistances emerged from the civil society as a call for the right of local residents to remain in the district. The resistances address social justice in the following terms:

- Call for regularizing informal housing such as squatting in public housing estates.
- Tenant’s request of becoming owners of the public housing.
- Call to freeze and stabilize the prices of tenancies in public housing.

The sustainability issue is not directly addressed by the residents of the district. AGAPE addresses sustainability with respect to social justice in terms of “social sustainability”. The latter refers to the fight of low income and marginalized people struggling to survive day to day and to their right to “stay put” i.e. to remain in their homes.

4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?

In Rome, anti-gentrification resistance progressively emerged in line with the gentrification process. This latter started from the 1990’s with a national law abolishing the rent control (i.e. guaranteeing...
5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)

The intervention is firstly characterized by non-government led governance mode and progressively turned to a co-governed or hybrid governance mode as soon as public actors engaged in the intervention.

6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?[1]

The case of Trastevere district is interesting because it specifically focuses on urban social (in)justices (i.e. participation, exclusion). It sheds light on the governance arrangements emerging from anti-gentrification practices in a specific context of crisis and austerity in southern European countries (SECs).

7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) Governance Intervention?

Primarily:

- AGAPE_01_Everyday resistances in gentrifying contexts_ANNUNZIATA_2019
- AGAPE_02_Garbatella. Heritage, Gentrification, and Public Policies in Rome, Italy_ANNUNZIATA_2019
- AGAPE_03_Resisting ‘Austerity Gentrification’ and Displacement in Southern Europe_ANNUZIATE_et_LEES_2016
- AGAPE_05_Philipp Katsinas reviews anti-gentrification workshop, ‘Staying Put’_KATSINAS_2017

b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:

a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

The intervention has been developed in the framework of the EU-funded project AGAPE (2014-16).[2]

The project aims at exploring the development of anti-gentrification practices in three Southern European cities (SECs) (i.e. Rome, Madrid and Athens) in the context of the post-2008 economic crisis. Specifically, the project seeks to determine the repertoire of collective actions to “stay put” (AGAPE_01) and to resist displacement as well as to contribute to gentrification resistance theories.

Gentrification refers to “a process involving a change in the population of land users such that the new users are of a higher socioeconomic status than the previous users, together with an associated change in the built environment through a reinvestment in fixed capital” (Clark 2005: 263, in AGAPE 01: 3).

b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.
The intervention best fits under the **Reconceptualising urban justice and sustainability** and the **Right to housing approaches**. The project is explicitly mentioned in the database under these two approaches.

- **c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?**

Yes: AGAPE_01_Everyday resistances in gentrifying contexts_Annunziata_2019

9. **Problematisation and priority:**

- **a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?**

In the case of the gentrification process in Trastevere, inequality and exclusion have been problematized by local inhabitants as well as researchers (from AGAPE project). They refer to the exclusions of lower income residents from Rome’s city center due to the privatization of public housing and the correlated gentrification process. Here, gentrification consists in a subtle transformation of the residential tenures and retails oriented to tourism and the eviction of the former working-class dwellers.

- **b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?**

The achievement of justice has been named as a major motivation behind the intervention. The project AGAPE seeks to draw attention to anti-gentrification practices in Southern European cities (SECs) “with a particular focus on their incorporation into - and capabilities to inform - local policy makings”. Hence, the goal is to support and voice anti-gentrification practices and policies in order to counter “urban inequality” as well as to set up a “post-crisis urban agenda aimed at achieving social justice”. The intervention in Trastevere district in Rome has been selected because it sheds light on social injustices but also because the intervention has a potential for informing about resistances and “alternative narratives” on counter-gentrification practices.

- **c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address? (see Database of drivers of injustice)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material and livelihood inequalities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unfit institutional structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Limited citizen participation in urban planning**

8. **Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities**

9. **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**

10. **Weak(ened) civil society**

c) **Actor constellations**

10. **Who initiated the intervention?**

   The intervention was initiated by some citizens in Rome, especially the local inhabitants directly targeted by the gentrification process and the evictions. Resisting gentrification includes a set of practices from “everyday” and individual to “collectively organized” actions i.e. within groups created for this purpose such as neighborhood organizations, community groups and tenants’ unions (e.g. The Comitato di Lotta per la casa del Centro Storico or the Network of San Saba) (AGAPE_01: 7). It is primarily a bottom-up intervention.

11. **Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)**

   The beneficiaries of the intervention are the local residents themselves (i.e. people used to live in Trastevere district) who “stay put” and might have a chance to remain in the district. Scaling up, the intervention also benefits other low income and marginalized residents of Rome potentially targeted by gentrification and austerity and housing policies. Generally, countering this process will benefit everyone concerned with social justice.

12. **Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor types</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Actor name and role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Organized anti-eviction platforms (i.e. platforms are citizens’ organizations including local tenants’ unions as well as anti-gentrification activists). They support and help targeted residents and voice their claim to fight evictions. They also advocate for social justice and housing solutions as well as pressure the Housing Authority and the municipality (AGAPE_01: 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid/ 3rd sector organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National government enforced in the 1990s the right-to-buy legislation that regulates the alienation of and the privatization of public properties (AGAPE_02: 6).

### Supranational government

The Housing Authority of Rome. It is responsible for allocating and administering social housing. It enforced the rental-homeownership conversion (i.e. according to the right-to-buy national law) which consists in offering tenants of public housing to buy (at moderate price) their housing.

### Other initiatives

| X |

13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

**Please, note that italicized sections are speculative**

The residents organize themselves locally, especially within anti-eviction platforms that are responsible for helping residents in distress but also voicing their claim to the public authorities. Anti-eviction platforms are crucial mediators because they convey the claims of the most deprived inhabitants (e.g. isolated persons, squatters) as well as of the neighbourhood groups or tenant’s unions and are the identified interlocutors of the municipality and the Housing Authority. They perform this back-and-forth work.
14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?

This intervention is based on and driven by citizens. The anti-eviction platforms as well as the community groups (e.g. of squatters) are the results of grassroot initiatives. The intervention of public actors (i.e. the housing authority and the municipality) to alleviate evictions or of external supporters (i.e. activists or researchers in the framework of AGAPE project) voicing the claims add to the already existing grassroot resistances.

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

n/a

16. Exclusion:

   • a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?

Migrants (and to some extent gipsies) are excluded from the intervention. Although many are living in informal housing and are more likely to be targeted by evictions (as recalls the example of a massive and brutal eviction in the via Curatone which took place in August 2017) (AGAPE_01: 12), they are not included in resistance groups and are not voiced.

   • b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?

The intervention is mainly implemented by community groups framed as neighbourhoods. The neighbourliness as understood and mobilized by local inhabitants is ambiguous. It recalls the idea of “‘popular’ neighbourhood” (AGAPE_01: 7) but without being really altruistic and supportive towards other social groups. As a consequence, neighbourliness might be exclusive in particular towards migrants who are not parts of this “historical working-class narrative” (which in this context is also related to collective memories of solidarity and resistance during the German occupation and to anti-fasciste pride) (AGAPE_01: 7).

The exclusion of some social groups remaining voiceless (i.e. migrants, gypsies) potentially breaks down solidarity among resistants. It also weakens and reduces the impact of anti-gentrification resistances since they only benefit (i.e. long-time local inhabitants sharing this “working class” narrative) and neglect specific social groups even more likely to face evictions.

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

The intervention takes place in a context of economic crisis and austerity (post 2008 crisis) that reinforced the running process of housing shortages that started in the 1990’s. The gentrification process fostered by the enforcement of neo-liberal housing policies (e.g. the abolishment of the rent control) and the multiplication of the evictions were the catalysts of the citizens resistances.

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)
The intervention is framed by urban social policies and housing policies. It addresses regulatory policies enforced both at the local level, specifically the abolishment of rent control (1992-1998) (i.e. referring to the abolishment of a housing price ceiling guarantee by the municipality), and at the national level, specifically the sale at moderate price of publicly owned residential stock (i.e. the right-to-buy national law, december 21, 1993, no. 560) (AGAPE_01, AGAPE_02: 1). In the framework of the right-to-buy national legislation, the local government established the rental-home ownership conversion that offers a cheaper buying price than the normal market and only applies to tenants.

These refer to economic policies because they provide favorable economic conditions for targeted actors (i.e. tourists, multinational companies and wealthy people) while they are economically detrimental for others (i.e. low income inhabitants).

Before the enforcement of the right-to-buy legislation, public housing was nationally administered by a public autonomous body called the Istituto Case Popolari (ICP) (AGAPE_02: 1). Entitlement to public housing was conferred in perpetuity to tenants which prevented them from being evicted. This system of tenure prevented the selling of units for profits (Annunziata 2019_AGAPE 02).

However, the privatization of public estates started in 1993 and was enforced in a national law. The denationalization of public assets was fostered in 2001 to solve the public debt (decreto Legislativo, september 25, 2001, no.351). “In 2006 the Lazio region, in charge of Rome’s building and planning regulations, approved legislation requiring that the city sell up to 70 percent of its public housing” and in 2007 a list of public properties to be sold was issued by the municipality (AGAPE_02: 7).

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country’s constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

The privatisation of public residential property since 1993 was established in accordance with constitutional norms, in particular the art. 47 of the constitution. The national law of december 24, 1993, no. 560 defines the framework of the privatization of public estate. It gives regional governments the power to administer the alienation of parts of the public property (between 50 and 75 percent of it) (AGAPE_02: 12). Starting from a national impulse, the privatization of public housing is enforced in the regional (i.e. Lazio region) and municipal (i.e. Rome) legislation.

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policy makers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation etc.)

The views of actors on the framework regulating the intervention is ambivalent from both sides (i.e. citizens and public actors). On the one hand, while citizens/ local inhabitants strongly denounce privatisation policies, some of those who can afford to buy (at moderate price) their (public) housing are likely to do it. On the other hand, although the municipality and the Housing Authorities implement privatisation policies, they are to some extent responsive to citizens claims and negotiate some sort of rental tenure (e.g. the regularization of informal housing or the re-housing of evicted inhabitants). These formal/ informal negotiations and mutual pressures between public actors and citizens result in a nexus of ordinary and collective resistances (AGAPE_01: 5).

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

n/a
22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

n/a

Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

- a. Regulatory framework

The above mentioned (Q.18) regulatory framework of privatization of public housing is detrimental for those who resist gentrification. In addition, the negotiated agreements between public actors and citizens can also hinder the resistance. For instance, the rental-home ownership conversion accepted by some tenants creates disagreement between citizens (between those who accept and those who decline) and contributes to weaken civil society resistances to gentrification.

- b. Legitimacy

Legitimacy obstacles arise from public actors narratives. Moralizing and criminalizing illegal housing (AGAPE_01: 6) are the counterparts of the spatial cleansing (i.e. privatization and eviction) they perform. The stigmatisation of squatting practices is used to justify the eviction of illegal occupants of public housing.

- c. Public awareness

n/a

- d. Finances

For some inhabitants, staying put and anti-gentrification resistance consists in accepting the rental-home ownership conversion (i.e. according to the right-to-buy legislation) offered by the Housing Authority. However, only middle class tenants can afford to buy (even at moderate price) their own housing while people of lower means cannot even afford it (AGAPE_01: 8).

- e. Others (please name)

The rental-home ownership conversion creates a solidarity break down among community groups. Buying their own housing represents a “deep cultural aspiration” (AGAPE_01: 11) for some tenants and will also prevent them from being evicted. A large number of them stand for it, especially middle class people who can afford to buy it. However, this standpoint is not shared by everyone. Specifically, those who cannot afford to buy - even at moderate price - their housing (i.e. people of lower means) or are not offered it by the Housing Authority (tenders are rather arbitrary) are very reluctant to the rental-homeownership conversion. As recalls S. Annunziata and C. Rivas Alonso, the right-to-buy at moderate price in prestigious locations (the city center of Rome) reduces the stock of housing available as well as “reduces future allocation and results in an individual appropriation of
the value gap produced by de-commodified assets now solving social needs” (AGAPE_01: 11). The right-to-buy legislation is controversial because it breaks down solidarity among social groups and fosters gentrification rather than resolves it.

f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles

24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displacement and eviction of some illegal occupiers of the public housing.</td>
<td>To (partly) curb the gentrification process and react to citizens' claims, public actors negotiated with community groups to find solutions against displacement. This includes the re-location of former residents in public housing or the regularization of illegal occupiers (i.e. in the framework of a sanatoria). The latter results from the call for anti-eviction moratoria issued by the anti-eviction platform as a way “to recognize the chronic housing deficit and the inadequacy of the public housing authority to act promptly in case of housing deprivation” (AGAPE_01: 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eviction and public narrative criminalizing squatting practices.</td>
<td>To fight eviction and pressure public authorities, anti-eviction platforms and other organized groups try to draw public attention to the housing issue. Inviting more actors to join the resistance and make it visible increases the critical mass and puts a greater pressure on public authorities. As an example, one anti-eviction platform (one of the most influential in Rome) asked the informal squatter to participate in a strike and to be actively a part of the collective struggle for housing. As a result, the request for housing is also voiced by those directly concerned as well as “scandalize the housing authority for not being capable of providing responses” (AGAPE_0: 91).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Reported outcomes

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

*(Please, note that italicized sections are speculative)*

The asserted economic outcomes (not observed up to now) are to stabilize and freeze the prices of tenancies in public housing in the city center of Rome, especially in public housing and to protect the latter from being privatized.

The intervention aims at setting “social sustainability” (i.e. the right for local inhabitants to “stay put”) in cities in the policy agenda and at drawing attention to the detriment effects of the privatization of the public housing stock on low income communities. In Rome, it seems that negotiations started between anti-gentrification resisters/ activists and public authorities. However, no tangible outcomes are so far accessed (this is also related to the fact that AGAPE project is not yet disseminated to policy makers. Due to some constraints, the project is not yet over).

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention
Please fill in any information on social learning that has occurred in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project). Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context

(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

- a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city...) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.
  
n/a

- b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

Anti-gentrification resistors in Rome did not reportedly learn from experiences elsewhere. However, researchers from the AGAPE project learnt from the cases of anti-gentrification resistances in the cities of Rome, Madrid and Athens (AGAPE_05).

Learning content

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?

- a. from previous experiences in the same urban context
  
n/a

- b. from inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere
  
n/a

- c. from other knowledge gathering/research

Yes, knowledge was acquired during a workshop organised in the framework of AGAPE. Held at Roma Tre University in Italy in October 2017, the gathering enabled activists from different resistances groups from Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece to meet and to exchange about their local experiences of gentrification and their ways to resist it: “activist groups analysed their campaigns, illustrating the varied experience of evictions and struggles in different states and the potential for cross-border synergies” (AGAPE_05).

Examples include among others “principles of assembly-ism, horizontalism, and non-party politics” in resistance groups in Spain as well as “their campaign of escraches putting pressure on politicians, and their popular legislative initiatives to change the law regarding evictions by collecting
signatures”; or the “anti-eviction activism through the physical blockade of court proceedings” in Greece (AGAPE_05).

Learning process

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?

n/a

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?

The obstacles (which were not really overcome) contributed to raise awareness especially among policy makers and public actors about the issue of gentrification and its consequences on the local population. This awareness allowed countervailing legal measures to be taken (as mentioned in Q.24).

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote) and the actors involved in using them.

- Workshops organized in the framework of AGAPE
- Mediated discussions between citizens and policy makers.

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

- a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]

The transferability of the intervention in a core element of the AGAPE project. Indeed, the latter aims at issuing an “Anti-gentrification Toolkit for Southern European cities” (AGAPE_05) based on the fieldwork conducted in the three case study cities (including Rome’s experience). The toolkit consists of a framework of prevention, mitigation and civil disobedience experiences which occurred elsewhere. It provides tools and examples of good practices for local communities, activists and collectives to fight evictions and gentrification. It also addresses policy makers by providing them concrete ideas. Thus, transferability is central to the project but does not consist in transferring the “same” intervention but rather to “providing the basic tools that local communities can draw on to fight gentrification and concrete ideas for policy makers” depending on local contexts.

- b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?

Transferability is primarily suggested in Southern European cities’ context because it is what the project is about. There is a form of unity in the gentrification process in SECs which is exacerbated by the debt crisis and the consequential austerity behaviors of nation states. Thus, the framework of AGAPE project including fieldwork and theoretical research as well as practical tools against gentrification process addresses primarily this particular kind of context. However, according to Prof. Loretta Lees, these learning experiences can apply to any urban context.
c. Who has made the claims?

The claim of transferability is included in the project call and has also been pointed out by the project leader.

d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?

n/a

32. In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?[8]

The findings and knowledge resulting from the project will be disseminated to city makers in the form of the Anti-gentrification toolkit.

33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

n/a

j) Structural learning

34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies

Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

n/a

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

n/a

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

The findings and knowledge resulting from the project will be disseminated to city makers in the form of the Anti-gentrification toolkit.

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance

(from NATURVATION project)

NATURVATION's NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed "management set-ups"):

- Government-led (Gov)
- **Co-governance or hybrid governance** (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
- **Led by non-government actors** (NGO)

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. **Self-governing**, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. **Provision**, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. **Regulations**, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. **Enabling**, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships”

### Appendix 2: Policy typology

*(from NATURVATION project)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory</strong></td>
<td>Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors</td>
<td>Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(administrative, command-and-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Economic (financial, market-</td>
<td>Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable</td>
<td>Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based)**</td>
<td>(or unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors</td>
<td>and procurements. Negative incentives are taxes, fees and charges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative</strong></td>
<td>They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to</td>
<td>Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(educational)</td>
<td>increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or</td>
<td>advertisements in different media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prevent social change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary</strong></td>
<td>Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private</td>
<td>Voluntary actions and agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actors and/or non-governmental organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes**

1. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent
sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5):

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCPCuDCOIQ1MsBjir20_F1CBbnSu6HqKH9nNLshlVQ/edit?usp=sharing.

2. AGAPE project on the Cordis portal. Last view on: 10/02/20:


3. Actor types according to TRANSIT’s Critical Turning Point Database,


4. If easily possible mention sources for your association of roles.

5. The ICP was created in 1903 to provide decent housing to the working-class and with a view to better control it (AGAPE_02).

6. Deliverable 7.1 Synthesis Report on results from Monitoring and Evaluation (p.14) :


8. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.
GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 2:
Citizens rescuing and sharing food in Berlin

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]

The selected intervention is called foodsharing.de and specifically focuses on the case of the public fridges in Berlin, Germany. Those fridges - or “Fair-Teiler” (derived from the German words “fair” and “verteilen”, “to distribute”) - are disposed of in different places around the city and give people access to free and anonymously shared food. In 2018, the city of Berlin counted around 25 fridges (SHARECITY_02: 202). The intervention, specifically, takes place at the scale of a capital city. However, it includes different scales of governance. At the local level, such as a neighbourhood or a city district, public fridges are managed by the local community of food savers. Scaling-up, Foodsharing.de as an organization is structured at the national level and the regional level and relies on an online platform that connects food-donors to food-recipients.

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

The intervention is implemented in the sector of food. Specifically, it addresses food-waste and food safety issues.

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

The creation of the public fridges addresses the question of sustainability with a view to preventing food waste. By collecting food and sharing it with others, foodsharing attempts to reduce the amount of edible food which is wasted every day. The aim is also to raise awareness about the food issue and our food system which generates too much waste. As a food saver in Berlin points out during an interview, there is an educational dimension in foodsharing: “of course part of food-sharing is educational” (SHARECITY_02: 209). Showing perfectly good food that is thrown away contributes to politicizing the food issue and to raise concerns about food waste.

The public fridges are also addressing the question of justice with a view to alleviating food insecurity. In this context, food is understood as a “common” good. The latter refers to resources which are “jointly governed, stewarded and shared by their users” (Ostrom and al. 1999, in SHARECITY 02: 203).

4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?

Foodsharing.de was created in 2012 and the public fridges were introduced two years later in 2014 (SHARECITY_02: 202). However, due to institutional and organizational constraints (see below),
beginning in 2017, many public fridges in Berlin were closed and the access of the remaining ones are restricted.

5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)

Foodsharing.de is led by non-government actors. Specifically, Foodsharing.de is self-governed by members and based on a hierarchical and distributed governance structure shaped through “trust, sharing and food safety” (SHARECITY_02: 202).

6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this governance intervention for sustainable and just cities?[1]

This governance intervention is worthwhile to study and share in the context of UrbanA WP5 because it meets the four criteria (mentioned in the footnote). Specifically, it provides an interesting example of non-government led intervention - based on the members’ self-governance - that works quite effectively in itself but faces obstacles related to a regulatory framework.

7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) governance intervention?

Mostly:

SHARECITY_(01)_Q&A with Anna Davies.Project lead for the *Sharecity project_DANCOX_2019
SHARECITY_(02)_Sharing food_Berlin case_MORROW 2019
https://foodsharing.de
https://wiki.foodsharing.de/Hauptseite
interview with O. (researcher) (12/06/20)

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:

a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

The intervention has been studied in the context of a EU-funded project called SHARECITY (2015-2021). The project aims at identifying and examining practices of city-based food sharing economies, referring to new forms of exchanges which entail, in most cases, environmental and social commitments.

Specifically, food sharing refers to a set of practices including eating (consuming), giving food (redistributing), or experiencing activities (eating together) which are done together with others. A database - called Sharecity100 database - maps the food sharing initiatives all around the world (SHARECITY_11). Out of it, nine cities have been selected for conducting in-depth ethnographic analyses. The intervention of foodsharing.de is a part of the project findings and case study but the organization itself has not been created within the framework of SHARECITY.

b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.
The intervention fits under the sharing and cooperatives for urban commons approach. Sharecity project is explicitly mentioned in the database as it shows the transformative potential of food sharing initiatives towards sustainable cities.

- c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?

Yes: SHARECITY_(02)_Sharing food_Berlin case_MORROW 2019

9. Problematization and priority:

- a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

The question of inequality and exclusion has been addressed by the founders of foodsharing.de with a view to establishing food as “common”, accessible to everyone, and as being free from money transactions (Fellmer 2014, in SHARECITY_02: 204).

Public fridges also tackle the boundaries between donors, recipients and providers. Hence, the aim is to deconstruct the relation of power and the perpetuation of inequalities often pointed out in food aid organizations and to reduce the stigma of free food. Indeed, donors and recipients do not need to meet social criteria (i.e. precarity, low incomes…) to share or receive food anonymously. This differs from other food aid organizations such as food banks or the German TAFEL. With the blurring identification of donors and recipients, public fridges step out of the scheme of assistantship and refuse the relation of power and the domination it implies.

- b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?

The achievement of justice is explicitly pointed out as a major motivation behind the creation of public fridges. Established two years after the creation of foodsharing.de, public fridges address this exclusionary issue and make food available to everyone. Both food savers and external recipients can access these public fridges. This is highly valued among food savers (SHARECITY_02: 205).

In addition, public fridges also tackle the issue of social exclusion as they provide sociability. Indeed, located in public and/or open places (e.g. at the entrance of buildings, often next to community centres), public fridges are suitable for regular encounters. As a food saver recalls: “It (a public fridge) also has a social aspect. Because you often meet people there […] then you stand there and chat for a bit and it’s totally nice” (SHARECITY_02: 205). Therefore, public fridges contribute to enhance urban sociability and community-building and de-stigmatize free food at the same time.

- c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address? (see Database of drivers of injustice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of Injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material and livelihood inequalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization**

4. **Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration**

5. **Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns**

6. **Unfit institutional structures**

7. **Limited citizen participation in urban planning**

8. **Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities**

9. **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**

10. **Weak(ened) civil society**

**c) Actor constellations**

10. **Who initiated the intervention?**

    The public fridges were initiated by members of Foodsharing.de in Berlin. This community-based intervention is an innovation within the social movement of Foodsharing.de.

    It was initiated without institutional support (i.e. urban policies or public food programs) and foodsharing aims at remaining outside the institutional framework. [2]

11. **Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)**

    The envisioned beneficiaries of public fridges are food savers/sharers themselves and any other recipients including local inhabitants of Berlin. Public fridges provide access to free food and also contribute to enhancing community-building among their users and other citizens. In addition, food companies or retailers also benefit from the intervention because less food they handle is wasted (i.e. ethical dimension) as well as the costs related to waste disposal are exempted (i.e. economical dimension).

12. **Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?**

    | Actor types[^1] | Yes | Actor name and role[^4] |
    |-----------------|-----|-------------------------|
    | Academic organizations |    |                         |
    | Religious organizations |    |                         |
    | Civil society organizations | X  | The members of foodsharing who are responsible for maintaining public fridges. |
    | Hybrid/ 3rd sector organizations |    |                         |
    | Platforms |    |                         |
13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

The intervention was triggered by the existing network of the members including within the Foodsharing movement as well as with other community organizations involved in sharing or social and cultural interventions.

One the one hand, Foodsharing.de provides social resources (i.e. experienced activists in food saving) as well as organizational resources (i.e. the online platform that connects donors to recipients) for establishing public public fridges. On the other hand, most public fridges are hosted by other community organisations collaborating with food sharing and providing space for locating the fridges (e.g. to plug them into electricity). This network and relationships support activists eager to set up new public fridges and facilitate the operating of existing ones.

14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?

The public fridges have been established by the members of foodsharing.de. They are run by volunteers and are self-managed. Thus, public fridges are a community-based / grassroots-based initiative. Not only have citizens created foodsharing and installed public fridges, but they also
regulate them and are responsible for keeping them running. Public fridges are self-managed systems to share food and are operated without public intervention.

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

Foodsharing.de is hierarchically structured. Specific tasks are attributed to members depending on their position/role in the structure. These positions entail specific responsibilities that enable to maintain trust within the organization and between the activists as well as to ensure the functioning of foodsharing.de (SHARECITY_13: 66).

The “food sharers”, registered in the platform, can take food from public dispensers and get acquainted with the project as well as with other activists. As Foodsharing.de aims at being open to everyone, this first level of commitment has a very low threshold.

However, becoming a “food saver” is more exclusive. It entails to have successfully achieved an online questionnaire or quiz about the policy, the ideological stance and the rules of the organization as well as to have attended local meetings. Food saver “applicants” have to take part in several food rescue operations to receive a “FoodSaver passport” which allows them to visit partner companies for picking food. This status entails a high level of commitment and more responsibilities (SHARECITY_13: 67).

Further hierarchical levels include the “store coordinators” managing food savers’ picking slots and coordinating them with the partner stores as well as “ambassadors” who are responsible for accrediting new food savers and for creating new partnerships with food retailers (SHARECITY_13). The “orgateam” coordinates and decides the national policy of foodsharing.de (Yunity, 2017, in SHARECITY_02: 203).

It can be pointed out that the set of rules, including food safety and rules for sharing, is enforced by membership through self-monitoring and peer surveillance (SHARECITY_02: 208). Every “violation” – such as being late for a pick-up or not being cautious with sharing food or maintaining public fridges - are reported by other members. Excessive infractions are sanctioned by ambassadors and lead to the loss of food savers privileges or even to exclusion. On the contrary, good practices are rewarded by co-savers. All violations and rewards are reported in an ICT platform (e.g. such as blames as well as “trust bananas” rewarding positive behaviours). Specifically, Foodsharing.de is based on a reputational economy mediated by an online platform (SHARECITY_02: 208).

16. Exclusion:

a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?

Public fridges are meant to be accessible to everyone. Whereas most of the public fridges are located in community centers, the access to them may depend on the connotation as well as on the others users of these places (e.g. a community center having stigma or a special cultural/political identity). In that sense, some people could exclude themselves from certain places (interview with O.). However, the exclusive dimension related to public fridges is not really about accessing food but rather about actively engaging in the organization of food sharing. As mentioned above, becoming a foodsharer that can collect food to grocery stores entails having been through a very exclusive procedure, including a quizz testing your abilities and commitment towards the organization. In addition, foodsharing rules and ideological stands (written and detailed in the wiki) as well as the quiz are only written in German language. This quiz greatly reduces the scope of members who are eligible/able to become food savers and excludes non-german speakers as well as people who do not want to take on too many responsibilities.
b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?

This exclusionary dimension is related to the hierarchical structure of Foodsharing. Food is made available for everyone but only those who are willing to commit themselves to a great level (including picking food on a regular basis, redistributing it, not being late) can take responsibility for collecting food. Food sharers are often people who were already dumpster divers or collecting food for the community and they accept a level of responsibility and work that people in need are probably not able/willing to commit to.

The exclusionary dimension of the quiz is an ongoing discussion within foodsharing. It has been created with the idea to filter people who could create problems (including being too greedy or giving the organization a bad reputation). As Foodsharing becomes more popular and has many applicants, the organization does not have the capacity to train so many people about food safety and food collection and the quiz that covers a lot of different things (including values and knowledge) is a filter. If revising the quiz has been discussed within the organisation, the ability to do it seems beyond most of the food sharers (interview with O.)

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

The public fridges and Foodsharing as an organization has been created as a response to food waste and to the gridlock of a food system that generates too much waste. Whereas food regulations do not effectively address this problem, a community-based initiative has been developed to alleviate this issue and find a solution to reduce food wastes. Foodsharing developed in a context of growing public awareness about food issues as well as the development of other forms of sharing economies including initiatives in the sector of clothing, mobility or energy (interview O.).

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)

The intervention has been framed by regulatory policies (i.e. administrative, command-and-control) such directives, legislations and laws addressing food risk and safety policies and food waste policies.

Food risk policies regulate the risk of the food chain or “from farm to work” (i.e. production, proceeding, storage, transportation, distribution and redistribution) and food hygiene policies concern food safety best practices (i.e. the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) systems, the cold chain as well as the Codex Alimentarius standards). Those regulations are mainly set up at the European level and adapted nationally and locally.

Public fridges tackle and challenge the legal framework regulating food risk and food wastes. This legal framework includes three levels of regulation - European, national and local - and only applies to food businesses (i.e. entrepreneurs handling food). At the European level, it includes EU 178/2002 General Food Law regulating food risk. This law enforces responsibility for those dealing with food and mandates the total traceability of the food chain (i.e. from one step backward and one step forward). In addition, EU 852/2004, Food Hygiene Law regulates food safety best practices and identifies food which is safe or non-injurious to health. EU 852 regulation is particularly responsive to local contexts and gives national and/or local authorities the competence to determine in which
circumstances this regulation is to be applied (i.e. to determine whether an organization is a business or not) (SHARECITY 02: 206).

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country’s constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

According to the hierarchy of norms, European laws (described above) are transposed into the German federal law. At the national level, the European laws are enforced and supported by the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (BMEL). The latter is responsible for food monitoring through the Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food Safety (BVL) and the Federal Institute of Risk Assessment (BfR). However, the responsibility for food control lays on the federal states (Länder). At the local level, each state has a Food Safety Authority (FSA) that ensures compliance with the food safety laws. The FSA is competent to determine whether an organization is a food business or not and thus, whether it has to comply with EU regulations or not. In addition, food safety entails to look at the German civil code for consumer protection (i.e. § 13 BGB) stating that businesses are liable for the goods and services they provide (including food) (SHARECITY 02: 206).

However, foodsharing.de is assumed to be uncovered by food law, despite being framed in response to it. Public fridges aim to remain outside of this food legislation. Theoretically, European as well as national food safety regulations apply to businesses and not domestic users. Specifically, businesses are characterised by a certain continuity and degree of organisation. In contrast, public fridges seek to remain in the realm of domestic use. This is justified by the non-continuity of the activity (i.e. the relationship between users of public fridges are uncertain as there is no supervision of who exchanges food with whom) and the low degree of organization (i.e. the small quantity of food gathered in public fridges refers to domestic and not to business uses). In doing so, foodsharing aims at avoiding to ensure compliance with the guidelines of a food business.

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policy makers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation etc.)

The local political culture has influenced the character of the intervention. Foodsharing members established themselves as actors of the food system. It means that a civil society organization feels entitled to make intervention in the city, to redesign and occupy the public space as well as to address dysfonctionnements in the food system. Citizens are political actors giving themselves space for political action which tend to indicate a democratic culture (interview O.).

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

Foodsharing.de is self-financed through donations. In 2012, the organization started with a capital collected through crowdfunding (i.e. via the platform Stratnext). Today, a small circle of supporting members as well as single donations provide funding. The organization seeks to minimize its expenses (i.e. foodsharing motto is “as little money as possible should be used”). These expenses include the Foodsharing-Festival, costs for accounting, traveling costs and the salary of one single employee in a mini-job.

Foodsharing.de is run on a voluntary basis and is based on unpaid commitment. Voluntary work includes the creation of the online platform, the webhosting (sponsored), the support from lawyers and other tasks such as the maintenance of the online platform and mediation of regional groups.
Drawing from an ideological perspective, foodsharing.de aims to be as free from financial support as possible (there are some exceptions where money is used) and work with committed people without money transactions.\[3\]

Foodsharing.de does not receive any public subsidies and is run without support from public authorities.

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

Yes, changes in the understanding of which organizations are food-businesses or not have influenced the intervention in a negative way. Foodsharing.de Berlin has been recognized by the FSA as a food business and thus, has been asked to comply with the food safety regulation (see below Q.23 “obstacles”).

Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

- a. Regulatory framework

The public fridges monitored by foodsharing.de in Berlin were targeted by the FSA of Berlin which has a narrow understanding of business and considers that foodsharing falls into this category. Thus, the FSA opposes foodsharing.de the EU 178/2002 General Food Law regulating food risk and the EU 852/2004 Food Hygiene Law regulating food safety practices applied to businesses. Consequently, foodsharing in Berlin turns out to be responsible for the content of the fridges and for the traceability of the food one step backward (i.e. before entering the fridges) and one step forward (i.e. who is taking it). This entailed for food savers to record every single food item which is saved and shared as well as to designate an individual (i.e. a member of foodsharing) who is responsible for it.

In January 2017, the Berlin Senate enforced a new set of rules governing public fridges in line with the EU 178 and 852 regulations. It required foodsharing.de to follow the safety rules such as a business and to name an individual “responsible for the contents of each fridge and their traceability” (SHARECITY 02: 207).

- b. Legitimacy

The self-governance practices of foodsharing oppose food governance practices built upon the EU and national regulations (SHARECITY_02: 203). Indeed, food governance at the level of the European Union is built upon risks and responsibilities. Drawing on Ulrich Beck’s theory of risk, food safety regulations understand risk at a global level rather than at the individual one. Thus, preventing food risk entails scientific processes of risk assessment which rely on technological methods applied by experts rather than by people (SHARECITY_02: 204). On the contrary, food savers understand risk at a local scale, from the point of collection (food stores) to recipients. Hence, the conflict opposing foodsharing and the FSA about the food safety issue over public fridges depends on different scales of governance and understanding of risk.
c. Public awareness
n/a

d. Finances

Foodsharing is run by (unpaid) volunteers and does not have the capacity (i.e. not enough human resources) to record the circulation of the food prior and after the fridges (in contrast to organizations that employ people such as food banks) (SHARECITY_02: 209).

e. Others (please name)

The obstacles related to the regulatory framework as a cultural aspect. The European food safety legislation applies everywhere. However, in many countries, there is often a grey area, such as community initiatives, which is tolerated by the public actors including food safety authorities. In Germany and specifically in Berlin, the FSA does not leave room for this grey area and establishes a strict separation between the private and the public realms. Collectively dealing with food outside of households is under the responsibility of the FSA (interview with O.)

f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles

24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for Foodsharing to endorse liability for the content of the fridges.</td>
<td>Foodsharing refuses to comply with this call on practical and ideological grounds. First, no members would accept to endorse the liability for a fridge which is not possible to be fully controlled. In contrast to organizations that employ people to record the circulation of the food (such as food-banks), a volunteer-based organization does not have enough (human) resources to do this work. On the other hand, the EU regulations contrast with some founding principles of the public fudges such as the anonymity of donors/recipients. Recording the circulation of food would indeed lapse this anonymity (SHARECITY_02: 207).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited handling capacities</td>
<td>Instead of designating someone responsible for a fridge, Foodsharing communicated the names and contact details of their entire Foodsharing group. In doing so, not only they refuse that one individual undertakes the liability for public fridges, but also, they stand for the collective management of these fridges (SHARECITY_02: 210).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The enforcement by the Berlin Senate of a new set of rules governing public fridges in line</td>
<td>In response to the Berlin Senate enforcement, foodsharing Berlin intended to reframe public fridges as private “club goods” and not businesses (SHARECITY_02: 210). For doing so, they have restricted access to public fridges, especially to Foodsharing members. In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the EU 178 and 852 regulations. In addition, foodsharing Berlin publicly stated that Foodsharing is not a business and that the food inside the fridges is not regulated. This statement was issued with a view to discharge the organization from its liability towards food.

The FSA started to pressure the community center hosting public fridges by threatening them with a fine in case they continue to do so. Put at financial risk, many organisations have stopped to host public fridges.

g) Reported outcomes

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

Regarding sustainability impact, Foodsharing.de achieved to prevent a large amount of food from being wasted. Since 2012, Foodsharing.de has “rescued” about 12,796,298 kg of food. Specifically in Berlin, foodsavers rescued nearly a metric ton of food in Berlin alone. This includes the food which has been saved before (from 2012 to 2014) and after the introduction of public fridges.

The public fridges established in Berlin were an attempt to address sustainability and social justice. However, the obstacles opposed by the FSA and the rules enforced by the Berlin senate reduced the impact of public fridges. The closing of many of them and the restricted access of the remaining (still are some active) jeopardizes the core objective of the initiative which was to make food available to everyone and to destigmatize free food. It has also hampered anti-food actions.

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

Please fill in any information on social learning that has occurred in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project). Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context

(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

- a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city...) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

In Berlin, There are many kinds of sharing initiatives related to food developed including community gardens, food banks or meal saving as well as other forms of sharing economies in other sectors such as clothing, services, mobility etc. Foodsharing members tend to be involved in lots of other sharing initiatives which informs about how a context of social innovation can be a fertile ground for the development of such an intervention. Building on a network and having experience in engaging collectively may have been crucial for the creation of public fridges.
• b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

Foodsharing as an organization started in Cologne (Germany) and other regional branches of the national organization developed in other German cities. However, Foodsharing in Berlin has initiated the creation of public fridges which are built on the experiences its members may have acquired elsewhere and in other sectors. There is no explicit evidence of this inter-city learning.

Learning content

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?

• a. from previous experiences in the same urban context

n/a

• b. from inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere

Knowledge has been acquired from other regional food sharing groups in Germany, especially Cologne where the headquarter of the organisation is located. Specifically, food sharing Berlin can compare how other regional groups deal with the food safety legislation. Hence, Foodsharing Berlin can advocate that the organization is not recognized as a business in the other Federal States of Germany and use this argument to oppose the local legislation.

• c. from other knowledge gathering/research

n/a

Learning process

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?

Public fridges and more generally Foodsharing successfully developed in Berlin because it is adapted to the local context including a strong subculture and live style of sharing as well as urban infrastructures facilitating sharing operations.

First, there are in Berlin a lot of people having the time and the enthusiasm to engage in this type of action. This is a part of the local subculture which made the intervention possible to emerge (interview with O.).

Second, foodsharing can develop in a context where a lot of food is available (mostly urban context) as well as infrastructures helping with the logistics of food collection and distribution (such as bicycles, public transport etc...) (SHARECITY_14). Insofar food is perishable, donors and recipients must be quickly connected and short distances matter and facilitated access matter.

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?

The members of Foodsharing Berlin who were confronted with these obstacles learn how to navigate political and administrative channels and to get the point across. They got used to making public statements, press releases and participating in meetings with local authorities, politicians and elected
officials. In that sense, facing these obstacles has contributed to the politicization of the Foodsharing members (interview with O.).

In addition, by refusing to comply with the requisite food traceability and individual liability (see Q. 24), the organization has reframed and strengthened its political line and clarified the ambition of the movement (inferred from SHARECITY_02: 210).

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote)[12] and the actors involved in using them.

The tools that enable the learning process include:

- the ICT-platform that gives information about Foodsharing.de’s actions and food saving and distribution.
- the mentorship between prospective food savers and initiated food savers.
- the use wiki that compiles the political line and all the practical information that enable prospective food sharer/saver to enter the organization.

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

- a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]

The members of Foodsharing were actively making sure that the initiative is spread. Active members have tried to expand Foodsharing outside of Germany. For instance, Foodsharing developed in the Netherlands (some public fridges are located in Amsterdam or Wageningen) (interview with O.).

Specifically, the group Yunity[13] that originate from the Foodsharing movement is developing tools and softwares for enabling other people in other contexts to start their own food sharing network. There are going all across the world doing Akaton to create community-based software and logistic tools to start foodsharing. The idea to share this technology that supports foodsharing beyond the Foodsharing movement itself (Interview with O.).

In addition, the replicability of food sharing initiatives such as Foodsharing.de has been pointed out in the project SHARECITY and its toolkit for food sharing called “SHARE IT toolkit” (SHARECITY_09).[14] The case of Foodsharing in Berlin demonstrates food governance arrangements and issues stressing food sharing regulations (i.e. social rules and legal instruments) and the obstacles to be overcome in order to replicate and transfer sharing initiatives.

- b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?

Public fridges can be transferred to many different urban contexts. However, a set of prerequisites have been identified (interview with O.).

- a political subculture and enthusiasm from people to engage in sharing activities
- the feeling of the right to the city. This means that people feel that the city is theirs which makes it possible to redesign it, to appropriate the space and make interventions.
For example, in a city like New York City, inhabitants do not necessarily feel this right to the city as the right to use public space is different from Berlin. Community fridges just developed in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, because so many people could not access grocery stores or food banks.

- political structures offering space for such initiatives to develop.

**c. Who has made the claims?**

The claim about replicability as been made by the intervention’s proponent i.e. Foodsharing members.

**d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?**

On top of the prerequisites detailed in Q.31 b), uncertainty about the legal aspect of Foodsharing is a limit to transferability. Many people including activists or food retailers do not want to endorse liability for donated or saved food which is hammered to a great extent for saving and sharing. Legal framework that removes liability for donated food, as the Good samaritan glass in the US will allow such initiatives to develop. However, such a regulation would come into tension with the EU regulation which requires that someone is always responsible for food and would create a free zone.

In addition, limits to transferability also depends on how people get food and how it is delivered. It is attached to the political culture and to what people see as the role of citizens and of the state. If people are used to a food bank doing this work, they might not engage themselves because it is the responsibility of government and social structures to make sure that the people have enough money to afford food (interview with O.).

32. In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?[15]

The obstacles faced by Foodsharing.de Berlin have been recorded in the wiki of Foodsharing.de as well as the response of Foodsharing Berlin (i.e. refusal to comply with the injunction).

33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

Foodsharing is actively expanding to other cities and sharing tools to create Foodsharing networks. The Foodsharing group is expanding in other countries with the support of German activists.

On top of the Yunity groups (see Q. 31 a), other collaborations have been reported. For example in London, a non-profit app connecting food donors to recipients called Olio[17] has been created with the support of Foodsharing members. These people have been hired by Olio to help them to develop this application. Other types of applications such as Too Good To Go try to monetize the relationships that food savers have built with restaurants and food retailers but also contribute to expanding ITC mediated food sharing. There are many other initiatives that are directly or indirectly connected to Foodsharing (interview with O.).

In addition, the SHARECITY1000 database[18] lists 124 kinds of food sharing initiatives in Berlin (including Foodsharing.de) from a range of activities including community gardens, shared means, shared bread etc... These initiatives have net been reportedly inspired from Foodsharing.de
34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

The intervention does not seem to have really changed governance arrangements in a more structural way. Some People in foodsharing are also involved in local food policy councils and assimilated structures but not necessarily.

Since Foodsharing is a loose and open network, everyone has their own motivations to commit and it is not possible to generalize the aims of everybody. Whereas some members have a radical political view and aim at changing the food system and the whole economy, other people just want to have less food waste and have a food system that generates less wastes. Foodsharing works to some degree because there is space for these different motivations (more or less radical) and offer people to join the movement.

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

It seems important to stress the potential of ICT-mediated sharing for sharing initiative to develop in the future. These new forms of food sharing extend the spaces and the social sphere where sharing takes place. As they involve diverse actors such as the civil society and policy makers, tackle food regulations and ICT-mediated food sharing entail new governance arrangements. It implies a set of rules and practices being established by the interaction – conflictual or not - between citizens, entrepreneurs and policy makers to regulate food sharing. The disruptive potential of ICT-mediated sharing is also to be more inquired (SHARECITY_06).

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

Foodsharing.de is based on a reputational economy mediated by an online platform. This study case highlights the potential of the reputational economy of ICT-mediated sharing to promote self-governance in common initiatives (SHARECITY 02: 208). Foodsharing governance arrangements offer an alternative to the current legal framework for regulating food in a more sustainable and fairer way.

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance

(from NATURVATION project)

NATURVATION's NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed "management set-ups"):

- Government-led (Gov)
Co-governance or hybrid governance (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)

Led by non-government actors (NGO)

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. Self-governing, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. Provision, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. Regulations, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. Enabling, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships

Appendix 2: Policy typology
(from NATURVATION project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory (administrative, command-and-control)</td>
<td>Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors</td>
<td>Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic (financial, market-based)</td>
<td>Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable (or unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors</td>
<td>Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance and procurements. Negative incentives are taxes, fees and charges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative (educational)</td>
<td>They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change</td>
<td>Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private actors and/or non-governmental organisations.</td>
<td>Voluntary actions and agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes

1. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on
transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5): https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCPcUd-COIQ1Ms8jir20_F1CBbn5u6HgKH9nNLshIQ/edit?usp=sharing.

2. Foodsharing.de Wiki. Last view on 24/01/20: https://wiki.foodsharing.de/Kontext_und_Selbstverst%C3%A4ndnis


4. If easily possible mention sources for your association of roles.

5. Website of the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture. Last view on 24/01/20 https://www.bmel.de/EN/Food/Safe-Food/safe-food_node.html.


7. Foodsharing.de Wiki. Last view on 24/01/20: https://wiki.foodsharing.de/Foodsharing_e.V. und dessen_Vorstand.


15. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.


GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 3:
Community led affordable housing in Brussels

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]

Community Land Trust Brussels operates within municipalities of the Brussels Capital Region, Belgium’s capital city (at the neighbourhood scale, especially the Anderlecht, Molenbeek and Schaarbeek municipalities, with completed/planned housing projects all over the Brussels Capital area).

CLTB is a social real estate developer that builds affordable housing projects in Brussels for people with limited means, on collectively-owned lands. It purchases land and engages with future residents and community partners to co-create affordable housing (CLTB website_what do we do).

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

Housing

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

Provide decent housing (good quality, sustainable, secure, affordable) to Brussels residents; increase community cohesion; empower residents via more control over shaping their communities (CLTB website_vision and mission).

4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?

In 2008, associations for affordable and sustainable public housing in Brussels learned about the Community Land Trust model at a convention. They visited an example in the US in 2009. In 2010, a group of 15 associations created and signed a charter for the establishment of a CLT in Brussels. After a feasibility study supported by the Brussels regional government between 2011-2012, it was formally supported by the Housing Minister and given a grant to begin operations, which happened that fall. The CLT’s first and only building so far (Quai de Mariemont in Molenbeek) was completed in September 2015. Currently, three developments are in construction and five more are planned. (CLTB website_our history).

5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)

Hybrid governance mode - the idea and motivation came from non-government actors, but it was made a reality via municipal governmental support and institutionalization (inclusion of the CLT model in the housing bill of the Brussels Capital Region and making the CLT an operator of the Housing Alliance investment program for new affordable housing) (CLTB website_our history). The CLT and its associated foundation have both residents, civil society, and public officials on their boards (CLTB website_our governance).
6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?\[1\]

It fills all of the criteria for desirable WP5 interventions. It is an interesting example of hybrid governance, where non-government actors sought to serve a need for communities and local governments empowered/adopted their initiative. It is also one of the first CLT models implemented in Europe. One reservation about this intervention is that it is explicitly focused on justice, but environmental sustainability is not as important (although still present).

7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) Governance Intervention?

CLTB website and project materials from the Interreg program’s Sustainable Housing for Inclusive and Cohesive Cities project. Most information is from the CLTB website (CLTB website) and several SHICC case study documents (Interreg_01; Interreg_02) and CLTB annual reports (Interreg_04 and Interreg_05). Additional information was provided by CLTB co-founder and current coordinator, Geert De Pauw, during a personal interview.

b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:

● a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

CLTB was studied in the EU’s Interreg project, Sustainable Housing for Inclusive and Cohesive Cities (Sept 2017-Sept 2020), which supports and studies four CLT’s in Europe (Brussels, Ghent, Lille and London). SHICC aims to “prove the concept’, create a supportive local, regional and national policy, funding and regulatory environment for CLTs and build a movement across the region” (SHICC Project_home).

● b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.

Governance and participation processes, Policies and practices for inclusion of disadvantaged groups, Right to housing.

● c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?

No.

9. Problematization and priority:

● a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

Intervention proponents have been vocal about the lack of affordable decent housing for low-income people in Brussels, particularly due to a small number of public social housing units and rapidly increasing housing prices between 2000 and 2010 (CLTB website_our history). This problematization
comes from the low-income groups themselves, since they are engaged with the various associations and CLTB to express their needs (De Pauw).

- **b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?**

Yes. Justice is central to their vision and mission in that the intervention provides decent housing and empowerment to marginalised, low-income groups to co-create their communities (see Q3).

- **c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address? (see Database of drivers of injustice)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material and livelihood inequalities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unfit institutional structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Limited citizen participation in urban planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Weak(ened) civil society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) **Actor constellations**

10. **Who initiated the intervention?**

Activists from various housing and neighbourhood associations in the Brussels Capital area (Buurthuis Bonnevie, a community center and CIRE solidarity savings group, were listed in particular) initiated it. After this initial interest was sparked, a smaller group of actors (unnamed representatives of this group of associations) were involved in CLT-specific learning/research, and then 15 associations signed onto the charter for the establishment of a Community Land Trust in Brussels in 2010. Afterwards the local government became more involved and the intervention took off. (CLTB website_ our history)
11. Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)

Low-income residents of Brussels, community members that projects are implemented in, housing-insecure individuals in other cities (if CLTB is able to prove the concept and inspire more CLTs).

12. Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor types</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Actor name and role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Wide variety of member associations, work together with residents and CLTB to develop projects (CLTB website_partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid/ 3rd sector organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>The Community Land Trust Brussels, manages and leads the intervention (CLTB website_our governance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide variety of member associations, work together with residents and CLTB to develop projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social entreprises</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Housing fund Brussels (cooperative society), provides mortgages to the prospective buyers (CLTB website_partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For profit enterprises</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Various private firms (i.e. Architects, contractors, etc.), provide their services, expertise or financial support, or act as a member of the CTLB general assembly (CLTB website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/regional government</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>The Housing Minister of the Brussels Capital Regional Government, provides 2m eu/year in funding (CLTB website_support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service members sit on board of CLT (CLTB website_our governance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

Firstly, the ability of many (15) community associations to self-organize and present a united appeal for the establishment of the CLTB was very important. Secondly, the productive and early engagement of the housing associations with the local government of Brussels was crucial. It resulted in formal approval and funding by the Brussels government to launch the intervention. Thirdly, early involvement (via workshops, meetings, etc) of the target group of people in need of housing was very important - it allowed CLTB to see that their proposal was an answer to the target group’s needs, and it gave a sense of legitimacy since it facilitated this expression of need. (confirmed by De Pauw)

14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?

Citizens, as members of the various housing associations, inspired and organized the intervention. They continue to be a central actor in the co-creation of the projects and (project residents) make up one third of the CLT board members (CLTB website_our governance). This is a highly participatory intervention. Future residents work together to guide the development of their dwellings, and current residents are responsible for their buildings’ management.

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

Community-based decision making in different forms. The CLTB NPO is directed by a mix of building owners, prospective buyers, the CLT members, the associations, the neighbours, and the representatives of the government. For each housing project, future residents and current ones have high responsibilities and their voices are central to decision making. There is also an annual general assembly where CLT members meet (active members have certain voting rights).

16. Exclusion:

- a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?

Since the intervention is so community-centred and prioritises inclusion, very few (marginalized) social groups are excluded. However, individuals must meet certain admission conditions, the same as those for normal municipal social housing admittance, to be given a CLTB residence spot (Interreg_02:2). Therefore these other groups are excluded (i.e. medium income groups, young
people with unstable employment, elderly) (Interreg_02:9). Also, there is currently too long of a waiting list at the moment, so no new candidates are being registered (CLTB website_get a CLTB home).

- b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?

Admission conditions are necessary to make sure that the most vulnerable are given priority, since there is excess demand for CLTB housing. Outcomes are unclear and there are no reports of work done to cater to groups that do not meet the admission conditions. Although there are other ways to participate, such as becoming a member or a volunteer with CLTB.

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

Brussels’ housing crisis in the early 2000s (increased rent prices, not enough social housing, policy focus on homeownership) spurred action from local associations, which then snowballed into the BLT intervention (CLTB_our history).

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)

Unfavourable housing and rental policies at the regional and national level were presumably influential in the motivation to establish the CLTB, since they were/are offering inadequate support for lower income demographics. Nationally, housing policies have largely benefited homeowners over private renters and people in social housing (i.e. national housing budgets are mostly allocated to private owners, and significantly less is allocated to social housing and the rental market) (OECD paper). Social housing has been made the responsibility of Belgium’s regions since 1980, and there are regional and national plans to increase the stock, but there remains big social housing shortfalls (Social housing in europe; Facets of housing).

Some specific policies include: the Brussels Housing Code, within which the CLT was entrenched in 2013 by the Brussels Capital Region (Regulatory policy type), and the Region’s ‘Alliance Habitat’ investment plan, which gives 2million euros per year in subsidies to the CLTB. (Economic policy type) Low-carbon building standards set in 2015 by the Brussels Capital Region are influential, since they require all new construction to meet a certain passive building standard. This includes CLTB projects (Interreg_01:5).

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country's constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

The Belgian Federal State has three regions, one of which is the Brussels Capital Region. The regions are responsible for providing affordable housing, which has enabled and motivated the Brussels Capital Region to be highly involved and supportive of the CLT intervention (Interreg_02:1).

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political
institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policy makers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation etc.)

The hybrid intervention is possible due to positive interactions between housing associations and the Brussels Capital Region government. The associations were eager to engage with the government to quickly institutionalise the intervention, rather than attempting to grow it on their own. And the regional government (a social democracy) was responsive to their interests, by conducting a feasibility study upon their request (before further adopting it later on) (CLTB website_our history).

Compared to colleagues implementing CLTs in other places, CLTB proponents feel lucky that there is a close relationship between civil society groups and local authorities in Brussels. In Brussels there is a strong and well-organized civil society, especially in the housing sector, and there are a lot of innovative community housing association groups that receive government funding. One reason for this government-civil sector collaboration is that BCR is a small territory but has the same capacity as the other two regions in Belgium. And since housing is dependent on the City, that creates the close relationship between the civil society groups and the authorities. (De Pauw)

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

Financial assistance in the start up phase included: a 150,000 euro feasibility study (from the Regional government), 10,000 from the RénovAssistance Foundation and support from the King Baudouin Foundation for the first years of operation expenses, subsidized jobs funded by the Region. Current financial arrangements include an annual 2 million euro investment subsidy from the Region which allows the CLT foundation to purchase land, and contribute towards 40% of building construction. The other 60% is derived from households’ mortgages (provided from Brussels Housing Fund). CLTB’s operational budget is mainly funded through various grants, membership fees (10euros per month), ground leases (10euros per household per month), crowd funding and donations. The financial arrangements listed above are more complex than this and are further detailed in the SHICC 2019 report (Interreg_02).

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

No.

Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

   a. Regulatory framework

Since the intervention is supported through a regulatory framework, it does not pose major obstacles. One implementation barrier includes: the lack of funds provided for non-residential spaces (like gardens or community spaces) in the Regional subsidies. These components are important to the CLT’s concept of thriving communities. (Interreg_02:5).

Another implementation barrier includes the administratives delays to win public tenders, to obtain planning permissions and build new housing leading to subsequent delay in the construction phase.
It means that some prospective residents have sometimes waited for years to receive housing.

- **b. Legitimacy**

  n/a It has legitimacy by being linked with government support and rooted in community needs.

- **c. Public awareness**

  n/a Demand exceeds supply. This is a popular intervention.

- **d. Finances**

  Sustainable and reliable funding for its growing operations as it produces more developments presumably poses the biggest obstacle to CLTB. It is heavily reliant on public funding, which could dry up if political priorities change (Interreg_02:9). Additionally, the current staff capacity is being stretched thinly and funding for more positions will need to be acquired in order to handle upscaled program implementation. Finally, as operations grow, the capacities of CLT’s partner associations will also be stretched, and will therefore also need increased funding (Interreg_02:9).

- **e. Others (please name)**

  Community building - which is a major dimension of the project - for prospective residents (before moving in the neighborhood) is more difficult for large communities including people still on the waiting list (candidate resident) and people who are not yet engaged in a concrete project (Interreg_04: 4).

- **f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles**

  24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inability to fund non-residential spaces</td>
<td>So far, the non-residential spaces that have been created were funded via higher lease costs to renters. But the Region may begin to support these spaces if the CLTB demonstrates that its pilot projects have sustainable business models. (Interreg_02:5,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Heavy reliance on a single source of public funding</td>
<td>Suggestions to overcome this include looking for different investment for this (from private actors or citizens), or funding campaigns (Interreg_02:9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stretched capacity of CLT staff and partner associations</td>
<td>CLTB is financing more full time staff positions via various charitable foundations (Interreg_02:9). No reports on how CLTB partners will increase their capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Administrative delays to obtain planning permits and build new housing.

It was not possible to speed up the administrative procedures. However, while some prospective residents did not yet receive housing, they have actively engaged in building community in their future neighborhood (Interreg_04: 3). In that sense these delays did not discourage prospective residents nor undermine community building processes.

5. Difficulties in building community in large groups of prospective (candidate) residents.

In 2017 for the second time, CLTB has organized events allowing candidate-resident to meet and get to know each other as well as to start engaging in projects while not living yet in the neighborhood. In collaboration with other local organizations thematic workshops have been organized (i.e. energy, finances, house reparations...). In addition, in 2016, in the framework of the project “Co-create”, CLT has experimented with a new tool called ABCD (Asset Based Community Development) for community building.

g) Reported outcomes

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

From Interreg_02: CLT has 2 completed projects (9 units, inhabited since 2015, and 32 units inhabited since the end of 2019), 4 projects in construction, 5 projects being studied, equalling 164 units in development with eventual resale prices at 25-50% of the market price. It has 600 members (400 candidate housing owners, 170 supporting members, and 30 not for profit organizations).

Since it is more focused on social sustainability, the intervention has so far not demonstrated substantial outcomes regarding environmental sustainability. The first completed project was built according to the Brussels Capital Region’s low-carbon standards (Interreg_01:5). But this was necessary by law, and not motivated by the project itself. Several of the planned projects include “green” features like community gardens and other communal green spaces, and one in particular is planned to be built within the upcoming Tivoli Green City quarter of Brussels.

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

Please fill in any information on social learning that has occurred in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project)[4]. Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context

(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

- a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city...) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

CLT builds off experiences in experiments for alternative affordable housing in Brussels such as the L’Espoir project (one of the first passive solar, energy efficient housing buildings in Brussels, housing
14 low income migrant families since 2009), and a solidarity savings group in 2004 that allows low income families to pool funds to purchase a house (CLTB website_our history).

In more detail from interview with De Pauw:

The L’Esper project was successful, but CLTB proponents learned that this kind of thing is not possible without public support (subsidies, grants). L’Esper started with nothing and spent a lot of effort trying to get support. There is a need for public money from the beginning. At several points through the project they almost stopped due to lack of funding. This is especially problematic for participants because it becomes quite risky. CLTB proponents also wanted to find a more sustainable way of using public grants, since, in L’Esper, residents who want to sell their home can do it at any price, and retain any project, which is not sustainable. They discovered the CLT model as a way of introducing non-speculative elements.

Regarding the saving groups, proponents such as De Pauw had already been working with CIRE who was running the savings groups. These groups worked well, but not when house prices increased. Therefore, proponents were interested in a more sustainable model that was affordable for the low income groups.

In summary, CLTB drew lessons from what couldn't be solved, and also from what worked. e.g. the way participation is organized in preparation for projects is very much inspired by what was done in L’Espoir and the saving groups.

Especially within the CLTB, projects learn from each other: “We are constantly reflecting on things, perhaps too much! ... For every part of the operation we regularly rethink how to do it. This happens at the level of the team, and also on the level of our working groups, partner associations, experts and other stakeholders, and the level of our board.” (De Pauw)

- b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

Housing association members first learned about the CLT model from a convention on Housing Cooperatives in Lyon, France. They then visited a successful CLT example - the Champlain Housing Trust in Burlington, Vermont (CLTB website_our history). The CLTB is also part of the SHICC EU-funded project, which connects it with other CLTs across Europe and aims to have a widespread movement of CLTs. The project financially supports the selected CLTs and provides some knowledge resources. (This support hits all four types of TRANSIT’s empowerment mechanisms)

In more detail from De Pauw interview:

Champlain was essential for CLTB success. "They helped us with everything we wanted ... When writing lease contracts we could use a lot of their documents, experience (despite being in a different context) and we had a lot of exchange with them and they were really supportive so that was really important, and still is. At least once a year we call them with a question. It was also a way of showing that what we wanted was possible and not just an idea." Champlain proponents also came to Brussels several times and their CEO did a video message at a CLTB press conference, which was very important.

Learning content

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?
● **a. from previous experiences in the same urban context**

As previously mentioned, one crucial piece of knowledge from the L’Espoir project was that its founders learned that significant public investment is needed to make affordable housing possible at a larger scale. While they were able to raise funds to cover the reduced contribution of low-income residents, this was seen as unsustainable.

From the solidarity savings groups, the intervention learned that alternative savings systems cannot overcome high housing prices, which dissuaded them from adopting a similar approach.

(CLTB website_our history)

An example of learning from the CLTB’s own internal reflections while replicating projects is about participatory procedures. In the beginning, they reproduced what had been done in L’Espoir, and actively involved participants from the start, right when they bought the land or even before. But they stopped doing that after the pilot projects because of all the risks and difficulties associated with building in Brussels. e.g. had to deal with a builder bankruptcy, had to wait two years for building permission, etc.. Despite it being interesting to engage from the start, proponents decided it was too risky and instead now compose the groups once they have the building permit. (De Pauw)

● **b. from inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere**

The specific nature and content of what the CLTB drew from their visit to the Champlain Housing Trust is not clear in the project documentation. This is the only mention of the “partnership”/”transfer”: “In September 2009, four members of this group were invited ... to participate at an international study visit to the Champlain Housing Trust in Burlington, Vermont, a CLT that had just won a United Nations World Habitat Award. After a week, they returned to Brussels, more than ever convinced that the CLT model might be what they were looking for” (CLTB website_our history). The CLTB did adopt Champlain’s governance model whereby the board of trustees is composed of one third current/future residents, one third civil society, and one third public officials (Interreg_02:1). The CLTB also adopted Champlain’s resale mechanism (Interreg_01:7).

However, the interview with De Pauw revealed the large amount of learning between Chaimplain and CLTB about a variety of things. See Q26b.

Regarding SHICC, their project website resources include: financial guides, local advocacy toolkit, and case studies of all the participating CLTs.

● **c. from other knowledge gathering/research**

None specifically reported, but since CLTs are a relatively novel and complex intervention, there was likely a big learning curve. Areas of acquired knowledge could include legal aspects and procedural elements: “The last two years, we invested a lot in strengthening our organization, developing legal models, procedures, etc” (CLTB website_our history).

**Learning process**

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?
The context of Brussels is characterized by high housing prices and low volume of social housing stock. The previous learned content may have caused the intervention to seek significant public investment in order to help it prosper at a wider scale (L’Espoir project) AND help the Regional government fulfill its duty towards social housing. The observed necessity to reduce cost of housing, and not just pool funds to buy expensive housing (solidarity savings groups) may have caused CLTB to source its land from a Regeneration scheme that allows municipalities to sell it below market price - aka the CLTB looked into strategies to lower its costs wherever possible in order to make the housing products more affordable.

Finally, the Champlain Trust model was adapted slightly to fit the Brussels context, for example taking the necessary steps of making it compliant with the relevant laws/policies (e.g. the 2015 low carbon standards). While everything from Champlain needed to be tweaked to fit the Brussels context, it needed less adaptation that one could imagine, despite having a completely different legal system (CLTB is under civil law, Champlain under common law). The big difference, however, was in the initiative aims. CLTB is aimed at targeting lowest income groups, so their model needed to accommodate that. This has forced CLTB to have a system that is more public than Champlain’s. Since it requires public funding to make it accessible to low-income groups, they need to do a lot of public tendering for architects, builders etc. CLTB’s pricing system, allocation procedure, has also been adapted to reach these groups. CLTB also had more participatory processes than Champlain, since BCR has a rich history of housing association activities.

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?

The process of learning and overcoming obstacles is not particularly well-documented in INTERREG project files, but CLTB annual reports contained useful information.

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote) and the actors involved in using them.

The site visit to Champlain Trust was a particularly important KBA which inspired the CLTB development. The community building methods called ABCD (Asset Based Community Development) developed by CLTB in the framework of the project “Co-create” and in collaboration with partners organizations and researchers from the Universities of Bruxelles (Interreg_04: 4) has enabled the learning process.

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

- a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]

Yes. The CLTB’s goal is to have many social housing projects created within the Capital Region, and the goal of SHICC project is to create/enable a CLT movement with many replications. The success of the intervention (aka being able to provide decent affordable housing to those in need) is dependent on it being scalable.
In the section “communicate with our members and with external actors” (Interreg_05: 21), CLTB aims to draw public attention to the project (and clarify its identity for the public) as well as become a (European) reference in CLT models.

- **b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?**

Urban contexts within the Brussels Capital Region and North-Western Europe in general, which SHICC has claimed to be in the midst of a housing affordability crisis (Interreg_03).

- **c. Who has made the claims?**

CLTB proponents and SHICC project.

- **d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?**

None recorded - the project documentation and intervention documentation have an optimistic perspective on CLT transferability.

A possible limit to transferability of the CLT model is that more public funding is needed to meet the needs of low-income groups than those with greater means. Therefore, if this funding weren’t available in other contexts, the CLTB’s aim of helping the most vulnerable residents would be less achievable. While a CLT is possible without their level of public support, it would indeed be more complicated and one would probably have to change their target group. For example, there are a few middle-class co-housing groups in Belgium that self-label as CLTs, without use of public money. (De Pauw)

32. In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?

The learning process has not been very well-recorded in Interreg project documentation. This documentation has a promotional feel to it, and it mostly describes how the CLTB currently functions. However, the learning process has been well recorded in the CLTB annual reports which describe current and upcoming projects, the outcomes and also reports the difficulties and the solutions to address them.

Regarding how CLTB has made its more general experience accessible to citymakers, it reports various outreach and learning opportunities, see Q33.

33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

From the CLTB website: “Since its creation at the end of 2012, the CLTB, the first CLT of Europe, has received widespread interest from local authorities, associations, foundations, international institutions, academics from various European countries (France, Netherlands, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Greece, Serbia, Sweden,...). We have already welcomed several delegations and taken part in numerous events abroad. In this way, we are contributing to the model’s distribution on a European and global scale.”

CLTB has improved its communication tools (i.e. social network, website, brochures etc...) and have participated in many international gatherings especially in Belgium and France. This includes among others presentations given at the housing cooperative society in Rennes (Fr), at the members of the
European project “Urbamonde” and at the “Collectif Goed” cooperative project in Anvers (Bel).
(Interreg_05:21)

Actual demonstrations of direct transferability can be seen between individual CLTB housing projects in Brussels, which directly learn from each other (see Q26a). In a less direct sense, proponents have seen the increase in new CLT’s since 2010 when the CLTB was getting started and few had yet heard of the model. These CLTs have been successfully implemented in many different contexts because the model is flexible and is an answer to many current issues of land, gentrification, housing crises which are on top of the agenda. A lot of the model’s success comes from people looking for alternatives for these issues. Regarding flexibility, it has different elements that can be combined in different ways: has been used in urban and rural contexts, small and big scale, with or without public funding, initiated by grassroots organizations or governments. However, CLTB proponents question whether these replications are true community land trusts, since many have a low level of participation. (De Pauw) An interesting takeaway here is that the model’s flexibility enables transferability, but can dilute the initial aims of the intervention regarding actively engaging and serving the most needy citizens.

For example, in France the CLT model is not bottom-up, federal law was changed to make it possible and projects are initiated by municipalities where the community aspect is often forgotten. However it still includes the main elements of a CLT (separation of land and the building, anti-speculation formulas...)(De Pauw).

j) Structural learning

34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

CLTB helped raise a discussion on public land policy and the idea that it should be used in a sustainable way and not sold on the markets. There is a real debate on this at a government level. Additionally, approaches to co-creating housing may be increasing as a result of CLTB, since other more established housing organizations are also giving more importance to resident participation. “These are things I think we contributed to change the mindset of.”(De Pauw)

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

n/a

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

Hybrid governance can be a very successful way of establishing an intervention, because it gets the ideas and legitimacy and motivation from the people and the funding and institutional support from
the government. However, interventions sharing the CLTB’s aims seem more context-bounded than non-government led interventions since government priorities and resources vary widely.

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance
(from NATURVATION project)

NATURVATION’s NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed "management set-ups”):

- **Government-led** (Gov)
- **Co-governance or hybrid governance** (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
- **Led by non-government actors** (NGO)

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. **Self-governing**, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. **Provision**, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. **Regulations**, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. **Enabling**, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships”

Appendix 2: Policy typology
(from NATURVATION project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory (administrative, command-and-control)</td>
<td>Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors</td>
<td>Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic (financial, market-based)</td>
<td>Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable (or unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors</td>
<td>Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance and procurements. Negative incentives are taxes, fees and charges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative (educational)</td>
<td>They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change</td>
<td>Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private</td>
<td>Voluntary actions and agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actors and/or non-governmental organisations.

Footnotes

1. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5):
   https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCPcUd-COIQ1MsBjir20_F1CBbnSu6HqKH9nNLshiVQ/edit?usp=sharing.


3. If easily possible mention sources for your association of roles.


6. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.
GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 4: Dealing flexibly with and learning from resistance in Barcelona

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]

This is about the creation of Superblocks in Barcelona, a mobility concept that tries to restructure the city in 503 so called Superblocks lowering the amount of cars and giving streets further functions than mobility, e.g for leisure and neighbourhood activities. Each of the 503 Superblocks will be different in its exact structure as they will be adapted to neighbourhood contexts.

The first Superblock in Barcelona was established in Ciutat Vella (El Born) in 1993 and later on in Vila de Gràcia in 2003 (SMARTEES_01: A114) Between 2012 - 2015 the Superblock Programme started of with four pilot areas in:

- La Maternitat i Sant Ramón, in Les Corts
- Sants-Hostafrancs, in Sants-Montjuïc
- DiagonalPoblenou, in Sant Martí,
- Esquerra de l’Eixample, in Eixample (Ajuntament_01: 21)

Starting in 2016 until 2019 the large-scale Municipal Action Plan “Let’s fill the streets with life. The implementation of the Superblock Model in Barcelona” (Ajuntament_01: 1) continued to work on the creation and implementation of Superblocks, also in other areas in the city such as in Poblenou which was the pilot area for this Programme.

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

Mobility and transport.

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

The municipality of Barcelona summarizes the strategic goals of the intervention in four points (Ajuntament_01: 25f).:

- Improving the habitability of public spaces

This is about boosting the use of public spaces (e.g for childrens, meeting, resting etc.) through prioritising pedestrians and increasing traffic calm areas, promoting new uses of public spaces and improving attraction and comfort of those spaces.

- Moving towards more sustainable mobility

The goal is a healthy, low-carbon model of traffic with fewer noise and exhaust gas pollution. This is done by reducing motorised vehicles in general, promoting alternative fuels in vehicles and switching to more efficient means of transport.
Increasing and improving urban greenery and biodiversity

This is about generally increasing green areas, creating micro-habitats for birds and other species, ensuring a broad variety of plants and making the ground permeable for water. Also community managed green areas are promoted to increase public interest and participation.

Promoting public participation and joint responsibility

The aim is to open up the process as far as possible and ensure participation in city and territory approaches.

The reclaiming of public spaces, which are currently occupied by private cars, for and by residents stands at the core of the intervention and is the main goal of it. It is about “filling the streets with life again”. (Ajuntament_01: 1f.)

4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?

The initial Superblock Programme took from 2012 to 2015. The Municipal Action plan lasted from 2016 to 2019. To create more Superblocks up to the number of 503 is still a long term goal (SMARTEES_01: A114).

5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)

Government-led.

6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?

A) The intervention has been implemented and studied on a district as well as a city-wide level B) There are EU-funded studies concerning the intervention C) The intervention aims at sustainable as well as just goals D) It is very well documented (project materials, research, media)

7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) Governance Intervention?


b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:

a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

It has been studied by SMARTeES - Social Innovation Modelling Approaches to Realizing Transition to Energy Efficiency and Sustainability - from 2018-2021 [3]. as well as GREENLULUS - Green Locally Unwanted Land Uses - from 2016 - 2021 [4].
b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has explicitly been mentioned in the database.

Energy and Mobility solutions. It is also about Right to the city ideas as it wants to free up public space which is currently taken by cars. It could also fit into Nature-based solutions as some affected spaces are re-naturalised.

c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?

Yes [5]

9. Problematization and priority:

a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

Exclusion of residents from public spaces and therefore the loss of public spaces in general is the core inequality that the intervention and the municipality of Barcelona addresses (Ajuntament_01: 2).

b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?

Justice is not explicitly mentioned, although it is definitely a driver behind giving the streets back to its residents.

c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address? (see Database of drivers of injustice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material and livelihood inequalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unfit institutional structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Limited citizen participation in urban planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**

10. **Weak(ened) civil society**

**c) Actor constellations**

10. Who initiated the intervention?

The municipality of Barcelona.

11. Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)

Residents as well as other citizens visiting the areas looking for public spaces to let their children play safely, relax... (Ajuntament_01: 1f.).

12. Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor types[a]</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Actor name and role[a]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Different universities, other expert institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid/ 3rd sector organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Biciclot SCCL - a bicycle workshop in Poblenou which supported the implementation of the Superblock in Poblenou and have joined the working group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platforms</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>There are citizen platforms which are in favor of their particular neighbourhood Superblock e.g. “Col·lectiu Superilla Poblenou”[a] in Poblenou or in Camp d’en Grassot[a] which have argued in favor of Superblocks as a way to reduce private vehicle circulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>TaulaEix Pere IV. supported the Superblock in Poblenou and have also joined the working group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social movements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>It seems that there are different strong movements in favor and/or against Superblocks which are mostly about the effects on the district/neighbourhood level and the perceived positive/negative outcomes of Superblocks and not so much about the city plan in general. The most controversial debate seems to be going on in Poblenou with strong opinions on both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The pilot projects were initially launched by the conservative party “Convergència i Unió”. After 2015’s election the new left party “Barcelona en Comú” is leading the city in a coalition with other left parties. They are giving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the program continuity. Opposition comes from “Partido Popular” who defend the priority of private car use.

There are also opposition parties in favor of the concept.

Media X

Unions

Social entreprises

For profit entreprises X Consultancies provide support in the development of the different measures for each superblock as well as assistance and guidance with participation processes.

Municipality initiated the intervention. Several city council departments are working on it. Primarily, the mobility and urban design departments of the local administration.

The local government formed a technical secretariat which is leading the program. Furthermore district administrations are playing a counselling role and members (which can also be members of the local political parties) sometimes are actively part of the district working group providing expertise etc.

Moreover the Catalan government and the public authorities “Metropolitan Area of Barcelona “and the “Metropolitan Transport Authority” are involved with the formulation of the programme on the city level.

Local/Regional government X

Regional organizations

National government

Supranational government

International networks

Other initiatives X

The Urban Ecology Agency which is a consortium of the City Council of Barcelona, the Municipal Council and Metropolitan Area of Barcelona and the Barcelona Provincial Council. Its role is to diagnose every neighbourhood where Superblocks are implemented and to aid with technical solutions that could improve the neighbourhoods sustainability.

13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

In several neighbourhoods multi-stakeholder decision making processes have been formalised in local, regular working groups that are steering the design of the ongoing superblocks. This was a result of the missing participation in Poblenou and the municipality realising that local Superblocks
have to be adapted to local peculiarities. The working groups also serve promotional purposes e.g., presenting the Municipal Action Plan to more residents, engaging citizens, local associations and local economy. They also try to find agreements between different voices and interests of stakeholders (SMARTEES_01: A121).

14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?

Citizen participation happens at the neighbourhood level and tries to involve the city-wide plan of implementing superblocks. There is a standard procedure for involving different stakeholders and citizens that is followed for each superblock. It can be characterised in nine distinctive steps (SMARTEES_01: A120):

1. Definition and analysis of the area;
2. Internal work by the Technical Secretariat
3. Technical work with the districts
4. Work with the Promotional Group
5. Participation of specific groups
6. Participation of local residents
7. Approval of Action Plan
8. Drafting projects with suitable protocol and participation according to type of initiative
9. Implementing the initiatives

The process itself is the same over the different districts, but the approval ratings from citizens and their view on their respective Superblock varies for each Superblock. The implementation of a Superblock itself seemed not to be up for debate as it was integrated into the Urban Mobility Plan, just the way of how it could be implemented. The municipality defines its general establishment process of Superblocks in two bigger phases: add the graphs

Over the course of the project participation became increasingly open and informal, as there was resistance in some neighbourhoods and the process had to be adapted. The Technical Secretariat designed this participatory process in the beginning, but politicians were too eager to start implementing Superblocks, so that the Superblock in Poblenou was started without any kind of public participation (Interview_6:01). While working on this scheme, the city council decided to start to implement the first physical changes in Poblenou. The outrage that was generated by this steered the project in a more participatory direction and was crucial for key learnings of this project. (Interview_6:05)

The meeting minutes and a protocol of the deliberative process and public meetings are published on the website of the municipality for transparency (SMARTEES_01: 45).

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

The city of Barcelona always had and still has the leadership over the whole project. The Technical Secretariat (see Q. 22; Q24) is in charge of the Superblock Programme, there are only three or four public servants who are members of the city council as well as people from urban designing/planning companies working in the Technical Secretariat (Interview). Therefore, it relies on the help of different consultancies which provide support in the definition of the measures that are supposed to be implemented (SMARTEES_01: 44).

The Urban Ecology Agency has a key role in the project because of its charismatic leader Salvador Rueda (SMARTEES_01: A122). The idea of Superblocks originates from Salvador Rueda
(TheGuardian_01). Especially in the beginning this Agency was very important in designing the Superblocks, now they do ecological diagnoses of the areas of new Superblocks.

Local actors, neighbourhood stakeholders and citizens are involved in a co-designing process launched by the City Council in order to develop the action plan which “should be” approved by the district political body (SMARTEES_01: A122). These processes are formalised in local working groups where different stakeholders can participate and present the Local Action Plan to the neighbourhood (SMARTEES_01: A121).

16. Exclusion:

- a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?
  
Citizens at the earliest stages (see q.14).

- b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?
  
In Poblenou, politicians wanted to implement changes to the neighbourhood without being patient and waiting for a participation process that was designed at the same time by the Technical Secretariat. The missing participation then resulted in local resistance in the neighbourhood. In response, the project participation became increasingly open and informal to accommodate citizens more.

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

One of the main issues was that streets lost a lot of their traditional functions as spaces for children's games, local resident gatherings, strolls, resting, financial exchanges, sport, culture and protests because over the past few decades, they have developed into spaces only used for travel. Adding to that are issues such as rising air-pollution levels; traffic noise; road-accident rates and a lack of greenery. (Ajuntament_01: 7). Barcelona has developed different integrated plans tackling those issues and also embedding those problems into global issues such as climate change and lack of biodiversity, trying to improve citizens’ quality of life which is deemed to be lowered over the past decades. Superblocks are one of the measures of a systematic change of Barcelona. Reportedly from SMARTEES (01: 42), a critical attitude towards the management of environmental issues in their city started with people from the municipality participating in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio Summit) in 1992. Environmental awareness and ecological motivations were one of the key drivers of the Superblock Programme as well as a holistic management strategy of such issues in the city in general.

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)

Very important for the implementation of the Superblocks is the so-called “Citizen Commitment for Sustainability” which was first signed in 2002 by over 800 organisations (large and small enterprises, community groups, professional associations, political parties and educational institutions ...). It was evaluated and renewed in 2012 which led to the “Citizen Commitment for Sustainability 2012-2022”. (SMARTEES_01: A123). The point of that commitment is to improve people's life in the city,
furthering participation and implementing small-scale interventions. Superblocks are one of the several actions that are defined in the document and experience support because of that. In general Superblocks are connected to different policies besides the Municipal Action Plan e.g. the Barcelona Mobility Pact (1998), which over 30 mobility linked organizations have formalised and over 100 have signed to reach consensus and increase sustainable mobility (SMARTIES_01: A121). the Urban Mobility Plan of Barcelona (2013-2018), the cities Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Plan (until 2020) or the Barcelona Commitment to Climate (Ajuntament_01: 22f.) which creates synergies and gives them a vision for comprehensive change in order to develop a common strategy.

Superblocks are therefore embedded in holistic city-wide changes and city level policies which are regulatory, but also informative and voluntary (See Appendix 1).

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country’s constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

Spain is a decentralised state that comprises a three level governance: central, regional and local; comprising Provinces and Municipalities (Art. 137 of the Constitution).

Provinces and Municipalities (and Autonomous Communities) run their respective affairs autonomously which is also ensured by Art. 137

Municipalities have all kinds of authority and decision - making power which are important for the implementation of Superblocks such as: Concerning municipalities with over 50.000 inhabitants are in charge of “Collective urban transportation” and “Urban environmental protection” (CorSpain).

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policy makers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation etc.)

The eagerness to start “constructing” Superblocks without talking to residents about any of the changes in Poblenou at all have led to a fundamental change of their implementation in other areas of the city and the general participatory process.

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

The total budget for the Superblock Programme between 2016 and 2019 the “Let’s fill streets with life. Establishing Superblocks in Barcelona.” government measure is 11 million euros (Ajuntament_01: 40). The cost of the superblock project in Sant Antoni is 7 million Euros. It is estimated that the implementation of all superblocks in Barcelona would cost less than 100 million euros (SMARTIES_01: A117).

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

As mentioned the Technical Secretariat that was formed because of resistance in Poblenou (see Q.24) is now in charge of the project. This improved communication between residents and government as well as helped to organize the whole process in a better way.

Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.
23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

- **a. Regulatory framework**
  
  Most issues are about legitimacy and public awareness and not so much about regulatory framework issues.

- **b. Legitimacy**
  
  Mentioned issues are a perceived unsafety at nocturnal hours where Superblocks become “deserted” and only frequented by young people who drink on the streets. Apparently, the project in Poblenou has also led to a sharp drop in merchants' sales in the neighbourhood. (SMARTEES_01: A128). Finally, because of the unchanged habit of some residents, traffic is still the same because people are still using the car (on the perimeter streets) the same amount as before. This is related to insufficient public transport for commuters. (ebd.) There is also a fear of gentrification as the process might transform neighbourhoods into “trendy places” (SMARTEES_01: 47).

- **c. Public awareness**
  
  The Superblock in Poblenou was started without any kind of participatory process where the first physical changes in the neighbourhood were done “on a weekend” which led to a lot of resistance in the neighbourhood (Interview_7:51).

  Groups in 2016 have emerged in different neighbourhoods called the Superblocks unrealistic because it is deemed to be unrealizable in a big city like Barcelona. They warn of a feared widespread collapse of the city if Superblocks continue to be built and refer to the then (from their perspective) further rising pollution levels. In Sant Marti, resistance groups also criticized missing information and the mobility chaos of the Superblock perimeter. It has also been criticized that the urban configuration itself has not changed at all and only feels provisional (SMARTEES_01:46).

  Of 1739 residents who voted in May 2017 in the consultation promoted by the Plataforma d'Afectats of the Superilla de Poblenou, which is a platform against the Superblock in Poblenou, 87% voted against its implementation in their district (SMARTEES_01: 46).

- **d. Finances**
  
  The project in general is deemed as a low-cost solution, only for some superblocks like the one in Saint-Antoni investment is more substantial as e.g some roads and sidewalks have to be newly constructed. Some critical voices mentioned that the city council should spend more money if they really want people to benefit, as they do not believe these low-cost solutions are truly beneficial for them/will change a lot. (SMARTEES_01: 47).

- **e. Others (please name)**
  
  The implementation of Superblocks is taking far longer than expected and it still only involves small areas of the city. This is also partly a result because of the very open participatory process that the municipality adapted after resistance in Poblenou which involves local working groups co-designing parts of each neighbourhood with citizens and other local stakeholders (see Q. 24). According to one
technician there are “about 100 areas already pacified, where superblocks could be created quickly and without social contestation.” (SMARTIES_01: A127).

In a few cases the local district council acted against the implementation of their Superblock, thus strengthening critical voices (SMARTIES_01: A129).

f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles

24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen resistance in Poblenou</td>
<td>Municipality started a post-intervention participatory process and a dialogue with resident associations as well as institutions e.g schools, kindergartens.. in order to improve the intervention (getting insights from residents about which streets to reopen for traffic etc.) (Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen resistance in Poblenou</td>
<td>Local working groups in other neighbourhoods were created to steer the process for each specific neighbourhood to co-design with residents and local actors to improve legitimacy in other areas and to give residents more power. (Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different fears of negative consequences of Superblocks by residents (e.g. unsafety at night ..)</td>
<td>The municipality was and is conducting Measurements/Surveys and empirical research in existing Superblocks to get insights about different effects and to be able to present these results to residents of other Superblocks. This sometimes can help in breaking misperceptions about feared negative consequences. Right now the SMARTIES team is conducting a research on the topic of safety at night in Poble’Nou as well as different perceptions about the Superblocks in general (Interview)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Reported outcomes

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

The Programme proves that it is not always necessary to implement huge changes or to invest large sums of money in order to improve the life of its citizens. Small-scale or low-cost actions are sometimes just as effective and far easier to implement.

Observed outcomes concern (SMARTIES_01: A125):

- Habitability: 25,129 m² of new public space without cars have been gained, 349 benches have been installed, 2,483 m² of playgrounds for children have been created.
- Mobility: The number of cars that access the streets on a daily basis has gone down from 2,218 to 932 vehicles / day. The area for pedestrians has been increased by 80%, similarly the area for cars has been reduced by 48%. Unregulated car parking spaces have gone down (from 401 to 74) while cyclist meters have increased.
- Green spaces and biodiversity: The green area has increased by 91% from 9,722 m² to 18,632 m². 176 units of trees have been planted.
Economic activity: The number of economic activities on the ground floor has gone up from 65 to 85.

Public housing: In the central area of the Superblock a public housing building is being constructed by the Municipal Housing Trust.

Equally as important are observed changes in the lifestyles of residents (SMARTEES_01: A126). Several residents have reported an increase in the personal use of bikes while reducing use of private cars/motorbikes. Biking has become a trend as it is perceived safer with the lower numbers of cars around.

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

Please fill in any information on social learning that has occurred in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project)⁶. Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context

(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

- a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city…) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

The municipality mentions that the implementation of Superblocks builds on several city-wide plans from the past such as the:

- Cerdà Plan
- County Plan (1953)
- The General Metropolitan Plan (1977) - the “current framework”
- The Street Plan (1986)
- Re-developments of Portal de l’Àngel and Plaça de la Catedral
- The Mobility Plan for Vila de Gràcia (2003) (Ajuntament_01: 8f.)

- b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

The municipality reports that taming the passage of cars through street arrangements based on blocks is also not a new idea and examples can be seen in:

- proposals for neighbourhood units
- ideas of environmental areas and traffic management published by English engineer Colin Buchanan⁷,
- the woonerfs in the Netherlands⁸.

Barcelona was the first city to implement Superblocks, but the idea is very common in Spain today. There is a lot of exchange about the implementation of Superblocks in each respective city and an
especially strong inter-city partnership with Vitoria-Gasteiz which also has a Superblock Programme (SUMP - Sustainable Mobility Plan) that started in 2008 and is supposed to end in 2023 reorganizing the city in 77 Superblocks. (SMARTIES_01: A95). Both cities are continuing to support each other through ii) legitimacy, iii) knowledge sharing, learning and peer support. Barcelona was the first city to implement Superblocks which Vitoria-Gasteiz adapted in 2008. Barcelona again profits from the experiences learned in Vitoria-Gasteiz. (SMARTIES_01: A109).

**Learning content**

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?

- **a. from previous experiences in the same urban context**

  Technical knowledge in how to physically change the existing structure of blocks originally implemented in the Cerdà Plan (19th century).

  Numerous experiences on how to reclaim space for pedestrians have been reported useful to the intervention especially those based on developments after the Street Plan of 1986 (Ajuntament_01: 10) Learning to not give up on the intervention because of resistance and throwbacks against implementation has further been important. (e.g In the first re-developments of Portal de l’Àngel and Plaça de la Catedral merchants were worried that making streets only accessible to pedestrians would lead to a drop in sales much like in current debates on Superblocks (Ajuntament_01:10).

- **b. from inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere**

  It is difficult to measure exact content and learnings from partnerships with other cities as exchanges about information are rather informal but steadily happening.

- **c. from other knowledge gathering/research**

  From the implementation of the intervention itself: The municipality (had to) learn that it is vital to provide enough information and reliable data about the changes and proposals in each neighbourhood. This is important to break misperceptions and that the plan has more benefits than inconveniences. It is furthermore significant to explain overall ambitions and the city-wide scale of the tackled issues. (SMARTIES_01: 48)

  Furthermore the ability to adapt and readapt certain parts of the Superblocks in cooperation with stakeholders from different fields and residents from the area has been one of the key learnings for the municipality (Interview_31:05)

  Different best practices about participatory processes have been developed based on experiences (especially resistances) gained including:

- best practices for engaging people in deliberative processes
- information and communication strategies and channels
- the use of ICT technologies (e.g., GIS maps) for illustrating the main changes proposed in the project at the neighbourhood level
- maintaining a coherent discourse and practice, building trust, accomplishing goals while also being open to people’s proposals are stressed as key elements for making participatory processes successful (SMARTIES_01: A123).
Janet Sanz, a city councillor and today’s “Deputy Mayor for Ecology, Urban Planning and Mobility” stressed that “listening to the neighbourhood has been the main learning of this project” (El Periodico).

Learning process

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?

In order to reduce conflict and resistance the Technical Secretariat (in Poblenou)

- Improved communication and participation
- Improved participatory process and created new channels of communication with citizens (Citizens were invited to formulate improvements in the design of the Superblocks)
- Started and entered a negotiation process between pro and con-speakers of the intervention

This led to the implementation of some changes such as permitting private vehicles and public transport from entering Superblocks.

The Technical Secretariat also became important in sharing the knowledge to other cities as it reportedly gave advice and shared knowledge with representatives of New York and Copenhagen (SMARTEES_01: 50).

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?

Especially the resistance in Poblenou that emerged after implementing changes to the neighbourhood without any prior participation process, fundamentally changed the way of how Superblocks were implemented afterwards and will be in the future. The newly created local working groups of each area give residents and other stakeholders the possibility to express issues and the power to co-create their new neighbourhood. (Interview). Speculatively, this might also change the way other projects in Barcelona will be designed in the future, although it is too early to measure this yet (Interview).

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote) and the actors involved in using them.

- Face-to-Face meetings (all actors)
- Field visits / meeting the locals (Workshops organised by city council with city technicians, politicians and residents) (SMARTEES_01: A119).

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

- a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]

The efforts of Barcelona concerning their Superblocks are well recognised internationally and many other cities are in contact with Barcelona to learn about their experience. Barcelona has also received a lot of media attention over the last couple of years from e.g The New York Times
b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?

Districts and city-wide plans, dense cities.

c. Who has made the claims?

Media, urban planners, researchers.

d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?

VOX mentions different limits to transferability especially regarding US cities:

- Cities tend to be too wide and focussed around interstates and freeways
- Missing density and walkability
- Missing short, regular blocks, orthogonal streets, and mixed-use zoning
- Missing familiarity with urban transformations and civic pride (VOX_02) Americans are so accustomed to the absence of walkable and accessible public spaces they barely can express what they are missing

These factors are especially prominent in the US but also apply to a lot of European cities.

Furthermore, interesting is the relationship between suburbanity and hurdles for reducing numbers of cars: Suburbanity with clear property borders and separated dwellings means less density which means less walkability and slower and less frequent public transport. This leads to an increase of private vehicles and citizens thinking of themselves as car drivers in the field of mobility. Drivers again do not want more people living near them, as that means more drivers and traffic jams.

The idea of vibrant, public spaces does not really work as there is not sufficient density around the spaces. “They become internal tourist destinations, places residents drive to visit” (VOX_02).

32. In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?

SMARTEES has a huge report on all kinds of issues related to the implementation of Superblocks. There is specific section on “Critical issues and How Critical issues have been overcome” (SMARTEES_01: 45f); as well as specific stories (an extra infobox) that show how exactly certain project processes developed e.g resistance in Poblenou (SMARTEES_01: A129f.) As mentioned there is also a lot of media presence concerned with Barcelona’s idea and implementation of Superblocks that report issues of implementation and how other cities can profit from it (NewYorkTimes_01)
SMARTERES is actively trying to further networks between Barcelona and other Spanish cities and are creating ways of formalising learning and sharing. SMARTERES wants to develop policy scenario workshops where cities can discuss future steps of Superblock interventions (Vitoria-Gasteiz and Barcelona will be part of these workshops). The goal is to bring researchers and actors from the cities together and discuss strategies and approaches alternatives and lessons from past experiences in Superblocks and how to transfer that knowledge to future implementations.

33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

In Spain the idea of Superblocks is spreading to other topologically diverse cities such as A Coruña, Ferrol, Viladecans and El Prat (SMARTERES_01: A49).

SMARTERES report that representatives of New York and Copenhagen have already visited Barcelona and are advised by the Technical Secretariat (SMARTERES_01: 50).

Other cities in the world such as Melbourne, Toronto, Lisbon, Quito, Buenos Aires are also interested in the Superblock Programme and are in contact with the Agencia de Ecologia Urbana. Seattle is also reportedly considering implementing its first Superblock brought to discussion by Seattle councilwoman Teresa Mosqueda (CapitolHill_01).

A lot of other cities in the world (from Japan, China, India, South Korea, Canada, Ecuador, Mexico and Moscow) have requested information on Superblocks (SMARTERES_01: 50).

j) Structural learning

34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

The Superblock model developed a new model of organizing the public participation pursuing co-responsibility as one of the core strategies of the programme (SMARTERES_01: 43). Other long-term consequences are not foreseeable now, as this project only started rather recently and will be going on for a long timespan. It will be interesting to see if there are going to be institutional changes because of the Superblocks Programme. SMARTERES is trying to evaluate these as part of their project.

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

Barcelona has a long history of involving the public as there are different formal structures already existing for participation such as the Conseils de Barri. (SMARTERES_01: 43) (VOX_02). The Superblock model developed a new model of organizing the public participation pursuing co-responsibility as one of the core strategies of the programme (SMARTERES_01: 43).
36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

This intervention shows how important it is to be able to adapt existing plans to local contexts. Possibly, there will be long term changes in the way the municipality will interact with residents in different kinds of programmes in the city that go further than Superblocks. The learnings from the implementation of the first Superblocks could be seen as a changing moment in time for that in the future (Interview).

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance
(from NATURVATION project)

NATURVATION's NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed "management set-ups"):

- **Government-led** (Gov)
- **Co-governance or hybrid governance** (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
- **Led by non-government actors** (NGO)

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. **Self-governing**, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. **Provision**, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. **Regulations**, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. **Enabling**, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships

Appendix 2: Policy typology
(from NATURVATION project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory</strong></td>
<td>Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors</td>
<td>Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(administrative, command-and-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable (or</td>
<td>Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(financial, market-based)</td>
<td>unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors</td>
<td>tax allowance and procurements. Negative incentives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informative (educational) They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change.

Voluntary Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private actors and/or non-governmental organisations.

Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media.

Voluntary actions and agreements.

Footnotes

1. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5):
   https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCPcUD-COIQ1MsBjir20_F1CBbnSu6HqKH9nNLshlVQ/edit?usp=sharing.


3. If easily possible mention sources for your association of roles.


16. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.
GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 5:
Biodiversity protection and social justice in the Barcelona Natural Park

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]

Peri-urban Natural Park of Collserola (Serra de Collserola Natural Park) in Barcelona (Naturvation_08).

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

Green Space for biodiversity protection, ecosystem services provision, and Nature-Based Solution (NBS).

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

The intervention aims to protect Barcelona’s fragile Peri-Urban ecosystems for both social and ecological functions while preserving biodiversity and providing ecosystem services to nearby residents (Naturvation_08). Since the enactment of the special plan for planning and protection of the natural environment in 1987, the park has become a recreational area and a place for being closer to nature in order to promote the cultural and environmental values among the population and to protect an area of great ecological value (Naturvation_09). Barcelona is a highly populated and dense city, therefore relatively few green spaces are available. Collserola Park enhances the liveability of the city, particularly, forest strongly contributes to air pollution removal and urban cooling (Naturvation_08).

4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?

The park’s new management activities started in 2010 and are still ongoing. The intervention was studied in the context of the NATURVATION project during the period 2016 - 2020 (Naturvation_08).

5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)

Government-led (Naturvation_08).

6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?[

The intervention meets the WP5 criteria for a case selection /study criteria to a high extent and highlights the governance challenges associated with the need for green spaces or recreational activities for the inhabitants and biodiversity protection. However, keeping a balance between visions of different stakeholders for the park and making sure local citizens participate in the park’s planning and management (given the geographical scale of the intervention and the traditionally hierarchical governance mode of the actors) are particular challenges.

7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place-specific) Governance Intervention?
Naturvation Deliverables

- Taking action for urban nature - citizens engagement handbook, 2019 (Naturvation_01)
- International comparison of nature-based solutions project report, 2019 (Naturvation_06)

b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:

- a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

The intervention was studied by NATURVATION with funding by the European Union’s HORIZON 2020 Programme (Naturvation_08). [https://naturvation.eu/nbs/barcelona/peri-urban-natural-park-collserola](https://naturvation.eu/nbs/barcelona/peri-urban-natural-park-collserola)

- b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.

The intervention best fits under the “Nature-Based Solutions” approach. It has been studied under the NATURVATION project which is mentioned in the database of approaches as an example.

- c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?

Yes, the four deliverables mentioned above (Q. 7).

9. Problematization and priority:

- a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

Collserola Park is the largest green space in the metropolitan area of Barcelona, an area that is under significant demographic pressure (Naturvation_09). The rapid urbanization of the city had been seen as a potential threat to fragile peri-urban ecosystems and consequently to biodiversity protection, ecosystem services, and access to green spaces. Additionally, uneven representation of different visions - biodiversity protection vs. recreation - of different groups reflect wider tensions and inequalities in existing management of the Park that has been problematized by the local citizens (Naturvation_06:82).

- b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?

Striking a balance between protection of biodiversity and fulfilling local citizens’ demand for more access to the green space and recreational activities is the major motivation behind the intervention (Naturvation_08). The Special Plan for the Protection of the Natural Environment and Landscape of Collserola Mountain (PepNat) has been devised to address Collserola’s new status as a NATURA 2000
site, responding to the challenge of preserving biodiversity while providing much needed recreational ecosystem services, given high density of population in surrounding areas (Naturvation_06:19).

- **c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address?** (see Database of drivers of injustice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material and livelihood inequalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unfit institutional structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Limited citizen participation in urban planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Weak(ened) civil society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c) Actor constellations**

**10. Who initiated the intervention?**

The intervention was initiated and is now jointly managed by the Park Consortium composed of Catalan government (Generalitat de Catalunya), the Barcelona Provincial Council (Diputació de Barcelona), the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona (AMB) and the adjacent nine municipalities (within the territory of the Park): El Papiol, Molins de Rei, Sant Feliu de Llobregat, Sant Just Desvern, Esplugues de Llobregat, Barcelona, Montcada i Reixac, Cerdanyola Del Vallès and Sant Cugat del Vallè (Naturvation_08).

**11. Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention?** (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)

Park visitors and local citizens. Park visitors could be outsiders e.g. tourists or scientists. Local citizens not only benefit from visits but also from the ecosystem services that the park provides such as moderating of atmospheric temperature.

**12. Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor types[^2]</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Actor name and role[^3]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

The interaction within the initiating consortium, i.e. between the Catalan government (Generalitat de Catalunya), the Barcelona Provincial Council (Diputació de Barcelona), the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona and the nine adjacent municipalities (Naturvation_06:19).
14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?

Citizens and visitors to the park are encouraged to leave suggestions for the park’s improvement at the information centre (Naturvation_07:59). Citizens’ are also asked for their feedback on the Park’s management plan (Naturvation_01:11). However, the NATURVATION project has documented that Collserola Parks’ management plans are often shared with the public but at an advanced stage of development and in formats that are not easy to understand. According to NATURVATION’s informants, citizens in Barcelona were invited to comment on initial park management drafts where, despite the inclusive small group format, the topics to discuss were pre-decided by the organizers, which obstructed effective participation (Naturvation_06:24).

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

This governance system of the park is comparatively advanced in terms of inclusive decision making than others and quite informed (Interview, 08.06.2020). The Serra de Collserola Natural Park is governed by the following bodies:

- **General assembly**

  The General Assembly is the Consortium’s supreme deliberation and decision-making body. It is made up of 10 members from Barcelona Diputació, 10 members from Barcelona Metropolitan Area, four members from the Government of Catalonia (Generalitat), one member from each city or town council affiliated to the Consortium and one member from an invited entity.

- **Executive committee**

  The Executive Committee is an operational body established to monitor and put in place mechanisms for the implementation of decisions taken in the General Assembly. The Executive Committee comprises twenty-one members, of which at least three are representatives of Barcelona Diputació, three Barcelona Metropolitan Area, and three from the Government of Catalonia.

- **Consultative committee**

  The Consultative Committee is the advisory body that brings together the social, academic, cultural, professional, and economic sectors alongside private non-profit organizations that pursue goals of general interest that coincide with those of the Consortium.

- **Scientific advisory committee**

  The aim of the Scientific Advisory Committee is to provide advice based on scientific knowledge to the governing body and management body of the Natural Park regarding actions to be undertaken. Its creation is pursuant to Article 13 of Decree 146/2010, of a declaration of the Natural Park of the Serra de Collserola (Naturvation_10).

16. Exclusion:

- **a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?**

  The Naturvation project has recorded tokenistic participation of local citizens in the Parks management and planning (Naturvation_06:24).
b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?

The analysis conducted by NATURVATION project lists following constraints to citizens’ participation:

- Park’s managers fear that the citizens' engagement (or inclusion) in the Park’s planning can weaken their long term sustainability/biodiversity protection vision for the park (Interview).
- It is reported that in the park’s management citizens’ engagement often depends on the interest and goodwill of individuals coordinating the plan.
- Lack of trust sometimes makes municipalities reluctant to genuinely engage with civil groups.
- A perceived sense among the citizens that the proposed plan would go ahead regardless of consultation responses has also impeded public participation in the management of the Park.
- The contextual distance between civil groups and municipalities or pre-existing contestations influences the participation process.
- The issue of privilege or who could afford to volunteer and participate in NBS consultants and management is another factor that leads to low participation turn-out rates (Naturvation_06:24).

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

The EU directive 92/43 / EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora provides for the creation of a European ecological network of special areas of conservation: the Natura 2000 network. Under the directive, the Agreement of the Government of the Generalitat de Catalunya of September 5, 2006, approved the proposal of places of community importance that included the Serra de Collserola, which corresponds to the totality of the "Space included in the Plan of Areas of Natural Interest". This territory has been managed since 1987 within the framework of a special protection plan. However, its environmental protection dimension has been consolidated with the declaration of the Natural Park in 2010 (Naturvation_08).

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)

As already stated above (Q. 17) that the EU Policy i.e. NATURA 2000 meets national implementation in local territories with the involvement of multiple levels of regional, local and municipal government agencies.

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country’s constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

On basis of the constitutional responsibilities (as prescribed by Spain’s constitution from 1978) regional and local government bodies have been involved in the implementation of the (European) NATURA 2000 policy and the management of the park: Part VIII Territorial Organization of State:

- Section 140: Autonomy of municipalities
- Section 141: ... a provincial government composed of municipalities is designed to carry out the activities of the state.
20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policymakers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation, etc.)

According to NATURVATION project documentation (Naturvation_06), constant coordination and collaboration between municipalities and regional bodies were found to be very important for the success of the intervention - for instance, by overcoming differences in interests.

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

The Diputació de Barcelona and the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona provide the annual budget that allows the development of the program of actions (Naturvation_08).

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

The Naturvation project has documented that the park consortium adopted new and improved methods of engaging citizens in planning and management for the park (Naturvation_01:59).

*Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.*

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

- a. Regulatory framework

The NATURVATION project has reported some controversies occurred while developing the Collserola Management Plan (PepNat) over whether or not an urban park - highly accessible and with much grey infrastructure - should be subjected to a stricter (biodiversity) protection regime. Similarly, an interviewee for the study also highlighted that there are conflicts of visions for the park between major park management entities i.e. regional government, park authority, and the MBA. Regional government and park authority’s vision favors more biodiversity protection for long term sustainability whereas, the MBA favors recreation needs (or demands fulfillment) for shorter-term social justice goals (given less number of green spaces in a highly dense and populated city Barcelona). The interviewee further flagged tensions around the central authority of the park. Collserola first was a central Park under the direct control of the regional government however, lately, the park’s authority shifted from regional to the local government due to some political power
influence. Finally, the NATURVATION project has also documented the Collserola Management Plan (2019), has left some issues unaddressed such as the possibility of gentrification in the Park’s surrounding and illegal housing on the premises of the park (Naturvation_06:26).

- **b. Legitimacy**

The Naturvation project has documented that the socio-economic impacts of the Park’s management plans are obscure. The plans had promised multiple benefits and thus gained popularity yet remained imprecise about how such measures will be implemented, neglecting implementation difficulties or discrepancies (Naturvation_06:26).

- **c. Public awareness**

According to the NATURVATION project, the proposal for adaptive management in Collserola’s PepNat introduced new concepts and ideas about park management that were too technical to understand by all stakeholders, giving rise to questions about their implementation and potentially contested impacts (Naturvation_06:24).

- **d. Finances**

According to an interviewee, the park is the best financially equipped park in the region.

- **e. Others (please name)**

We found no references to other types of obstacles

**f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles**

24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Contestations around different visions for the park: biodiversity protection vs. recreation</td>
<td>Stakeholders negotiations and the park’s planning to strike a balance between both visions. On the ground, the park managers are trying to reduce the number of tracks, regulative approach, and restriction on zoning for bikers. And force the regulation in putting more signs and so one (WP5 Interview on 08.06.202).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inevident social benefits</td>
<td>The Park Consortium designed more recreational activities for the Park’s visitors (Naturvation_09).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Poor public participation and lack of awareness</td>
<td>The regional and park authorities initiated a variety of public participation methods – incorporating discussions that were similar to round tables in order to debate and discuss its planning drafts with citizens. The initiative benefited from numerous public meetings and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
workshops held in municipal premises adjacent to the park. However, it was found difficult to provide sufficient information for citizens to develop an informed perspective (Naturvation_01:11).

g) Reported outcomes

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

The park currently hosts several plant and animal species; a large number of visitors are attracted every year (almost 30,000 in 2015) and it hosts several environmental education activities. The intervention is ongoing, below are expected impacts: Green space, habitats and biodiversity (SDG 15) Regeneration, land-use and urban development Inclusive and effective governance (SDG 16) Health and well-being (SDG 3) (Naturvation_08).

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

Please fill in any information on social learning that has occurred in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project)(4). Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context

(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

• a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city…) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

Not reported.

• b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

Not reported.

Learning content

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?

• a. from previous experiences in the same urban context

The Park has been given and has taken up a lot of guidance in the region. The park authority has been involved in various European networking for learning and exchange of knowledge with other
parks. Given its management/governance system with various bodies has greater capacity for
learning and exchange. They are in contact with other park exchanges and it is quite rare
(https://www.europarc.org/case-studies/transition-agroecology-collserola-nature-park-enhanced-
participatory-process) (Interview, 08.06.20).

- b. from inter-city partnerships or transfers from experiences elsewhere

Answered above under question number 27.

- c. from other knowledge gathering/research

The parks’ governance body has a scientific advisory committee that takes decisions for the park on
the basis of scientific research (Interview, 08.06.20).

Learning process

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted
urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?

Not reported.

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed
to the learning process?

According to the NATURVATION project, the park consortium has adopted new ways of citizens’
engagement in the park’s management planning. However the issue is not fully addressed yet (6).

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage
Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote) and the actors involved
in using them.

It can be assumed that the numerous citizens' engagement meetings and workshops organized in
municipal premises by the park consortium (as recorded by Naturvation) added to the learning
process (Naturvation_01).

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

- a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the
intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links
would be perfect]

The intervention could be replicated in other places in Spain or Catalonia. It is interesting that
according to an interviewee, southern countries are not often exemplary in terms of sustainability
governance and are rather replicating interventions from northern European countries i.e.
Scandinavia, Germany, the Netherlands etc. This may change and Italy especially has shown some
interest in Catalonian sustainable interventions.

- b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?

Other cities of Spain.
c. Who has made the claims?

Johannes Langemeyer, Established Researcher, ICTA - UAB as a passive observer of the Collserola National Park on June 10, 2020 has made the claim of potential transferability of the intervention.

d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?

Not reported

32. In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?[6]

Some learnings from the intervention have been recorded by the NATURVATION project and are hence accessible via the respective website.

33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

Not reported.

j) Structural learning

34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

None

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too? This is a purely government-led intervention that benefitted from trans-organisational cooperation, but was challenged by a lack of effective citizens’ participation.

WP5 Interviewee (Johannes Langemeyer) on June 08, 2020: The biggest takeaway from this intervention is terms of governance arrangements is how bringing together different legitimate views especially combining long term vision (from the province and with a view to protection of a natural area) and short term vision (from the municipality to mitigate the lack of greens and provides residents with a recreational area) could be a challenge.

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance

(from NATURVATION project)
NATURVATION's [NBS-Atlas](#) distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed "management set-ups"):

- **Government-led (Gov)**
- **Co-governance or hybrid governance** (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
- **Led by non-government actors (NGO)**

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. **Self-governing**, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. **Provision**, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. **Regulations**, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. **Enabling**, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships

### Appendix 2: Policy typology
(from NATURVATION project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors</td>
<td>Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(administrative, command-and-control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic (financial, market-based)</td>
<td>Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favorable (or unfavorable) economic conditions for targeted actors</td>
<td>Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance and procurements. Negative incentives are taxes, fees and charges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative (educational)</td>
<td>They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change</td>
<td>Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private actors and/or non-governmental organisations.</td>
<td>Voluntary actions and agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes
1. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5):
   https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCPcUd-COIQ1MsBijr20_F1CBbnSu6HqKH9nNLshlVQ/edit?usp=sharing.


3. If easily possible mention sources for your association of roles.

4. Deliverable 7.1 Synthesis Report on results from Monitoring and Evaluation (p.14) :


6. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.
GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 6:
Co-creation of a sustainable neighborhood in Freiburg

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]

The intervention addresses the eco-district of Vauban, specifically co-housing projects, in the city of Freiburg, Germany. It has been developed at the scale of a neighborhood or city district in a regional hub (Freiburg has 220,000 inhabitants).

The intervention aimed to co-create and design a sustainable neighborhood providing inclusive and affordable housing adapted to the needs and the will of the local population.

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in ? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

This intervention is primarily implemented in the sectors of housing and urban development (i.e. building/establishing a new district).

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

The intervention (co-housing in Vauban and Genova’s case) aimed to establish a sustainable, ecological and green district while implementing participatory planning and cooperative ownership (TRANSIT_01: 5). Ecological and social objectives such as inclusiveness and affordable housing as well as walkable pathways, car-free areas, green areas and low-energy buildings are embedded in the project (TRANSIT_01: 6).

“Social and ecological goals and standards have been set from the beginning as part of the official guidelines by the City of Freiburg: compulsory low energy standard for new buildings, connection to the tram network until 2006, rain infiltration on the very territory, socially mixed inhabitant structure and a priority of giving away land to private builder-owners and collective building projects (Life-Projekt) (TRANSIT_16).

4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?

The creation of a new district in Vauban started after the withdrawal of the French military troops from the military facilities in 1992. In 1994, the city became the owner of the land and launched the project. At the same time, citizens interested in engaging in the project created organizations (i.e. Forum Vauban and the Independent Housing Project - SUSI). The creation of housing cooperatives started in 1997 including the Genova housing cooperative. The first tenants moved into Genova I in 1999 and in Genova II in 2001 (Table 5.1. Timeline and development of Vauban_TRANSIT_01: 8).

Other projects have been developed since then. In 2009, the construction phases were completed.

5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)

The intervention is characterized by a hybrid-governance mode.
6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?

provides an interesting example of negotiated governance between a grassroot-initiatives and the municipality that reaches across institutional boundaries.

7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) Governance Intervention?

- TRANSIT_01_cohousing: the eco-district of Vauban and the cohousing project GENOVA (02)
- TRANSIT_02_Social Innovation Research project: http://www.transitsocialinnovation.eu/
- Interview with A., a project proponent (10.07.20)

b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:

   a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

   Yes, the intervention has been studied in the context of the EU-funded project TRANSIT (2014-2017). The project aims to develop a new theory on Transformative Social Innovation (TSI) which refers to “a process of changes in social relations, involving the challenging, altering and/or replacing of dominant institutions and structures”. The project aims to draft a manifesto for TSI that sheds light on initiatives and emerging movements for TSI and can inspire policy makers, social entrepreneurs, academics and other stakeholders.

   b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.

   The intervention best fits under the Co-living, co-housing & intentional communities approach and TRANSIT project is explicitly mentioned in the database. In addition, the intervention addresses the Governance and participation processes approach as well as the Sharing and cooperatives for urban commons approach.

   c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?

   Yes, the project has been coded in the framework of WP4 but not the intervention itself.

9. Problematization and priority:

   a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

   Inequality and exclusion has been problematized both by the (prospective) residents of the district (in the framework of citizens organizations including Forum Vauban, SUSI, other citizen groups or cooperatives...) and by the municipality of Freiburg in view of creating an inclusive ecodistrict with affordable housing.
Specifically, to make GENOVA co-housing more inclusive, the cooperative is even regulating the pricing structure, reducing house rents for targeted groups i.e. “elderly people and long-term members, as well as persons with the right to social housing, so called Wohnberechtigungsschein” (TRANSIT_01: 36).

- **b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?**

  The achievement of justice has explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention and focuses on affordable housing and citizens self-planning and management: “(Vauban) is an ecological, sustainable district which has consciously set itself social objectives such as inclusiveness and affordable housing, as well as short distances” (TRANSIT_01: 6); “affordable housing, planned and managed by its residents” (TRANSIT_01: 16); “the goal of which was to create ecological living space based on the principles of social justice and self-organization” (TRANSIT_01: 24).

  In addition, “The City of Freiburg as the owner of the territory of Vauban is responsible for its planning and opening up for development. In the course of this, social and ecological goals and standards have been set from the beginning as part of the official guidelines by the City of Freiburg: compulsory low energy standard for new buildings, connection to the tram network until 2006, rain infiltration on the very territory, socially mixed inhabitant structure and a priority of giving away land to private builder-owners and collective building projects (Life-Projekt) (TRANSIT_01: 16).

- **c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address?** (see [Database of drivers of injustice](#))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material and livelihood inequalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unfit institutional structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Limited citizen participation in urban planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Weak(ened) civil society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) **Actor constellations**
10. Who initiated the intervention?

The intervention was co-initiated by citizens i.e. primarily the citizen-lead initiative Forum Vauban and the Independent Housing Projects -SUSI as well as by the municipality of Freiburg in a view to building a new district:

“After the departure of the military (1992), the Vauban district was designed and rebuilt anew during a unique citizen-involvement process – for which it has been awarded several times – by the City of Freiburg together with the citizen-lead association ‘Forum Vauban’ as a bottom-up actor with a mandate in the Vauban city planning council (TRANSIT_01: 5).

“When the City of Freiburg decided to build the new district in 1993, the citizen-lead initiative of Forum Vauban had already been active in setting up their plans and visions about how to build the district in a “green”, sustainable and participatory way” (Transit_01: 24).

11. Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)

The envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention are the (prospective) residents of Vauban, especially the owner of housing cooperatives (interview with A.) and more broadly, the residents of Freiburg who can potentially move into affordable and ecological housing. The municipality of Freiburg also benefits from the reputation of the district and uses it as “green flag” in urban marketing strategies to enhance the attractiveness of the city (TRANSIT_01: 27).

12. Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor types</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Actor name and role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid/ 3rd sector organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Forum Vauban (citizen-led organization)
- Co-housing cooperatives (e.g. SUSI ; Genova e.g. ; Vaubanaise e.g....). (Table 5.2: co-housing and other important projects in Vauban_TRANSIT_01: 13)
- Baugruppen (e.g. Wohnen&Arbeiten ; Woge e.V. etc...) (Table 5.2: co-housing and other important projects in Vauban_TRANSIT_01: 13)
- Other initiatives among others : Autofreies Wohnen e.V. The association organises car-free mobility in Vauban ; Quartierladen e.G. is a cooperative supermarket for local organic food supply ; Kinderabenteurh of Freiburg e.V. an associative kindergarten ; Villaban with Restaurant Kantine which is a restaurant organizing joint cooking events.
13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

The converging goals and visions of the citizens and the municipality for building a new district were crucial. Whereas the municipality intended to plan a new district meeting the extremely high demand on living space in Freiburg, Forum Vauban had the vision of an ecological, socially just and self-organized city quarter with lots of green space and affordable housing (TRANSIT_01: 16). Specifically, citizens represented by Forum Vauban benefited from direct access to discussion with parliamentarians and municipal actors in the “Vauban city policy council” GRAG (see Q.15). The support from local parliamentarians was crucial for citizens plans and visions to be implemented (interview with A.).

In addition, the city dedicated more public money than usual to set-up the project in a participatory way and officially mandated Forum Vauban for mediating the process and assisting them (e.g. with the distribution of building lots) (TRANSIT_01: 23).

14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?
Citizens, especially Forum Vauban, were the drivers of the co-housing projects. Citizens engaged in visioning and planning the district as well as in building it (e.g. the Baugruppen) (TRANSIT_01: 16).

When the project of rebuilding a new district arose (1992-1994), self-organized citizens were invited to share their vision of the district: “The Forum Vauban (working as an open forum) invited, organized, and coordinated professional expertise around planning, ecological housing, funding and forms of ownership brought in by interested citizens”; “This could be realized because the city of Freiburg agreed and provided a frame and organizational innovations to cooperate with the citizen lead Forum Vauban. From this platform emerged various building groups, some of which came up with the idea of cooperative building (TRANSIT_01: 17).

In addition, students of architecture - on a voluntary basis - initiated and facilitated the process of developing utilization plans. (TRANSIT_01: 17).

Finally, “the citizen-initiative was the driving force in establishing participatory planning and “learning while planning” methods” (TRANSIT_01: 18).

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

Both civil-society and governmental actors participated in creating the ecodistrict of Vauban. “On the one hand, it was built in a bottom-up process through self-organized housing initiatives of cooperatives and privately organized building groups (Baugruppen). On the other hand, the overall planning of the infrastructure, the selling of land property, and the ecological building laws were set-up and coordinated by the government of the City of Freiburg including participatory planning processes with the future residents” (TRANSIT_01: 42). Citizens groups were responsible for giving visions of the district and participating in the planning and building process while the administration of the City of Freiburg, owner of the land, had the responsibility to decide on planning and selling land slots (TRANSIT_01: 33).

In addition, a mix-consultative council called “Vauban city planning council (GRAG)” including seven parliamentarians, twenty members of the municipality administration and one member of Forum Vauban was established. This council was responsible for “creating the necessary infrastructure, taking over a coordinating role, doing the marketing of the territories” (TRANSIT_01: 33). The GRAG was separated from the usual municipal hierarchies and directly assigned to the head of the construction department which opened up possibilities for the representatives of the citizenry to directly contribute to the work of this group (TRANSIT_01: 18). The council was a forum for discussion between different actors allowing to bridge institutional logics.

The municipality also designed and implemented the principle of “Planning that Learns” meaning that pilot initiatives would be experimented before being enforced. A prime example of this principle is the mobility concept of Vauban which has first been experimented on a third of the district before being implemented in the whole neighborhood (interview with A.).

16. Exclusion:

- a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?

Direct exclusion of social groups is not reported. However indirect exclusions have been controversial. First, the car-free mobility concept of the district was found exclusive and dissuasive for car-owners. Second, housing was primarily accessible to owners rather than to tenants. Indeed, about 76% of the district is dedicated to housing owners (including cooperatives). However, becoming an owner is not accessible to everyone because it entails very high entry costs.
Additionally, building its own house takes a lot of time (at least 5 years) that not everybody can afford (interview with A.).

- b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?

There are not reported indications about the triggers of these indirect exclusions. Concerning the car-free mobility concept, a solution was found by creating dedicated parking lots and establishing a system that meets the needs of both car owners and of those who do not have a car. Concerning the housing system, the primacy given to housing owners is a political decision which has not been amended (interview with A.).

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

The circumstances which have reportedly triggered the interventions are:

1. The housing crisis in Freiburg (and co-housing alternatives as a response to it).

“Because of its attractiveness (geographical, cultural, economic hub and university), Freiburg is one of the most expensive cities in Germany in view of the housing price. As a result of the high pressure on the housing market, creative forms of alternative living like trailer home communities developed as well as ongoing urban planning activities of the municipality, trying to explore and build new areas and quarters” (TRANSIT_01: 7).

1. The eco-minded citizens and local policy makers.

This is related to the historical background of the city including its tradition of critical thinkers at the University (e.g. H. Heidegger, H. Arendt), social movement against the nuclear power plant of Wyhl or left wing policy makers (TRANSIT_01: 7).

1. The opportunity to build a new district from scratch after the departure of the French troops in Vauban in 1992.

“The well-educated, collegiate and ecological milieu of Freiburg was in need of housing. The expected liberation of the French Vauban barracks at a central location in Freiburg generated desires and creative ideas. The time span until the sale to the Federal Republic was settled could be used for establishing a professional forum, the Forum Vauban, from within the citizenry from 1994 on. This forum started to develop serious urban planning concepts.”(TRANSIT_01: 8).

1. The capacities and resources of Forum Vauban to engage in the project.

Forum Vauban included a core group of four people working almost full time on the project and being professionalized as well as several working groups. Those working groups were responsible for developing visions and for implementing projects in the sectors of energy, mobility, social cohesion or social infrastructures (interview with A.).

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the
Regarding the participatory process, the municipality conceptualized a legal framework - including the “Vauban city planning council (GRAG)” as well as the principle of “Planning that Learns” - that allows citizens to participate in urban development.

Besides, cooperative housing in Germany is regulated by the CooperativesAct, first adopted in 1889 and reformed in 2006. It determines the cooperatives’ organizational rules, including their business conduct (TRANSIT_01: 6). The Rent Regulation Act rules the obligations and responsibilities of all landlords of rental dwellings, including housing cooperatives such as rent increases (ICA) (Enkeleda 2011, TRANSIT_01: 6). Cooperatives are framed by regulatory policies framed at the national level and enforced locally.

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country's constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

In Germany, the municipality is responsible for urban planning along the lines of the national regulations (i.e. the urban planning laws and codes). The municipality together with the federal state can allow citizens to participate in urban planning i.e. specifically, the Baden-Württemberg Development Agency gave to Forum Vauban extended governance and financial responsibilities for mediating the participation process. This means that citizen participation in urban planning depends on specific and local regulatory policies.

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policy makers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation etc.)

There is in Freiburg a political culture of ‘eco-minded’ citizens implication in political issues. This includes various protests (i.e. against the Wyhl nuclear power plant) and participation in national and local politics. Freiburg was the first city in Germany which voted for a green political majority. Self-organized groups are recognized since some squatters succeeded in building (for) vivid communities (80s).

Regarding the development of Vauban, there were enough people trusting the eco-left Millieu to influence the district development positively, they invested money in Baugruppen and proved that their trust was justified.

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

The intervention was financially supported by two means:

- Funds raised and gathered by the citizens.

“It consisted first of all in voluntary work for planning the private houses and furthermore working on concepts for the whole district. Furthermore, Forum Vauban could fundraise several projects because of its special model character, sometimes in cooperation with the city or other official institutions” (TRANSIT_01: .40). Between 1996 and 2002, about EUR 200, 000 were received from the German Federal Foundation for the Environment and from 1997-1999 about EUR 700, 000 from the EU Life environmental program. Memberships, donations and other fees account for the overall
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budget of Forum Vauban which was managing a budget of 2 million Euro from 1995-2001
(TRANSIT_01: 40). In addition, “on the level of private housing subsidies, the house builders and
cooperaives could make use of the so-called Eigenheimzulage, a state subsidy for builder-owners”
(TRANSIT_01: 40).

- Financial support from the city development budget.

The regular process of building a new district financial support was provided for the city
administration by the Federal State of Germany. As an urban development project, the Vauban has a
specific status and budget (EUR 85,000,000) according to German building law. The city invested all
in all 95 million Euros in the district and provided additionally EUR 200, 000 for the participation
process (TRANSIT_01: 41).

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have
(significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

Citizen participation was consolidated throughout the project as Forum Vauban earned the trust of
the institutional actors (interview with A.). The milestones of this progressive recognition are:

- the invitation to Forum Vauban to join the “Vauban city planning council (GRAG)” as well as
  the financial support of 30 000 marks per year given by the municipality (spring 1995)
- the financial support of the Deutsche Bundesstiftung Umwelt as well as *the participation of
  Forum Vauban to the United Nations Organisation Habitat Conference in Istanbul (summer
  1996)
- the implementation of the mobility concept according to the principle of “Planning that leans”
  (summer 1996).
- the grant from the Baden-Württemberg Development Agency
  (Landesentwicklungsgesellschaft LEG) to Forum Vauban for participating in the development
  of the district (1998).

Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may
also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning
context.

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular
context) have been identified, relating to:

- a. Regulatory framework

Disputed destruction of old military barracks that opposed the municipality to the activist/former
squatters. For instance, a joint initiative of SUSI- and GENOVA-stakeholders - called Drei5Viertel i.G
aiming at renovating three further barrack buildings failed because of the regulatory framework. The
stakeholders failed to meet the (tight) municipal deadline for proposing a financing concept
(TRANSIT_01: 14) and the barracks were demolished.

In addition, the timeframe of the project, due to administrative procedures (about 5 years at least to
build the first houses), may discourage citizens to engage in the project. Besides, the uncertainty
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about its outcomes i.e. whether the project would be accepted by the municipality and a grant given is also an obstacle to implementing the intervention (interview with A.)

- **b. Legitimacy**

The collaboration between citizens and the municipality was not always easy because each group had to adapt to the institutional logics of the others. For instance, when the GRAG invited a representative of Forum Vauban to take over a permanent seat in a consulting role, “Forum Vauban welcomed this decision of the city as a step towards them. Nevertheless they were not always satisfied, because the citizens were expected to adapt to the logic of urban planning which already existed in the city bureaucracy” (TRANSIT_01: 25).

From the perspective of many inhabitants of Vauban, an unjust treatment by the City persists throughout the history of the quarter. For instance, the city benefits from tourism in Vauban and from the image of Freiburg being a “Green City” which is due mainly to Forum Vauban and its civic activities, without the latter being recognized and appreciated sufficiently (TRANSIT_01: 27).

- **c. Public awareness**

n/a

- **d. Finances**

The entry cost to become a housing owner is very high which prevents many people from engaging in such projects (interview with A.). The financial obstacle is a driver of exclusion for working-class people.

- **e. Others (please name)**

1. Contrasting visions of the district development between project proponents.

“While some followed a radical path of squatting houses and initially moved their trailer homes illegally onto the free area left behind by the military. –, others wanted to maintain good contacts with the city council” (TRANSIT_01: 16). Specifically, squatters and trailer home owners had some confrontations with Forum Vauban. Whereas squatters already living in the military barracks were reluctant to some plans proposed by Forum Vaubau, the latter felt that squatters were jeopardizing the project by undermining citizens’ actions towards municipal actors (interview with A.)

1. Gradual disengagement of the residents.

“When the majority of the houses were built and residents moved in, as ‘normal’ life started, the engagement for the quarter started to diminish” (TRANSIT_01: 23).

1. The liquidation of Forum Vauban

Forum Vauban became bankrupt in 2004 after a lawsuit from the European Commission. It was replaced by the new ‘Stadtteil Verein Vauban e.V.’ (city district association) based on resident members.

f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles
24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controversies over the destruction of old military barracks by the municipality</td>
<td>by the activists, occupations of the barracks and protests. by the municipality, continued the demolitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidation of Forum Vauban</td>
<td>by the residents/activists, establishment of “Stadtteilverein” district association (as follow-up organization of Forum Vauban).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissensus among project proponents</td>
<td>by the civil society organizations, “The different groups involved in the design and development of Vauban managed to cooperate in a productive way to realize this district project due to a great balancing act between innovative visions and the reality of existing city planning laws. The diversity of the district map (including housing cooperatives, groups of private house builders and construction companies) mirrors the different interests and groups and their ‘areas’”(TRANSIT_01: 16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual disengagement of residents</td>
<td>after the completion of building the district, residents spread out to a large variety of projects both inside the district (including “hosting space” for supporting refugees with rooms for german lessons) and outside of the district with the creation of various interest groups with relevance for the entire city and beyond (TRANSIT_01:24).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Reported outcomes

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

Sustainability challenges addressed in Vauban district include:

- Car-reduced living (including specific external parking lots managed by a “car-free living association”).
- Energy-efficient housing and low carbon buildings. “The municipality of Freiburg introduced a low energy housing standard for all buildings, namely a maximum of 65kWh/a of the primary energy consumption” (TRANSIT_01: 20).
- Lots of green areas and amenities

Apply to GENOVA cooperative : “One of the accomplishments of GENOVA in view of affordable living space is the fixing of rental prices for 10 apartments supported by GENOVA by means of the social building program for 10 years. However, after some efforts to choose the beneficiaries itself, GENOVA decided that applicants should have an official document proving their eligibility to receive low cost housing issued by city institutions. After 10 years, they can then receive support for paying their rent by a special social fund created by GENOVA” (TRANSIT_01: 28).

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention
Please fill in any information on social learning that has occurred in this intervention (conceptualized here as "Learning context, content, and process" in line with the FOODLINKS project). Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

**Learning context**

*(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)*

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

- a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city…) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

   The intervention was built upon the development of another district in Freiburg called Rieselfeld. Located on a former leach field, the creation of this new district in 1992 is pioneers in terms of citizens' participation in urban development projects in Freiburg. Specifically, the “City planning council” (see Q.15) including parliamentarians, municipal actors and citizen organisations was first established for Rieselfeld. Civil society partners actively involved in the urban development project included among others the protestant social welfare organisation Diakonie as well as a car-free living organization that conceptualized a new mobility vision for the district (Interview with A.).

- b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

   The cooperative movement in Germany has inspired the intervention. The movement is rooted in the 19 century history and the leading figures of Raiffeisen and Schulze-Delitzsch. Cooperative models developed in different sectors (housing, farming, energy) and spread across Europe and especially in Germany during the late 19th and the 20th century. These examples of housing cooperatives in Germany (especially in the the German Federal States of Schleswig-Holstein, North Rhine-Westphalia, Hamburg and Lower Saxony were traditionally large housing cooperatives are more strongly integrated into the urban planning process) have reportedly been inspirational for the instigators of the intervention (TRANSIT_01: 6).

   However, the old housing cooperatives had a rather distinct vision of the social organization of housing (e.g. environmental standards or cooperative rules) and Vauban proponents moved away from the old cooperative model to experiment with innovative approaches (e.g. carpooling) (interview with A.).

**Learning content**

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?

- a. from previous experiences in the same urban context

   The experience of Rieselfeld was inspirational for Vauban’s proponents, especially for Forum Vauban which attempted to develop a more comprehensive approach to citizen participation. Forum Vauban lobbied to have a stronger influence on politicians as well as to directly engage in visioning, planning
and especially building the district. Whereas welfare or mobility organizations were the partners of the municipality for the development of Rieselfeld, local citizens represented by Forum Vauban were the driving forces of the urban development process.

In addition, the car-free living concept of Vauban is reportedly built upon the vision for Rieselfeld (interview with A.).

- **b. from inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere**

The intervention acquired knowledge from the other housing cooperative experiences in Germany. Specifically, according to the german regulation, every cooperative has to become a member of a cooperative confederation “in order to be advised, supervised and observed” (TRANSIT_01: 37). GENOVA and Quartiersladen are both members of “Prüfungsverband der kleinen und mittelständischen Genossenschaften e.V.” (PkmG). This unit audits cooperative provides support in matters of economy, law and tax policy, and advises on questions of management organisation. This audit was deemed very useful for the creation of GENOVA (interview with A.).

- **c. from other knowledge gathering/research**

n/a

Learning process

**28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?**

On its website, Forum Vauban states: “Learning about participatory planning processes was a key topic in the Vauban process. The principle of “Planning that learns” and the extended citizen participation with Forum Vauban set new standards of communication, interaction and integration” (TRANSIT_01: 37)

Through the process of participatory planning, the intervention has been adapted to create manifested houses and infrastructures where some people spend the rest of their lives. The aspect of community building in the early phase with the future neighbours is seen as centrally important: (TRANSIT_01: 38).

**29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?**

The conflicts that opposed the municipality to the residents/activists (e.g. over the demolition of old barracks or over the modalities of the citizens participation) and which were overcome enhanced transparency and mutual trust between both actors and allowed further cooperation.

“The sense of responsibility of the citizens had been strengthened and the disenchantment with politics reduced. Despite occasional conflicts the City of Freiburg and the citizenry see the participatory and cooperative approach as a great gain of the quality and further development of the city quarter of Vauban” (TRANSIT_01: 25).

**30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote) and the actors involved in using them.**
● for activists (especially at the beginning of the intervention): face-to-face meetings, location where people met (e.g. the student broad office at the university), a print media for information and exchanges namely the “Vauban actuel” district magazine

● for citizens and municipality cooperation, the “Vauban city planning council” as well as the implementation of the principles of “planning that leans” set up participative standards. They included workshops *for co-creating the design of streets and open green spaces as well as excursions mediated by Forum Vauban.

● About 10 events (including district festivals, international conferences “UrbanVisions” as a pre-event of the UN ‘urban 21”) were co-organized with the City of Freiburg, mainly addressing future house owners, architects, craftsmen, the building industry and financial institutes (TRANSIT_01: 37).

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

   ● a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]

Vauban district and the co-housing projects are internationally known and the model “has inspired all over the world in view of sustainable planning especially with regard to citizen involvement” (TRANSIT_01: .6).

Vauban district and the co-housing projects are internationally known and the model “has inspired all over the world in view of sustainable planning especially with regard to citizen involvement” (TRANSIT_01: .6).

“Vauban’s widespread reputation as a model ecodistrict (e.g. through exhibition at World Expo Shanghai) attracts hordes of visitors from all over the world. A number of organizations offer guided tours to Freiburg’s green city with a special part of Vauban. About 25,000 such technical visitors are counted by the municipal Green City Office each year, most of them from South Korea, France and Italy, many of them politicians or (municipal) technical staff, but many also school children (TRANSIT_01: 38).

“The growing worldwide recognition and dissemination of Vauban as a model-eco district has led to an unexpected phenomenon: more and more interested persons from all over the world have started studying, and visiting Vauban in order to learn more about the details of the district’s development – academia, politicians, technical experts, and even pupils and ordinary persons who just want to add a “green sight” to the standard visiting tour of Freiburg. Admittedly, after digesting first impressions, some of them have also voiced the possibility of “transplanting” the ideas behind the model of Vauban to other places (Interview VB2) (TRANSIT_01: .30).

The success of Vauban ecodistrict serves urban planners and mayors from all over the world to learn from the example of this experimental district (TRANSIT_01: 6).

The experiences made with GENOVA e.G. have inspired the setting up of Vaubanaise e.G., built also in Vauban and are currently informing the establishment of Esche e.G. (i.Gr.) for building around 70 housing units in another part of Freiburg over the coming years.

   ● b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?
The intervention can be possibly transferred to other urban contexts. The Vauban model has been looked at and visited by experts from all over the world.

- **c. Who has made the claims?**

Activists from Forum Vauban, the municipality which supports the replication of the intervention and promotes it as well as researchers from the TRANSIT project.

- **d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?**

“The concept of Vauban was never entirely repeated in any other new district of Freiburg except for the low energy standard for housing which has been introduced as obligatory in Freiburg since then. Unfortunately this regulation had a negative effect on affordable housing, because the standard has increased the prices. In this sense, this case reveals a danger of extracting single innovations from the overall concept or case they are embedded in. If the social innovation of citizen-lead planning and ownership – for instance in the form of housing cooperatives – was combined more often with the technical innovations of ecological building laws, affordable housing in low-energy houses could be realized on a broader basis (TRANSIT_01: 44).

In Freiburg, the mobility concept of Vauban was never replicated because of some shortcomings that have undermined its legitimacy. While the residents of Vauban owning a car have to declare it and pay for it, some free-riders did not declare it and parked in the surrounding neighborhoods. The strong criticism that arose resulted in the municipality rejecting to transfer this mobility concept to the new district of Gutleutmatten district. However, the possibility of implementing a car-free living concept in the district of Dietenbach in Freiburg is currently discussed (interview with A.).

32. **In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?**

The framework of TRANSIT project the learning process related to Vauban’s co-housing project has been record in a reflexive way and special attention is paid to it on the section “5.1.16 Social learning through Vauban” (TRANSIT_01: 37) of a deliverable of the WP4.

There are about 25,000 visits per year in Vauban from people from all over the world including “academia, politicians, technical experts, pupils and ordinary persons” in order to learn more about the details of the district’s development. This interest was triggered by the exhibition of the Vauban model at the World expo 2010 in Shanghai.

Facing a growing number of inquiries about the model eco-district, the City’s planning department called for private expert agencies to provide guided tours; “a network of professional guides hosts tours around the quarter for political and international guests” (TRANSIT_01: 30).

“At the same time, the City of Freiburg intensified its PR work to present Vauban to the interested public: a website with six subpages, online and printed brochures in six different languages, as well as imagery and presentations are available.”

In addition the growing attention for Freiburg as a “Green City” in general and the sustainability awards it received led the municipality to establish a designated “Green City Office” in the municipal Department of International Relations that coordinates and answers to inquiries. “The office has signed Memorandums of Understanding with four designated “Green City”- agencies to organize study visits and seminars, meeting the visitors’ interests” (TRANSIT_01: 31).
33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

Since its presentation at the HABITAT exhibition in 1996 Vauban has been looked at as an example of urban planning projects involving citizen participation, car-reduced and sustainable living. Specifically, the creation of living spaces free of cars was inspirational for several law developments in Germany. The two options for choosing – either payments for a parking lot or a contribution for the association “Autofreies Wohnen” (car-free living) has “resulted in a legal amendment on the level of the State of Baden-Württemberg allowing more freedom to create diverse forms of parking lots, for instance for bikes instead for cars only” (TRANSIT_01: 29).

“Most of these visitors claim they are taking inspiration from the innovations of Vauban, but there is no monitoring or evaluation and little feedback as to where and how these inspirations have led to real changes in other places. Nevertheless, many examples show the dissemination of Vauban’s experiences. For instance, after several visits and exchanges with Vauban citizens, the nearby rural Municipality of Teningen, with which Vauban has developed a partnership, is now planning to invest in solar installations as well (VB1)” (TRANSIT_01: 39).

In addition, in “December 2015 Vauban started a city partnership with the French town Eybens, which approached Vauban to learn from its experiences as a sustainable city district” (TRANSIT_01: 36).

j) Structural learning

34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

In Freiburg, the co-creation process and the application of the principle of “Planning that learns” as well as the creation of “City planning councils” set new standards in terms of citizens participation (TRANSIT_01: 37). Building on the experience of Vauban, the city had developed a planning method able to react to new developments quickly and flexibly- allowing “enlarged” citizen participation that goes far beyond the usual demands of the construction law (TRANSIT_01: 18). For instance, a “City planning council” was implemented for the development of the new Dietenbach district in Freiburg. However, unlike in Vauban, the council for Dietenbach included experts (in mobility, housing), members of the municipality administration and local parliamentarians rather than a citizen forum.

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

n/a

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?
“The main aspect of Vaubans’ innovation is the negotiation process between the urban planning office of the municipality and the strong citizen initiative of Forum Vauban with its diverse aims of a socially just, ecological district” (TRANSIT_01: 42).

**Appendix 1: Three modes of governance**

*(from NATURVATION project)*

NATURVATION’s NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed "management set-ups”):

- **Government-led** (Gov)
- **Co-governance or hybrid governance** (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
- **Led by non-government actors** (NGO)

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. **Self-governing**, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. **Provision**, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. **Regulations**, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. **Enabling**, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships”

**Appendix 2: Policy typology**

*(from NATURVATION project)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory (administrative, command-and-control)</strong></td>
<td>Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors</td>
<td>Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic (financial, market-based)</strong></td>
<td>Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable (or unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors</td>
<td>Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance and procurements. Negative incentives are taxes, fees and charges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative (educational)</strong></td>
<td>They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change</td>
<td>Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary</strong></td>
<td>Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private actors</td>
<td>Voluntary actions and agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actors and/or non-governmental organisations.

Footnotes

1. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5):
   https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCpUd-COiQ1MsBjir20_F1CbnSu6HqKH9nNLSihVQ/edit?usp=sharing.

2. TRANSIT website. Last view on 29/06/20: http://www.transitsocialinnovation.eu/.


4. If easily possible mention sources for your association of roles.


7. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.
GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 8:
Holistic neighbourhood development Augustenborg

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]

This project is about a holistic neighbourhood development programme called Ekostaden Augustenborg and is located in a neighbourhood/district in Malmö, a Swedish city with over 300,000 inhabitants.

It is about a holistic, sustainable development of the area which started with works on the development of a Drainage System, energy retrofitted buildings and issues around biodiversity but over the course of the project even more social, ecological and economical topics became part of it.

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

holistic sustainable neighbourhood development, community engagement

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

There is a wide focus on sustainability which includes all kind of measures in different areas:

- A strong focus on energy efficient buildings (e.g. passive house standards) and installation of solar panels, small scale-wind and a pilot project for the production of biogas in the district.
- The project also aims at the modification of energy related behavior and the lowering of the CO2 footprint of the residents through awareness raising and training programs as well as agreements in the rental contract.
- It includes a wide variety of goals around mobility with a prioritisation of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport; the encouragement of a local use of electric vehicles and the development of a Green Line’s zero emission electric street train service as well as carpooling among residents.
- Another string of development are goals around greening the area with an attempted increase in biodiversity and a greening of roofs.
- Another big part of the intervention was the creation of a Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) which aimed at reducing flooding by 70% as the capacity of the old sewage and drainage system was exceeded during heavy rainfalls (Kazmierczak; Carter, 2010).
- The intervention also includes symbolic and demonstrative actions that help to strengthen the identity of an eco-neighbourhood:
  - annual environmental days or weeks, cleaning days, bike days and projects, demonstration sites, symbolic street signposts, organised visits, etc.

The intervention strongly focuses on procedural justice and to a lesser extent endemic justice as it included citizens at all stages and in some cases residents were able to directly design certain parts of the intervention.
4. **What is the interventions’ timeframe?**

The intervention started in 1997 and the main frame of the development lasted until 2002 (Kazmierczak; Carter, 2010).

There are other projects that continued to further the image of a eco-neighbourhood that happened a lot later e.g. a lighthouse project called the Greenhouse Augustenborg, a high-rise building with a passive-house energy standard was built in 2014 (although by another construction company as one mentioned below), but the main time-span of the intervention was between 1997 and 2002.

5. **By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)**

It is government-led but characterised by its strong community engagement with a shift of responsibilities to community members later on in the project, arguably developing into a more hybrid mode of governance.

6. **Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?**

The intervention has been studied in an urban context in Europe and is at its core about sustainability while considering different dimensions of justice. There is a lot of media attention and the documentation by SMART EES is very extensive. Developing a neighbourhood in an holistic, integrative way is crucial as it aims at breaking down institutional logics, as well as compartmentalised policy making leading to more sustainable and just outcomes.

7. **In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) Governance Intervention?**

  

  

  

b) **Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work**

8. **EU Project-context of the intervention:**
a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

It has been studied by SMARTIES - Social Innovation Modelling Approaches to Realizing Transition to Energy Efficiency and Sustainability which lasts from 2018 until 2021. [https://local-social-innovation.eu/](https://local-social-innovation.eu/)

b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.

Governance and participation processes

Governance for urban climate mitigation and adaptation

c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?

The deliverable by SMARTIES ([https://local-social-innovation.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/Deliverables/SMARTIES-D3.1_SI_in_Action_R1.pdf](https://local-social-innovation.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/Deliverables/SMARTIES-D3.1_SI_in_Action_R1.pdf)) has been coded, but only for the case study on Superblocks in Barcelona.

9. Problematization and priority:

a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

The area has had high rates of unemployment and multiple socio-economic problems which affects the general liveability which was problematized by the municipality.

b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?

Not directly. More in a way that life quality in the area in general is quite low in comparison to other districts of the city. It therefore is about distributitional justice to give individuals similar opportunities (e.g. job related) to other areas of the city and about environmental justice issues (e.g. to protect them from floods that could not be handled well in the past due to a missing working Drainage System).

It also tackles justice as recognition as it actively focuses on a neighbourhood with a high ratio of foreigners and minorities and tries to include them in the process of the implementation.

It therefore also targets procedural justice aspects.

c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address? (see Database of drivers of injustice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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1. **Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure**

2. **Material and livelihood inequalities**

3. **Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization**

4. **Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration**

5. **Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns**

6. **Unfit institutional structures**

7. **Limited citizen participation in urban planning**

8. **Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities**

9. **Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism**

10. **Weak(ened) civil society**

c) **Actor constellations**

10. **Who initiated the intervention?**

The district renovation was promoted by the city administration together with the local public housing company (the Malmö Municipal Housing Company - MKB).

11. **Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)**

People living inside the district due to an increase of the quality of life (new leisure spaces, new green areas, new services), also due to the environmental benefits; an increase of social cohesion (e.g., new places for socialisation, etc.), the decrease of unemployment and the increase of political participation.

12. **Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?**

    **Actor types**

    - Academic organizations
    - Religious organizations
    - Civil society organizations
    - Hybrid/ 3rd sector organizations
    - Platforms
    - NGOs
    - Social movements

    **Yes Actor name and role**
13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

The role of certain individuals has been emphasised by the project report, as some have been particularly important to the success of the intervention. Especially important has been the enthusiasm of those individuals. Especially mentioned are: Peter Lindhqvist from The Service Department, City of Malmö Bertil Nilsson, former headmaster at the school in Augustenborg Christer Sandgren at MKB Trevor Graham, project leader since 1998.

Especially in the early years of the project, there was a critical mass of people with important functions that tried to address ALL issues in the area and did not care too much if it was their responsibility on paper. This generated a belief that a holistic change of the area was possible (Interview Trevor Graham).

Furthermore “high standing people” (e.g. professors) played a crucial role in mediating and facilitating with citizens.

14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?

Citizen participation is one of the keys to the success of this intervention.

All physical changes were discussed in advance with residents, giving them the possibility to express their suggestions and observations so as to have the possibility to adjust and modify the plan. All actions were agreed on together with residents. The involvement of citizens was carried out through a wide set of different methodologies:

- extensive public consultation, regular meetings, and permanent working groups, dialogues with experts, informal gatherings and co-design.

Important to note is the different level of participation for different parts of the project. Before the first changes were implemented, project proponents thought about which physical investment based
projects have the most scope for public involvement in design and development of the project, which have opportunities for jobs etc. (Interview Trevor Graham) Some aspects of the plan were therefore co-designed by residents, as they were considered as experts and bearers of specific and territorially grounded knowledge. For other, more technical issues (like the Storm-Water system), public participation was focussed on acceptance, which still means that plans might have to be adapted, but the focus there is around creating a dialogue with the community. (Interview Trevor Graham). Initially, the green roofs (on housing buildings) had very little input from communities, but more green roofs were created when the community designed the waste-management houses (which they were in charge of) and wanted to have green roofs on them. (Interview Trevor Graham)  

In total an approximate of 20% of the residents participated in the project. Several ideas of residents were completed and implemented into the neighbourhood such as:

- Developing the open storm water system in a more natural process that enhances the area’s urban biodiversity
- an after-school centre that teaches children how to take care of and respect animals (the Rabbit Hotel)
- energy consumption monitoring and active engagement in recycling and composting
- Creating and shaping public spaces into parks, allowing play areas for children and hubs for increased biodiversity
- the Café Summer, a café and meeting space for residents to discuss and share ideas
- the first car-pooling scheme of Malmö

To add: School pupils were involved in different aspects of the project e.g. the planning of a new community/school garden, rainwater collection pond/ice rink, a musical playground, and sustainable building projects incorporating green roofs and solar energy panels. One obstacle regarding public participation was the commitment of institutions over time - there were times where the housing company (MKB) or the municipality did not invest enough effort in the project which led to less public and neighbourhood interest. (see Q.23). This makes future efforts in the neighbourhood also more difficult as it hollows out trust by residents.

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?  
As this project was originally started by the local housing company and the municipality, those two were in charge of it. The wide range of actors (universities, schools, citizen groups...) and the informality of the relationship between the actors was crucial for successfully developing ideas of how to change the district and which interventions to implement. As mentioned, residents had a lot of power over the nature of the intervention and were able to develop a lot of their own ideas.

16. Exclusion:

- a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?  
Presumably, people who did not have time to participate in the participation process.  
The area has a lot of non-Swedish speakers, the municipality has tried to include them as well (see below), but there were also voices who had a “We are in Sweden, we speak Swedish attitude”.  

- b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?
There are a lot of non-swedish speakers living in the area. Flyers have been printed in other languages as well as translators accompanying the participation processes which helped to include non-swedish speakers.

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

When the area was newly built (1948-1952) it had a high status but it started to decline in the 70’s. Many problems such as high unemployment or the flooding of basements emerged. In the 90’s the neighbourhood had a lot of social, ecological and aesthetic problems which ultimately led to a sense of urgency that something had to be done.

The trigger was a discussion in 1997 about closing down an industrial area in the area of Augustenborg. Peter Lindhqvist from The Service Department, City of Malmö suggested opening an eco-friendly park in the area. At the same time the former headmaster of the school in Augustenborg, Bertil Nilsson, had become one of the coordinators of the Swedish Urban Program in Malmö. He contacted Christer Sandgren from the Malmö Municipal Housing Company who was the housing manager of Augustenborg and had the mission to renew the area. The three together contacted senior officers, colleagues and active residents from the area in order to create a sustainable district of Malmö. At the first meeting over 400 people showed up to talk about flooding issues, a drainage system, green roofs and a musical theme playground (MKB_01: 2). A project leader with experience in the field of transforming communities, Trevor Graham, was hired in 1998. As the project developed further, local businesses, schools and the industrial estate became a part of it.

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)

It does not seem that one general policy was highly crucial for the project but Augustenborg was very linked into developments of the time which affected the project in different ways (Interview Trevor Graham): In the end of the 90’s a strong focus on environmental issues with a democratic dimension was present (e.g with Agenda 21 movements) Social inclusion was a big influence and narrative of the time There were a lot of socio-economic problems present at the time in Sweden and Malmö e.g the closing down of the shipyards, integration, the difficulty of entering the labour market, general economic decline which led to a collage of redevelopment projects and policies that tried to address these issues at different scales. Augustenborg is one of these local projects and was very much tied into national and local policies of the time. (Interview Trevor Graham)

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country's constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

Swedish planning culture is trying to promote best practice examples and new technology through goal-oriented and integrated urban development (Galina 2012) An important legal framework for Sweden is the “Planning and Building Act” (1987 updated in 2010) and the “Environmental Code” (1999). The Planning and Building Act applies to all new buildings as well as reconstruction. It aims at paying attention to climate and environmental issues as well as regulating construction better and giving planning permissions within ten weeks (Galina 2012). Municipalities need to check if new developments they are planning are in accordance with the Planning and Building Act. The
Environmental Code serves as an umbrella/framework for the Planning and Building Act. It also includes other special laws that concern the change of the physical environment. It aims to improve sustainability by regulating the quality of water, air and land. Fig 1 shows the general planning process of Sweden. Municipalities have a planning monopoly generating comprehensive plans for their municipality. The Swedish government may overrule certain decisions if they are not in accordance with national interests (e.g. regulations or environmental goals in Planning and Building Act and Environmental Code). The city therefore has to show it meets the national guidelines e.g for air quality.

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policy makers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation etc.)

Crucial was a mindset of allowing experiments, learning from mistakes and not being too uptight about mistakes which allowed for a lot of adaptivity in the project (Interview Trevor Graham). This is also connected to a will to include citizens and the knowledge that projects are more accepted if developed together with residents. It is a holistic and integrative way of planning, as for example shown by the efforts to also tackle resident’s energy consumption behaviour and not purely relying on technical solutions as well as the wide variety of topics in general. It might mean though that changes might generally take longer to implement and that certain aspects of original plans might not be implemented exactly in the way it was originally thought out to be.

In the beginning of the project a lot of people working on it shared this mindset, but as soon as certain people were not a part of the project anymore (e.g. the head of a certain department changed) and other people who were not used to that mindset replaced them, flexibility and adaptivity started getting lost in the chain of command (Interview Trevor Graham). So as soon as people having a mindset of not being responsible for certain issues and being afraid of mistakes became the critical mass, this flexibility disappeared (Interview Trevor Graham).

On a more general, institutional note, Malmö’s governance system is rather decentralised which allowed for adaptability and flexibility throughout the planning, development and perpetuation of the project although working in partnerships again, is not a very well developed approach in Sweden (World Habitat Award_01)

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

The intervention cost a total of 200 million SEK’s (1 Swedish Krona (SEK) equals 0.095 Euro). About half of the sum came from the local housing company (MKB), the rest mainly came from the local authorities, principally the City of Malmö, in addition to several other sources which included: The Swedish government’s Local Investments Programme for Ecological Conversion and Eco-Cycle Programme (SEK 24M) The Swedish Department of the Environment (SEK 4M) EU program LIFE (SEK 6M) provided funds for the creation of the Botanical Roof Garden The European Union URBAN program, A number of other sources both public and private. The extensive financial commitment by public authorities and the MKB was crucial for the success of the intervention as it was essential for long-term planning. (World Habitat Award_01)

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?
The project manager of MKB changed. The new manager lacked the in-depth understanding of the case that his predecessor possessed. The Housing Company lost a lot of credibility and legitimacy in the lower hierarchy of the company and with residents. The project mostly anchored in the upper management of the housing company afterwards. A lot of other people in power changed over the course of the project which led to a change of culture around responsibilities as some of the newer people did not feel as responsible for a holistic change of the area, but cared more about their own sector. This led to a more sluggish mode of development (Interview Trevor Graham).

Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

- a. Regulatory framework

There did not seem to be many issues regarding the regulatory framework.

- b. Legitimacy

In general, the intensity to which the local community was engaged was unusual for the time and not everybody involved in the project saw the need for it and some people were actively opposed to it e.g some of the contractors architects did not see the point of involving residents (SMARTIES_01: A79.).

- c. Public awareness

Trevor Graham, project manager, calls continuity the greatest challenge of the project. In the beginning, participation has been easy as there was a wide public interest in the intervention which has faded over the years. This is closely connected to institutional commitment over time as there were times where the housing company/the municipality was less active. This generates problems in relation to a long-term belief of a process of change for local people in a “Why should I as a community member invest time and resources if the institutions pushing the project do not seem to do so” - manner. (Interview_Trevor Graham). This meant that in the beginning (first three - four years) public interest was very high and it decreased over time.

Key here seems to be a good balance between short-term change of the area (where residents see fast changes as a result of their own participation) and long-term commitment of institutions (so residents see a bigger vision behind the project and feel like their time and energy will contribute to something bigger) (Interview Trevor Graham)

In this case, because of the efforts to include residents and even making them co-responsible for certain parts of the intervention, public resistance was not a big issue. However there was still some resistance from some individuals.

- d. Finances
There did not seem to be many issues regarding finances.

- **e. Others (please name)**

A lot of foreigners who do not speak Swedish live in Augustenborg which made their inclusion harder. This issue was tried to overcome with hiring translators and printing flyers in other languages.

Some residents who speak louder made their voices better heard while quieter residents' issues were discussed less.

**f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles**

24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commitment over time of institutional partners (housing company, city)</td>
<td>This has been a huge issue that was not perfectly solved. It seems that in the beginning institutions were very committed to changing the area, but it decreased over time. Finding new ways “to do things” through letting go of power and making residents more responsible. This is closely connected to the issue of institutional commitment as residents also partly lost interest in the project as they did not want to spend their own time if they did not feel that the institutions committed enough. New ways of engaging with citizens in later stages also partly addressed trust issues of community members towards the municipality and the housing company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintaining continuity in public participation</td>
<td>Participation flyers were printed in foreign languages and translators were hired by the municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some of the residents not understanding Swedish</td>
<td>Project team member “casually bumping into him” and striking up a casual conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resistance from one specific resident</td>
<td>Wide set of methodologies of involving the public with formats that tried to give a voice to everybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Louder residents issues being more heard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**g) Reported outcomes**

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

To name some of the most important outcomes (SMARTeEs_01: A76f).:

- Biodiversity in the area has increased by 50% (The green roofs, predominantly the Botanical Roof Garden, have attracted birds and insects, and the open storm water system provides...
better environments for local plants and wildlife. In addition, flowering perennials, native trees and fruit trees were planted, and bat and bird boxes were installed.

- Unemployment fell from 30% to 6% (to Malmö’s average)
- The environmental impact of the area (measured as carbon emissions and waste generation) decreased by 20%
- The heat and hot water consumption has decreased by 25%.
- A small scale wind power generation in the area was installed in the local school as follow up project
- Augustenborg features the world’s first botanical roof garden, with around 9,000 m2, providing local habitat and helping to absorb rainwater
- The implementation of an open storm-water system at Augustenborg has improved not only storm-water management in the area, but also the performance of the combined sewer system that serves the surrounding area.
- There have not been any floods in the area since the open storm-water system was installed.
- Turnover of tenancies decreased by 50%
- As a direct result of the project, three new local companies have started: Watereco AB (set up by local resident and amateur water enthusiast), the Green Roof Institute, and the carpool established in 2000, which uses ethanol hybrid cars to further reduce environmental impacts
- Political interest and participation in elections have increased

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

Please fill in any information on social learning that has occured in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project). Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context

(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

- a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city…) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

Certain aspects of the intervention emerged when citizens learned about similar plans for other areas. It is not specified if those other areas were from other cities or Malmö (SMARTEES_01:75) This mostly targets iii) (knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support).

- b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

There did not seem to be important inter-city partnerships existing at the time worth mentioning here.

Learning content

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?
a. from previous experiences in the same urban context

Residents were eager to implement renewable energy projects and sustainable mobility ideas when they heard about similar plans from other areas. (There are no precisions about where they got their ideas from)

b. from inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere

Not applicable.

c. from other knowledge gathering/research

It is very important to note that learning has also happened on an individual scale. Trevor Graham (project manager) shares stories from a Somalian gynecologist who was unemployed for a long time and then working in recycling with an employment creation project. He was given time on Fridays to explore opportunities in the health sector again and is now working as a doctor. Another story tells about a woman who was very much opposed to the idea of recycling (and that part of the project) but then discovered the car pool and became involved in it.

This also shows that these interventions can become opportunities for individuals to grow and change their lifestyles.

Learning process

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?

Not applicable.

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?

The process of the implementation changed over the course of the project. As mentioned the greatest challenge of the development was maintaining continuity and keeping residents involved. As staff and with them priorities changed the project lost credibility and support. The project then again had to find new ways of doing things through letting residents gain more power over decision-making. Project leaders then had to accept that things will not always go the way they thought, but the new ways can be interesting and are much more diverse due to other ways of thinking by other individuals.

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote[5] and the actors involved in using them.

   answer

   i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

   a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]
In general, the wide range of topics and fields of this intervention make it hard to speak of a replicability or transferability of the intervention. Rather single elements (e.g reducing energy efficient buildings) have been discussed and/or actually transferred.

The World Habitats Award claims that Augustenborg has become an international example for incorporating participatory processes in urban regeneration processes. (WorldHabitat_01: 09). The project is recognised by the “UN’s World Habitat Award 2010” an award which only two projects worldwide receive annually.

A lot of technical elements were transferred to other contexts (see actual transferability) Trevor Graham, project manager, sees Augustenborg as a pioneer area to create more sustainable urban neighbourhoods and says that it is not enough that just Augustenborg is an “eco-neighbourhood”, but that every area in Malmö and more in Sweden and Europe should have a stronger focus on these issues. (MKB_01)

The organisation of the first “Electric Carpool” in Sweden as well as the “world’s first electric road train” a zero emission electric street train service seem like they are thought to be replicated.

- **b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?**

Especially to areas where people are living in similar 60’s (in Sweden these are mostly areas of the “million home program”) and 70’s buildings and especially in northern european areas.

- **c. Who has made the claims?**

SMARTEEES, The world Habitats Award, Project manager

- **d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?**

The local housing cooperative of Rosengard district in Malmö was inspired by the project in Augustenborg and wanted to start changing the neighbourhood in a sustainable way. Local people led the way there, and they tried to get help from the city. The Rosengard project lacked long-term thinking (Interview Trevor Graham) (institutional commitment) which led to a diminishing public interest over time. The crucial balance between short-term changes and long-term institutional investment was off there (Interview Trevor Graham) At one point for example the local housing company in Rosengard just informed residents about measures through info screens rather than involving and engaging them through workshops/inhabitant meetings where long term consequences of these changes could be discussed, possible fears could be mentioned etc.

It seems that when transferring physical changes of a project it is important to also think about the governance arrangements that made these changes possible. One important actor constellation is that institutions as well as local people are willing to change the area short-term as well as invest resources on a longer timespan.

It seems that when transferring physical changes of a project it is important to also think about the governance arrangements that made these changes possible. One important actor constellation is that institutions as well as local people are willing to change the area short-term as well as invest resources on a longer timespan.

A general issue seems to be that cities are lacking jointive long-term approaches and shared visions of change, but are operating on a project by project basis (Interview Trevor Graham). This is also connected to political issues which makes these jointive ideas difficult (e.g the idea of implementing changes with a strong focus on local communities). This hinders learning in general and leads to making the same mistakes in different projects in different and even the same city over and over again. An example of this is the departmentalised way of engaging with communities as a lot of departments have their own unit that does so (in Malmö e.g the Highway and Parks department, the
Culture department...). On a city scale these units can be brought together on a local level being an intermediary between neighbours, the city, housing companies, local companies etc. (Interview Trevor Graham) These departments then could become the core of a long-term structured development processes in a city acting as an institutionalised intermediary, transferring knowledge in and between cities. Important here is that there has to be an institutionalised way of organising learning on an individual level here as well and to think about which people can work in such an intermediary institution especially in times of staff change. It would be difficult to fulfill the role of this intermediary (which requires strong communication skills, but also an existing network in the city around businesses, other departments of the city as well as local communities) immediately after your job starts. It therefore might make sense to learn about these things beforehand as an apprentice of the more experienced people working in these intermediaries right now. (Interview Trevor Graham)

32. In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?

The Municipal Housing company has published an online document which gives a lot of insight “behind the scenes” and shows their motivation behind the project and its different aspects. Especially the part on “Augustenborg is not enough” (MKB_01: 7-8) shows their motivation to transfer insights and ideas to other areas and highlights the pioneer role of Augustenborg. Also interesting is the part that is described in Q. 17 which is about the events that reportedly triggered the intervention (MKB_01: 2).

There are a wide number of guided study visits to the area (e.g “40 French city officials”) (MKB_01: 8). In total over 15.000 interested people have visited Augustenborg to learn about its development and implemented actions (MKB_01: 2). In general the intervention is well recognised (inter)-nationally and has received a lot of attention especially connected to the World Habitats Award which also published a document on why Augustenborg deserves the prize (WorldHeritageAward_01). There is an extra section on “Analysis and lessons learned” which is structured into “Key achievements”, “Challenges” and “Critical success factors”.

(WorldHeritageAward_01: 15f).

33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

Especially in Malmö and Sweden a lot of aspects of the project were transferred and upscaled: The Augustenborg solar project was the starting point for Solar City Malmö which operates all over Malmö (SMARTeES_01: 79). The regeneration of the Rosengard district and Rosengård (about 2010-13) and Lindängen (2014-2016) was based on Ekostaden Augustenborg. Both are located in Malmö. In Rosengard the goal was to reduce CO2 emissions by 50% e.g through climate coaches trying to inspire residents towards sustainable lifestyles and several technical solutions (ebd.) The participatory and inclusive aspect of the intervention was transferred to a similar development project in Järva /Sweden (ebd.)

There are also a lot of other aspects that reportedly were transferred to other cities in Sweden and throughout the world especially in waste-management, car-pooling, recycling and composting (WorldHabitatAward_01: 2).
The world’s first botanical rooftop garden serves as a best practice example for rooftop greening (WorldHabitatAward_01)

j) Structural learning

34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

It is difficult to speak of clear cause and effect chains here. There seem to be no institutionalised bodies/programs that were created as a result of the project. Trevor Graham criticises this as the city operates mostly on a project by project basis with a lacking long-term shared vision of change across departments (Interview Trevor Graham).

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

Taking up a perspective of what could be done and helping residents in figuring out what they want and need as a municipality will lead to far better (sustainable and just) results in the end than if the goal is to transfer best practices from other areas (e.g. the transfer to the Rosengard district)

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

One of the keys to success of this project was that the people working on the project from different departments of the city, the housing company, the school etc. tried to change ALL issues that were addressed in the neighbourhood, no matter if they were responsible for these issues on paper. This generated a collaborative approach and a belief that change was possible. Another part is combining elements of social as well as physical change, which creates a process of reinforcing (E.g seeing that my neighbour managed to design a certain part of the neighbourhood you might think that you can do so as well)

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance

(from NATURVATION project)

NATURVATION's NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed "management set-ups"):

- **Government-led** (Gov)
- **Co-governance or hybrid governance** (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
Led by non-government actors (NGO)

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. **Self-governing**, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. **Provision**, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. **Regulations**, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. **Enabling**, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships”

### Appendix 2: Policy typology

*(from NATURVATION project)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors</td>
<td>Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(administrative, command-and-control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic (financial, market-based)</td>
<td>Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable (or unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors</td>
<td>Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance and procurements. Negative incentives are taxes, fees and charges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative (educational)</td>
<td>They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change</td>
<td>Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private actors and/or non-governmental organisations.</td>
<td>Voluntary actions and agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes

1. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on
transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5):

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCPcUd-COIQ1MsBjir20_F1CBbnSu6HqKH9nNLshiVQ/edit?usp=sharing.

2. Actor types according to TRANSIT’s Critical Turning Point Database,


3. If easily possible mention sources for your association of roles.


6. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.
GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 9:
Citizens share in Berlin Energy Grid for sustainable energy

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (a neighborhood in the capital city)”]

The intervention is called BürgerEnergie Berlin (BEB). It is a cooperative that unites citizens in Berlin - the capital and a city-state of Germany - to work together for a sustainable, climate-friendly, and citizen-owned energy system in Berlin. The intervention is at the city level.

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

Energy

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

BEB aims to acquire the energy grid of Berlin and change the energy mix towards renewable energy. It intends to promote and support members economically and to build a socially and environmentally compatible, decentralized, inexpensive, nuclear-free sustainable energy system. BEB advocates a climate-friendly, democratic, and solidary energy supply and energy policy in Berlin. The areas under focus include green electricity, energy-saving, citizen power plants, and the Berlin power grid purchase.

In an interview a BEB member stated, “One of our major aims has been to bring back the Grid in public ownership with the participation of a cooperative which is us. This is a tool to reach our overarching objective of having a sustainable and fair energy system in Berlin. We have approached this by putting a bid for the license of the grid”.

4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?

BEB was founded in December 2011 and it is registered in the cooperative register of the district court in Berlin under the number GnR 734. It formally started its groundwork in 2012. Still fighting against a concession to Vattenfall, and to buy a share in the future concessions.

5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)

BEB could be categorized to have a voluntary governance system - commitment or action beyond legal requirements undertaken by private actors or non-governmental organizations (TESS 4, pg. 25).

6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?

It is an interesting case of citizen’s realizing that they themselves could be the better providers of public services, in this case, energy from renewable sources for fair prices. The intervention citizen-based initiative that recommends a hybrid system of governance with an equal say of citizens and a significant share in profit.
7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) Governance Intervention?

TESS Project:

- Deliverable 3.2: Analysis of success factors - summary reports on case study findings.
- Booklet - Community Climate Action across Europe.

b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:

- a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

BEB has been studied by a European project called Towards European Societal Sustainability (TESS). TESS was funded by the European Community’s Seventh Framework Programme under grant number 603705 from the year 2013 to 2016. The project was exploring the role of community based initiatives (CBIs) in transitioning to a sustainable and low-carbon Europe.

- b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.

Civil disobedience and Energy & Mobility

- c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?

Yes

9. Problematization and priority:

- a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

Privatization of energy markets, monopoly of a few private organizations over Berlin’s energy grid and consequent unfair electricity prices in the city has been challenged by the intervention while bringing an alternative democratic, citizen-centered and decentralized energy governance system to bring about change (TESS 4).

- b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?

Yes, justice with regards to fair tariffs and distribution of profits to wider communities instead of one big company is an explicit motivation.

- c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address? (see Database of drivers of injustice)
Drivers of injustices | Based on WP4 coding | Based on own assessment
--- | --- | ---
1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure |  |  
2. Material and livelihood inequalities |  |  
3. Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization |  |  
4. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration |  |  
5. Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns |  |  
6. Unfit institutional structures | Yes | Yes
7. Limited citizen participation in urban planning |  |  
8. Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities |  |  
9. Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism |  |  
10. Weak(ened) civil society |  |  

c) Actor constellations

10. Who initiated the intervention?

The initiative was initiated by a group of active citizens concerned with the ways to bring the energy grid under the management of people convinced of the need for a transition to renewable sources of energy (BEB) in 2011. Still fighting against a concession to Vattenfall, and to be sold a share in the future concessionist (TESS 4, pg. 15).

11. Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)

Immediate beneficiaries are the cooperative members, whereas, the wider beneficiaries from fair electricity prices and green energy could be citizens of Berlin.

12. Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor types</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Actor name and role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic organizations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Students of the field of renewable energy as volunteers in their free time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid/ 3rd sector organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 Platforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social movements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Yes NetzGipfel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social enterprises</td>
<td>Yes Naturstrom, EMobility, EWS Schönau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For profit enterprises</td>
<td>Yes Supermarkets, StadtwerkeSchwäbisch-Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/regional government</td>
<td>Yes Local Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other initiatives</td>
<td>Yes Volunteers, shareholders and local citizens as part of campaigns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

BEB has a large number of alliances including cooperatives, ethical banks, and renewable energy companies. The cooperative expanded fast in numbers and donations through synergies with the networks established by other energy cooperatives and movements in the field of energy and politics. Schönau Cooperative has been instrumental in the success of BEB by passing on knowledge and expertise. In order to reach out to people and inform them about the cooperative, they worked together with a media network summit called “NetzGipfel” and took part in demonstrations and other events to inform people about their initiative and to get more participants (TESS 4, pg. 113). Besides, BEB would not have been able to establish and grow the way it did without the contribution of volunteers. Most of them are students, mainly graduates from the field of renewable energies but there are also retired people who want to use their free time to help the cooperative. According to an interviewee working at BEB as a volunteer, “Among the most important factors for the cooperative being alive and working to realize its goals is that we have a lot of people as volunteers giving their time and putting in their efforts for instance, myself and other team members, although, their duties are being managed paid positions - two general managers – in BEB. The two general managers are essentially doing what needs to be done from coordinating all the activities to implementing new ideas and doing all the nitty gritty and everything. However, that wouldn’t have been possible without the larger membership base that is gradually increasing”.

14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?
Citizens have been the founders and drivers. The BEB works on the notion of democratic participation. Any citizen, including citizens from other parts of Germany and even other countries in the EU could be the members of BEB with amounts starting at 100 euros (TESS 4, pg.17)

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

BEB has a pyramid structure with only a few people on the top, consisting of founders and highly engaged people, and a broad base of members involved in the daily work. It has groups of volunteers and general assemblies, allowing for the participation of all members. However, it also has some key individuals who are driving the evolution of the organization through careful planning and more strategic actions. Every member of the cooperative has votes for different levels of decisions depending on the number of shares purchased. BEB’s cooperative’s supervisory board is elected through voting that decides on the use of profits, ways to deal with losses, and general trend-setting decisions about BEB that are made at the general assembly (TESS 5, pg. 31).

16. Exclusion:

- a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?

Non-German speakers and those who could not buy 5 shares (each cost 100 Euros) to be part of BEB's decision-making process (TESS 5, pg.25). BEB members who have financially contributed to the project by purchasing a minimum share of 500€, are more influential. The members who cannot afford that cost are excluded from certain decisions (TESS 5, pg. 31).

- b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?

The cooperative is German-based and therefore it uses the language of natives. Regarding the financial matter, it highly depends on its members’ shares to buy a share in the Berlin energy grid. As a result, members with greater financial contributions have a greater say in decision making.

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

BEB was driven by civil discontent and frustration with a profit-oriented company - Vattenfall - owning the energy grid in Berlin. Over the past decades, the governance of electricity grids in German municipalities has been shaped by liberalization processes. In the 1990s Berlin took a leading role in the privatization of public assets due to the city's financial crisis post-reunification. The city failed to install appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for the emerging hybrid service provision systems. This has resulted in poor performance on regional innovation and environmental modernization, along with limited economic benefits for the city. Consequently, growing discontent with private utility ownership and an increase in awareness of the potential financial benefits to be gained from grid operations have given rise to a resurgence of ideas around community management. One of the principal actors in the resurgence was a roundtable organization campaigning for the remunicipalisation of Berlin’s power utility. The campaign to force the city government to regain control of the power grid and create a municipal power utility began in 2010.

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)
BEB started in response to a change in the allocation procedure in the Berlin power system which opened the possibility of buying and operating the Berlin energy grid. BEB benefited from Energietitsch (plebiscite held in 2013 which voted in favor of remunicipalisation (83%) but missed the threshold of total numbers in favor of the remunicipalisation.) and the new allocation procedure for the Berlin power system (Strombetriebskonzession – current operating license). It took advantage of the window of opportunity, challenging single dichotomies of public versus private management by introducing a citizen-owned management partner (TESS 4, pg. 15). Other policies shaping the intervention may include the German feed and tariff program (came into force in 2000) to achieve renewable energy goals of 40-45% by 2025 and 55-60% by 2035, followed by the EU Renewable Energy Directive 2009 that sets rules for its member countries to achieve 20% of renewable energy by 2020 (TESS 4, pg. 32).

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country’s constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens, etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

The initiative has been founded on the basis of the right to hold a plebiscite/referendum and the constitutional right to freedom of assembly (Art. 8) and association (Art. 9). Moreover, BEB was launched to strengthen democratic participation and achieve a more progressive climate policy (TESS 5, Pg. 31). Other constitutional rights (given by the Federal Republic of Germany) may include:

- Art. 8 freedom of assembly
- Art. 9 freedom of association
- Art. 5 Freedom of arts, expressions, and sciences
- Art. 42 The Bundestag - Public sitting (majority decisions)
- Art. 72 Division of powers between federation and Landers
- Art. 104 Apportionment of expenditure - financial system - Liability
- Art. 28 Land Constitution - Autonomy of Municipalities

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policymakers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation, etc.)

BEB is an initiative attempting to decentralize the hierarchic and monopolized energy market in Berlin. It is mainly the result of public distrust in private and government institutions and the realization of their responsibility and competency to provide themselves the basic services in a more efficient, effective, inclusive, and sustainable way while being fair and just. However, given the current political system, BEB’s success is highly dependent on political decisions that take a long time to come along and is well-connected to formal political parties and actors. Therefore, it works extensively on making and maintaining contacts with public figures. Furthermore, the cooperative is perceived as a space for political training where people can meet and deliberate. In their attempts to buy the energy grid of Berlin, BEB cooperates with the city government and needs the collaboration of local officials (TESS 5, pg.17).

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

BEB mainly depends on corporate members’ shares and trust funds for raising money for the purchase of a 25% share of Berlin’s electricity grid. Whereas, funding from sponsorships and
donations are used for the awareness-raising campaigns (e.g. zuvielKohle) run by the cooperative (TESS 4, pg. 46).

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

Awareness among citizens through awareness campaigns regarding safe and green energy and their democratic rights to decide for themselves has increased and has positively impacted the intervention by increasing the number of volunteers and members.

Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

- a. Regulatory framework

Legal arrangements related to bidding procedures are complex and time taking, for instance, Vattenfall right now is taking legal measures against the preliminary operator of the grid "Landesbetrieb Berlin Energie" (who won the procurement procedure in 2019) but legally can only start operating when vattenfall’s legal measures are overcome. An interviewee representing BEB says, “One of the barriers to the goals we have is the national regulation for grid ownership. The legal system doesn’t favor easy changes in the grid concession, especially if you are a newcomer it is very difficult to get into this area because you have to fulfill a lot of requirements which is a good thing actually because it is a very important public infrastructure consequently, it is important that one is highly capable of delivering a safe and secure energy supply”.

- b. Legitimacy

The flow of information and transparency has also been flagged as shortcomings.

- c. Public awareness

Another barrier as per an interviewee with a BEB member is public attention. The interviewee said that it had been a long time ever since they started as a cooperative in 2011 (officially started in 2012 and handed in the bid for the concession in 2016) and the senate in Berlin making a decision on who gets the concession for the grid. Many people in the public have forgotten what this is about or don’t even know it because they moved into Berlin quite sometime after the matter was in the public and media attention.

- d. Finances

- Arranging funds to obtain 25% of the Berlin power grid. BEB is highly dependent on membership fees (or 100 euro) due to its legal restrictions to harness project funding for being a cooperative.
- Vagueness of the act for the economy of energy (Energiewirtschaftsgesetz) cost money (lawyer’s consultancy) and time.
Vattenfall has been proposing numbers concerning the value of the grid that were not reasonable (TESS 4, pg.17).

e. Others (please name)

- The resistance against remunicipalisation is strong; companies and the Federal Cartel Agency question the suitability of citizens and cities as service operators and want to protect the current market structure.
- Given most of the members work on a voluntary basis, BEB cannot be as professional as it could be due to the constant change of people. One of the board members states she has a lot of control over the cooperative, although the supervisory committee also plays a central role in management.
- Dependence of BEB’s success on political will. One interviewed politician says, “It could be too much money and work for them to handle” (TESS 5, pg. 25).

In an interview, a BEB representative stated: “The political will is another barrier even though it is mentioned in the coalition agreement between the currently governing parties in Berlin that cooperative ownership in the public grid is wanted. Politicians tend to forget this over time. Well, we are not in the spotlight anymore and we have to remind them, especially if there is a legal procedure which is going on pushed by Vattenfall against the governments’ decision on giving grid concessions to a public entity”.

f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles

24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Lack of required finance</td>
<td>Run awareness campaigns to attract financial donations and membership share through the media. In an interview (on Sep 9, 2020) a BEB representative illustrated that the cooperative uses 50% of the money from the membership shares which provides a financial base for the implementation of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Data security issue</td>
<td>Ensured safety of data by changing BEB website’s security standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Legitimacy/Transparency concern</td>
<td>Flow of information and transparency matters have been addressed by issuing an internal newsletter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Resistance against the initiative by Vattenfall</td>
<td>BEB is reaching enough people to influence political decisions and to strengthen its stand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Regulatory challenges</td>
<td>Are being dealt with by the members of BEB with great patience and a significant amount of economic, time, and energy resource investment (TESS 5, pg. 25).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an interview a BEB interviewee emphasized, “we demand better conditions in terms of better regulations and more favorable policies that would allow us to do certain things not only us but in general civil
society and citizens to get directly engaged for example in electricity production from solar PV. We try to campaign for that, we try and propose what is possible and we do it regardless of the legal system which is our identity as a cooperative to do it anyway. If the state doesn’t provide us with the rights and enabling conditions we try to generate them ourselves. But this is really difficult in the energy area because it is strongly regulated in an Urban context where you have to deal with a lot of actors and a lot of regulations and it is quite complex”.

g) Reported outcomes

25. What are the reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

BEB has not reached its goal of purchasing the Berlin energy grid, thus its success could be measured in terms of its campaigns work, and has started an important discussion on public participation in decisions concerning energy infrastructure. Below are some achievements of the milestones accomplished by BEB:

- Collection of 11 million Euros in 2015 (100 million Euros is the target) to buy 25% of the energy grid.
- Increase in the rate of membership (therefore funding too), campaign sponsorships, a number of volunteers, and media attention are the biggest achievements of BE.
- Success in the future would mean to be a shareholder of the energy grid in Berlin or at a cooperation partner, supplying renewable energy (TESS 5, pg. 16).

Besides, in 2019 the "Landesbetrieb Berlin Energie " won the procurement procedure which is a victory on the way to remunicipalisation. After an interview with a BEB member, it has been found that the BEB has not been selected for the grid concession which was one of their goals. The government has made the decision to give the license to a city-owned public utility. But the decision is not final yet since Vattenfall, the grid operating company, has filed a lawsuit against the government’s decision. BEB, however, supports the government decision, the BEB representative said, “The government has made a great decision. It is also part of our campaign. We have to reinvent ourselves a little bit because our overarching goal is not only operating and having a grid concession but also contributing to a sustainable energy system in Berlin. So we have started implementing for example solar power projects and there we have a completely different set of barriers. Having an overarching goal, a vision, and being able to adapt that to the circumstances is very important because over time (that is my personal feeling) the circumstances change a lot. You have to constantly think if our vision is still relevant and up to date, do we need to adapt, and can we carry on”.

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

Please fill in any information on social learning that has occurred in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project)\[4\]. Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context

(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)
26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

- a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city...) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

No

- b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

The intervention is building upon previous experience in the town of Schönau that does not exactly have the same context - Schönau is a small town whereas Berlin is a state city. In an interview, a BEB member highlighted that Schönau EVS had provided great support. He further elaborated “... Schönau EVS pioneers were the ones most experienced in operating the grid, campaigning against nuclear power, campaigning in favor of sustainable energy, and also successfully winning the concession of their grid. They have supported us from the beginning. They have also given guidance during the whole journey and provided resources we couldn’t have come up with ourselves. The concession of a grid is an extremely difficult matter. One has to have very very specific detailed legal knowledge which demands a lot of resources. In that sense, we have been directly supported and inspired by EVS Schönau. We have also shared learnings in a different context with people working on a similar initiative in Hamburg. Likewise, there are a lot of examples in Germany especially with cooperatives implementing projects for renewable energy generation and there is an active process of sharing best practices and learning so on”.

Learning content

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?

- a. from previous experiences in the same urban context

N/A.

- b. from inter-city partnerships or transfers from experiences elsewhere

EWS Schönau has been instrumental in the success of BEB through passing on knowledge and expertise. In order to reach out to people and inform them about the cooperative they worked together with the media, organized so-called “NetzGipfel” (Network Summits), and took part in demonstrations and other events to inform people about their initiative and to get more participants. One of the founders of Schönau is a board member of BEB. A BEB representative mentioned, “From my own experience over the years a huge amount of interest from all kind of different actors in what BEB has been shared in forms of: participation in research projects, presenting our experiences before different groups varying from a class of school children who would like to learn about the project to a delegation from a South Korean city, civil servants visiting Berlin on a study trip to journalists, media, and so on. We are constantly in touch with the responsible people
from the Berlin city administration especially in the area of energy and we also participate in civil society platforms, forums and events”.

- c. from other knowledge gatherings/research

Not reported.

Learning process

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?

The intervention had not been replicated elsewhere yet.

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?

Not reported

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote[5] and the actors involved in using them.

No learning tools documented or reported.

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

- a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]

BEB is a replication of another cooperative from the town of Schönau that successfully purchased the town’s currently operational power grid. A similar initiative has been undertaken in Hamburg. So, it can be said that the initiative is highly replicable, however, transferability/replicability has not been suggested.

- b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?

Transferability in the same context has been recommended.

- c. Who has made the claims?

Not reported.

- d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?

Not reported

32. In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?[6]
As part of TESS study, BEB members had been interviewed about the intervention including confronted challenges/obstacles.

33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

BEB’s goal has not yet been achieved therefore the replication of the specific intervention has not been recorded.

j) Structural learning

34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

Below is a statement as an answer to the question given by an interviewee from BEB:

"I would argue that there have been changes in terms of how the energy system can be imagined, who owns it and who participates in it. There have also been changes in political documents for example the coalition agreement in Berlin especially, there has been quite a lot of public and policy attention to citizens’ participation in the energy sector. There is legislation for tenants’ energy self-consumption models contributed by the citizen energy movement. BEB is part of that movement”.

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

The initiative aims to build and improve alternatives in parallel to the existing governance structure. A decentralized (economy and) energy system that focuses on supply-driven-demand, not demand-driven-supply.

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

A citizens-driven initiative based on a decentralized bottom-up governance system, standing firm to achieve envisioned goals even when things didn’t work as expected and planned.

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance

(from NATURVATION project)

NATURVATION’s NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed "management set-ups"):

- Government-led (Gov)
- Co-governance or hybrid governance (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
- Led by non-government actors (NGO)
Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. **Self-governing**, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. **Provision**, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. **Regulations**, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. **Enabling**, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships”

### Appendix 2: Policy typology

*(from NATURVATION project)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory</strong> (administrative, command-and-control)</td>
<td>Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors</td>
<td>Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic (financial, market-based)</strong></td>
<td>Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable (or unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors</td>
<td>Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance and procurements. Negative incentives are taxes, fees and charges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative (educational)</strong></td>
<td>They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change</td>
<td>Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary</strong></td>
<td>Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private actors and/or non-governmental organisations.</td>
<td>Voluntary actions and agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes

1. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5):
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCPcUd-COIQ1MsBjir20_F1CBBnSu6HqKH9nNLshIVQ/edit?usp=sharing.


3. If easily possible mention sources for your association of roles.


6. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.
GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 10: Regeneration of a deprived neighborhood in Rotterdam

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]

The intervention is called the “Veerkracht Carnisse” or “Resilience Lab” and refers to an urban regeneration experiment in the context of a deprived urban neighborhood. Specifically, it takes place in the neighborhood of Carnisse in the south of Rotterdam (Netherlands). [1]

The intervention consists of the creation and implementation of an Urban Living Lab, consisting in different projects (education, greening, local democracy), that engage residents, professionals and policymakers to regenerate this city district. It aims to collectively address the social problems the neighborhood is facing and reinvent the way in which neighborhoods could be redeveloped and regenerated.

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/ policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

This intervention is primarily implemented in the sector of urban regeneration.

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

The intervention seeks to address both sustainability and social justice issues. On the one hand, the intervention “focused on empowering the local community” (i.e. in a “most disadvantaged neighborhood” of Rotterdam) (GUST_05: 1049). On the other hand, it aimed to “foster(ing) urban sustainability and resilience”.

Transition challenges were primarily tied to social justice, that is to say focused on “social cohesion, equity, community engagement/empowerment, and democratic legitimacy” (GUST_06: 202). Classical ecological issues were not really addressed by participants and sustainability was rather framed as “something that is durable, as a desire for consistency over a long period of time” (i.e. it refers to social sustainability and to social networks) (GUST_06: 202). The intervention is driven by the idea of reinventing the ways urban regeneration projects are developed and implemented and to make them more inclusive and responsive to the populations’ needs and wishes (interview with F.).

4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?

The Resilience Lab started with a period of concept development and scoping in 2009 and officially started in September 2011 and concluded in September 2015 (4 years) (GUST_05: 1049).

5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)

The intervention is characterized by a hybrid governance mode including the partners of the Resilience Lab (civil society organization, research institute), the municipality and the local citizens.
6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?

This is a relevant example of Governance Intervention that addresses the second order of learning i.e. that aims to structurally change the governance arrangements in urban regeneration projects (interview with F.).

7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) Governance Intervention?

- GUST_05_Frantzeskaki_Lab Rotterdam
- add to GUST_(InContext) Wittmayer and al. Transition Management in Urban Neighborhood
- Interview with F., researcher, (16.06.20)

b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:

- a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

The intervention has been developed and primarily funded by the dutch ministry in the framework of a national program that aims to regenerate deprived neighborhoods in the south of Rotterdam. The project was developed by a consortium (see Q. 10) of four partners. One of them, the Dutch Research Institute for Transitions (DRIFT) related the intervention to EU-funded project InContext (2010-13) (not included in UrbanA WP4 database) that allowed them to translate and apply a methodology for transition management at the scale of the neighborhood . Incontext investigates the conditions for creating sustainability transitions at the local and individual levels. Carnisse neighborhood was the 1st pilot project of InContext.

On top of that, the GUST project (2014-17 - Governance for Urban Sustainability Transitions] enabled this same partner to conduct an impact assessment and an evaluation of all the activities done in the Resilience Lab. As a part of the Joint Programming Instrument Urban Europe, GUST aimed to examine, inform and advance the governance of sustainability transitions through Urban Living Labs (ULLs), as a means for testing innovations (in buildings, transport and energy systems) and providing economic stability and social cohesion while achieving urban sustainability.

- b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.

The intervention best fits under the Experimentation labs approach. The overall project - GUST - is explicitly mentioned in the database: “The GUST project offers a number of illustrative examples where urban living labs of collaboration and innovation have been formed”. However, the intervention itself is not mentioned.

- c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?
Five project deliverables have been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4 including GUST_05_Frantzeskaki_Lab Rotterdam (available in the Zotero library) that refers to the intervention.

9. Problematization and priority:

- a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

Carnisse neighborhood is known for being among one of the forty “disadvantaged neighborhoods” in the Netherlands (according to the Ministry of Housing 2007) (GUST_05: 1048). The neighborhood is poorly scored in terms of safety, social cohesion and housing (according to different municipal indexes). The partners involved in the intervention (see Q.10) “identified and encountered (in the neighborhood) persistent problems in different societal systems (e.g. education, welfare, healthcare and food)” (GUST_05: 1049).

- b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?

The achievement of social justice is implicitly a major motivation behind the intervention. Even though the terms of “social justice” is not mentioned, the “Resilience Lab” explicitly focused on activity related to “poverty reduction, the upbringing of children, and democratic reform for local development programs” (GUST_05: 1049). In addition, the intervention aims to develop non-tokenistic participatory processes that are related to social justice (interview with F.).

- c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address? (see Database of drivers of injustice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material and livelihood inequalities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unfit institutional structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Limited citizen participation in urban planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. **Weak(ened) civil society**

**c) Actor constellations**

**10. Who initiated the intervention?**

The Resilience Lab was initiated by a consortium of four project partners including the Rotterdam Vakmanstad, Creatief Beheer, Bureau Frontlijn and the Dutch Research Institute for Transitions (DRIFT). The three first ones are local civil society organizations/associations involved in community building projects and activities in other neighborhoods of Rotterdam and the fourth is a “research institute where several action researchers were active in Carnissee” (GUST_05: 1049). This consortium developed the Resilience Lab as a whole and each partner was responsible for one “interactive field” within it including “improving residents’ home situation”, “education at school” and “greening the public space” (interview with F.).

**11. Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)**

The direct benefits of the intervention of the residents of the district. Indeed the “target groups of the Resilience Lab included primarily children (aged 4–12 years), their families, schools (board, teachers and parents) and residents or volunteers actively involved in community life”. Also included were the networks in Carnisse and Charlois consisting of professionals, civil servants, social workers, and entrepreneurs” (GUST_05: 1050).

Scaling up, the intervention aims to benefit the municipality of Rotterdam because it consists of experimenting with a new form of transition management in an urban regeneration context that can be later transferred to other neighborhoods (upscaling).

**12. Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor types</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Actor name and role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic organizations</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(initiator/project leaders) DRIFT researchers and associated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil society organizations</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(indicators/project leaders) Bureau Frontlijn, Creatief Beheer, Rotterdam Vakmanstad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hybrid/ 3rd sector organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Platforms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social movements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political parties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social entreprises X a foundation responsible for the ‘re-opened’ community-center.

For profit entreprises

Local/regional government X The municipality of Rotterdam
different sub-department of the Municipality of Rotterdam

Regional organizations

National government X (co-funders) the Dutch government

Supranational government

International networks

Other initiatives X Welfare organizations

Housing associations

13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

The intervention was made possible by the lot of freedom given by the municipality to the consortium to implement the project. In a context of turbulence in local institutional settings (regarding municipal structures and competences), the consortium was given a “carte blanche” for developing and experimenting with the Resilience Lab. Whereas most funded projects are predefined and have to follow a pre-established framework, the freedom given to the consortium partners enabled them to progressively develop and adapt their methodology to the local context. This freedom was crucial to the success of the Reliance Lab.

14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?

The citizens (i.e. actors involved in the district including residents but also other people working or being connected to the district) engaged with the intervention by developing a vision or “narrative of place” about transition pathways for the future of the district and establishing an agenda for transformative and experimental actions (GUST_5: 1053) or directly by participating in the activities of the Resilience Lab.

These two levels of citizens’ engagement i.e. deliberating about the vision of the neighborhood and joining the activities of the Resilience Lab were complementary.

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

The consortium partners of the Resilience Lab were the drivers of the project. They first framed and impulsed the intervention as well as proposed tools for engaging citizens (i.e. community areas, activities). The citizens engaged in the Resilience Lab by developing the vision of the neighborhood as well as participating in activities. In other words, the four partners were the drivers and facilitators of the projects and the citizens participated in shaping the intervention as well as in orienting its outcomes. Over time, citizens’ roles and responsibilities grew bigger since the project developed according to their wishes and needs. For instance, citizens were the drivers of the creation of the community gardens and the community center (GUST_05: 1054).
16. Exclusion:

- **a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?**

The methodology and activities for the transition management approach were focused on abstract discussion and meta-level questions on the vision of the neighborhood. Thus it targeted people who were more accustomed to such deliberative settings. In addition, the methodology for the visioning aspect of the Resilience Lab works with selective participation and targets 20 to 30 front runners of the neighborhood (interview with F.). In that sense, it was rather exclusive to people who were not familiar with such settings including people facing barrier language, newcomers and young people (below 20 years old (GUST_06: 193). Some did try to integrate the deliberative arena but participated only in a few workshops rather than observers.

- **b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?**

To balance this exclusivity, the consortium partner tried to engage people in practical activities which proved to be more inclusive than discussing the neighborhood. Indeed people joining the activities in the community center or garden were more diverse in terms of ethnicity, languages and age difference. This "hands on" mentality proved to be very rewarding for the people who live and work in Carnisse (interview with F.)

d) **Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention**

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

The Carnisse neighborhood had been identified as an area that needed to be regenerated (due to persistent social problems). Whereas typical regeneration strategies include the demolishing of aged public housing and a top-down re-development approach, the municipality agreed on experimenting new forms of urban regeneration in the neighborhood. The Resilience Lab - suggested by the consortium partners (see Q.10) - was a “test bed for new methodologies and innovative practices” (GUST_05: 1050).

In addition, overall design of the project (i.e. participatory, involving the local community) matches with the context of a new national neighborhood approach in which “citizens should be more active in addressing and solving problems in their living environment” (GUST_05: 1048). Thus, it was favorably appreciated by the local government which gave lots of freedom to the leading partners for implementing the Resilience Lab.

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)

The current neighborhood approach of the ministry of Internal Affairs in the Netherlands consists of a reconceptualization of the role of inhabitants and citizens who are to a greater extent responsible for addressing issues related to their living environment: “a revised role for the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations in the 40-Neighbourhood-Programme. They describe this change as follows: “from active financial commitment linked with targets to a more facilitative role, acting on request in relation to what others do” (Ministerie BZK 2014: 2)” (GUST_06: 1880).

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country’s constitution (in a broad
sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?

The Resilience Lab was developed in a context of changing institutional settings including the municipal centralization of sub-municipal departments (which were dismantled) and at the same time the decentralization of national policies of social and welfare to local municipalities (interview with F.). It means that the municipality of Rotterdam was in charge of extra tasks related to the welfare and well-being of Rotterdam citizens.

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policy makers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation etc.)

The project material points out that a new trend of the political culture, emphasizing the role of citizens in addressing local issues, influenced the intervention. Indeed, the Resilience Lab took place in the context of withdrawal of the state welfare structures and financial support with a redirection of the responsibility to the local inhabitants and citizens. In that sense, the Resilience Lab is a solution given the context of a required “participatory society” (GUST_06: 188).

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

The main transition management in Carnisse’s neighborhood was funded by the dutch ministry under a national program for urban regeneration in Rotterdam-South (GUST_06: 190)n. The development of the transition methodology by DRIFT (one partner) was funded by the EU-project InContext and the assessment and evaluation by Drift of the overall intervention was funded by the EU-project GUST (see Q. 8.a).

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

The institutional settings were very turbulent over the course of the intervention and the governmental policies and constitutional settings detailed above (see Q.18 -Q.19) were progressively set-up at that time.

*Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.*

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

- a. Regulatory framework

Turbulence and change in institutional settings (i.e. regarding the competences of the municipality as well as the welfare structures) were an obstacle to implementing the intervention (GUST_05: 1050). Whereas the sub-municipality that Carnisse belonged to were dismantled as well as budget cuts were enforced in social support, the project partners were navigating without grasping all these new settings. The consortium did not manage to establish a durable relationship with other actors including the municipality or housing associations and welfare organizations because the contact person changed every year (interview with F.)
The constantly changing institutional settings created a lot of ambiguity and insecurity about future processes. It constrained people in engaging in a participatory process while not being sure on how everything is going to be arranged in one or two years (interview with F.).

- **b. Legitimacy**

The intervention faced obstacles prior to its implementation. Before it started, the project faced distrust from some residents towards these kinds of projects which have the “tendency to portray the neighborhood as a disadvantage, an image which frustrated many locals and in which they did not recognize themselves” (GUST_05: 1050).

In addition, another challenge was the relative scepticism from both the residents and the municipality about the “relative openness of both the process and the outcomes” of the living lab. They were doubting the urban living lab could effectively address the problems the neighborhood was facing.

- **c. Public awareness**

There is a big residential mobility in Carnisse which is considered as an “arrival” neighborhood. Many newcomers, especially young and less educated workers, move in as they arrive in the city and move out as soon as they can afford to live in a better district (InContext). As a consequence, the short-term residents are not necessarily aware about the local projects.

- **d. Finances**

It was challenging to start the intervention because it took place in a context of “budget cuts” from the municipality and generally regarding public subsidies for social intervention (i.e. the context of the erosion of old welfare structure) (GUST_05: 1050).

- **e. Others (please name)**

The participatory and deliberative aspect of the resilience Lab were not very inclusive (see Q. 16).

**f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles**

24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turbulences in institutional settings</td>
<td>To overcome these turbulences, the consortium partners tried to work quite autonomously from these formal institutions. This found to be quite fruitful for the success of the resilience Lab that could experiment activities from the ground and really engage with the people of carnisse regardless of institutional constraints. However, this autonomy hammered the more durable impact of the resilience Lab in the municipal agenda (see Q. 36).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scepticism of the residents and the municipality

The project leaders. To address the scepticism of the residents and the municipality about the process and the outcomes of the project (is it worth it or not?), the Resilience Lab had to “prove [...] the benefits from being involved in it”, “this require a deep study of the dynamics of the neighborhood, building networks based on reciprocity and gaining trust over time by showing results that benefited the local community” (GUST_05: 1050).

Budget cuts in social welfare

The consortium partner DRIFT used other fundings including from the two EU-projects Incontext and Gust.

Lack of inclusivity

The “practical” and “hands on” activities of the resilience lab allowed more diverse people to engage in the project and made it more inclusive (see Q. 16).

g) Reported outcomes

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

The outcomes of the intervention are:

- New social relations established within the neighborhood between citizens and some policy makers but also between residents themselves. The participatory activities and tools used in the framework of the Resilience Lab increased interaction between different social groups (GUST_05: 1059). It enhanced trust and contributed to community building (although one of the problems in the district was the lack of community).
- Opening of the neighborhood: people living outside of the neighborhood took part in the Resilience Lab increasing the openness, enhancing network and relationships outside of the administrative boundaries of Carnisse (GUST_05: 1052).
- Citizens empowerment. The narrative “blossoming Carnisse” (GUST_05: 1053) developed in the deliberative workshops empowered citizens because it gave them the opportunity to express they aspiration (what to they want for their neighborhood) but also to express legitimate criticism to the current dynamic of the place (e.g. the severe budget cuts that let to the closure of public facilities such as two community centers and an educational garden).

Over time, the citizens turned to be almost fully responsible for the community center and the community garden.

- The identification of the residents/citizens with their neighborhood (i.e. the creation of a symbolic “sense of place”) although before the resilience Lab, most of them did not feel connected to the neighborhood in terms of “shared meaning and experience” (GUST_05: 1053).
- The success of the “collaborative governance” (i.e. between policy makers and citizens) which demonstrates that reciprocity and institutional connection are key for escaping stigmatization of the place and its people” (GUST_05: 1053).

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

Please fill in any information on social learning that has occured in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project)². Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context
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(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

- a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city...) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

The four consortium partners “had been involved and worked in their respective domains (i.e. social work, education) in other neighborhoods of Rotterdam south” (add to GUST: 190). Thus, the partners have brought their own experience and set of different approaches and activities to be experimented in the framework of the Resilience Lab.

- b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

Not reportedly. However, one of the consortium partners, DRIFT, had previously experienced some transition management strategies in the sectors of housing and mobility in other urban contexts that have been translated to the scale of a neighborhood for Carnisse (interview with F.).

Learning content

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?

- a. from previous experiences in the same urban context

The Resilience Lab is not explicitly built upon another intervention and is experimental. However, the methodology developed for transition management was influenced by previous work carried out by the consortium partners. The project started with a vision translated into a set of principles to be developed in practice (interview with F.). This methodology was the overarching umbrella under which the activities were created. The partners have already experimented some of these activities in other neighborhoods of Rotterdam-South (GUST_05: 1049) but adapted them to the local context e.g. in the sector of education or greening the public space.

- b. from inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere

The partner DRIFT had already experienced transition management strategies in the energy or mobility sector. The methodology they had previously developed was translated and adapted to urban regeneration at the scale of a neighborhood (Interview with F.).

- c. from other knowledge gathering/research

Since the Resilience Lab was incorporated into other EU-projects on transition management, especially Incontext, some learning may have been disseminated, especially based in the case of the other pilot projects, the city of Wolfhagen, Germany, and the village of Finkenstein in Austria.\[8\]
Learning process

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?

The intervention started from abstract vision as well as a methodology and set of activities already experienced in other contexts. The practical dimension of the intervention was not set in stone and developed over the course of the project to make it context specific (i.e. depending on the need, wishes of the residents as well as facing local constraints). To sum up, it is an intervention that learnt from itself in the process of implementing it.

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?

Overcoming obstacles contributed to the learning process especially regarding the exclusive dimension of the project. The consortium partner found out that engaging citizens in a deliberation process can be quite exclusive whereas “hands on” and practical activities i.e. in the community center or the community gardens are far more inclusive. This learning allowed them to combine these two aspects of the participation (Interview with F.)

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote) and the actors involved in using them.

- Guidance tool for self-organization developed by the Drift
- In the framework of Incontext: “Community Arena” for transition management including the processes of envisioning, backcasting, experimenting, self-reflection and learning

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

- a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]

The project aims to be transferable. The idea was to identify “new ways of neighborhood development” (GUST_05: 1055) and reinvent integrative methods for neighborhood redevelopment that could be adapted to different contexts. The overarching umbrella and set of principles for transition management would remain while the different activities within the Resilience Lab would be context specific (interview with F.).

- b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?

The principles and methodology for neighborhood transition management i.e. the resilience Lab as a whole can be transferred to any other context. However the activities within it should not be pre-determined and have to be adapted to the local context. It means that vision and basic principles of the Resilience Lab can be transferred but the actual implementation would differ in every neighborhood. (interview with F.).

- c. Who has made the claims?
Researchers and project managers.

- **d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?**

The limit to transferability would be not to take the Resilience lab as a whole i.e. as an integrative project but only to replicate the different activities within it e.g. related to education, green space etc. Lacking of an overarching and integrated vision of neighborhood transition management would limit the success of such intervention (Interview with F.).

32. **In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?**

The project has been disseminated.

33. **Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)**

The resilience Lab as a whole has not been replicated in other contexts. However, the different activities developed by the consortium partners (including educational tools for schools or arrangement of the public space) have been transferred and implemented in other districts in Rotterdam or cities in the Netherlands. The residents also replicated some activities such as the community garden after the first one had been closed by the municipality (interview with F.).

In addition, based on the experience of carnisse, The notion of "self-sustained community center" is also being replicated by the municipality in some other neighborhoods in Rotterdam under the name of "Houses for the neighborhood" (interview with F.). In 2013-14, a local policy established that every neighborhood should have a community center in which the desires and needs of citizens are central and where the community takes an active role in sustaining the center. These “Houses for the neighborhood” are a sort of replication of the community center in Carnisse but are mainly led by policy municipality structure together with welfare organisations”. Some also develop elsewhere in the Netherlands.

j) **Structural learning**

34. **Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?**

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

Yes, the project was mainly aimed at restructuring the governance arrangements. Whereas the municipality and other dominant stakeholders like the housing associations or welfare organizations were very dominant in the previous years, the Resilience Lab was explicitly aimed at breaking the dominant structure and actors who could govern the neighborhood development. The Resilience Lab tried to counter that by working more in a co-creative manner and really involving residents and all kinds of resident groups in having an impact on their neighborhood. Changing the governance arrangements was a really strong ambition of the intervention (interview with F.).

However, this ambition faced two obstacles and turned out to be quite limited. First, in the context of institutional turbulence, the consortium partners decided to develop the project quite
autonomously from the municipality (see Q. 24). As a consequence, they could not really connect with the municipality and share the learning of that intervention. Whereas some civil servants learnt from the intervention, they did it at a personal level and not at the structural level of the institution. Second, the fragmented replication of Resilience Lab (see Q.33) rather than its integrated vision hampered impact and changed more structurally the governance settings (interview with F.).

k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

n/a

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

The biggest takeaway from such a Resilience Lab or neighborhood re-developed is to aim for the autonomy and sovereignty of the residents and the people involved there. Such interventions have to be context specific, have a sense of freedom in developing your activities in practices so learning by doing (interview with F.).

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance
(from NATURVATION project)

NATURVATION's NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed "management set-ups":

- Government-led (Gov)
- Co-governance or hybrid governance (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
- Led by non-government actors (NGO)

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. Self-governing, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. Provision, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. Regulations, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. Enabling, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships

Appendix 2: Policy typology
(from NATURVATION project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-governing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regulatory (administrative, command-and-control)

Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors

Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.

Economic (financial, market-based)

Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable (or unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors

Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance and procurements. Negative incentives are taxes, fees and charges.

Informative (educational)

They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change

Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media.

Voluntary

Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private actors and/or non-governmental organisations.

Voluntary actions and agreements.

Footnotes

1. Resilience Lab website. Last view on 26/06/20: https://www.veerkrachtcarnisse.nl/.
2. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5): https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCPhUD-COIQ1MsBjir20_F1CBbnSu6HqKH9nNLshiVQ/edit?usp=sharing.
4. GUST website. Last view on 26/06/20: http://www.urbanlivinglabs.net/.
6. If easily possible, mention sources for your association of roles.
10. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which
the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.
GOVERNANCE INTERVENTION 11: 
Public-private partnerships for sustainability infrastructure in Athens

Note: This intervention was later classified as a non-positive example of governance for sustainable and just cities. Therefore it was not used as the basis for Enabling Governance Arrangements.

a) Basic characteristics and ambitions of the intervention

1. What is the name and the urban context (e.g. city/district) of the intervention? Please also indicate the geographical scale of the intervention (e.g. neighborhood, district, small/medium/capital city, metropolitan area ...). [Example: “Brixton Energy in Brixton, London (neighborhood in capital city)”]

The intervention refers to the Stavros Niarchos Foundation Cultural Center (SNFCC) and takes place in the city of Athens in Greece. The cultural center is an urban regeneration project established in the framework of a private-public partnership. It hosts two major cultural institutions and includes a park. The overall infrastructure is sustainable and based on nature based solutions.

The intervention has been developed at the scale of a neighborhood in a capital city (Athens).

2. What sector(s) (alias domain/policy field) is the intervention primarily implemented in? [e.g. housing, mobility, energy, water, health, local economy, biodiversity, CC adaptation, etc.]

The intervention has been developed for the urban development policy field as well as cultural development.

3. What is the intervention (i.e. situated experiment) aiming to achieve in terms of sustainability and justice? [If possible, please copy from a project website and give a reference]

The project addresses both issues of social justice and sustainability. However, social justice is not directly mentioned but is rather framed as the broader access to cultural facilities and environmental amenities. The first refers to the access to the two cultural institutions hosted in the center i.e. the Greek National Library and the Greek Opera. In addition, the SNFCC offers free a set of activities such as yoga classes or music workshops: “the project is committed to a range of educational and cultural activities, which have been provided for free” (Naturvation’s webpage). Environmental amenities refers to the big park that aims to improve the health and the well-being of the local population.

From the perspective of the SNFCC the intervention addresses social justice by being inclusive. Inclusiveness includes the access to the facilities for reduced mobility visitors and the for-free activities. The intervention also aims at improving the quality of life of the local community “with clean air exercise facilities and twice as much green space” (Naturvation_04: 2).

Sustainability achievements refer to the sustainable construction and design of the SNFCC which is LEED (i.e. Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certified (i.e. an internationally recognized certification). The building has a recycled water system, a green roof, solar panels on the top and the park is designed in a way that is not too water intensive and adapted to the local climate (i.e. with mediterranean plants for instance). The expected impacts include “sustainable consumption and production (SDG 12)” as well as a “green space, habitat and biodiversity (SDG 15)” (Naturvation’s webpage). At the scale of the neighborhood, the intervention addresses environmental health issues as it was set up on a formerly degraded area (interview with P.). Scaling up, the intervention is a
response to a sustainability challenge that Athens is facing as the city has a high rate of air pollution (due to the heat island effect) and which has the lowest per capita green space in the EU cities (Naturvation_05: 2).

4. What is the interventions’ timeframe?
The project started in 2009 and was finalised in 2016.

5. By what governance mode is the intervention characterized primarily? (see Appendix 1: Three modes of governance)
The intervention is characterized by a co-governance of hybrid governance mode (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) between private actors (i.e. the SNF) and public actors (i.e. the Greek State).

6. Why do you consider it worthwhile to study and share experiences made in the context of this Governance Intervention for sustainable and just cities?
This intervention is interesting because it shows an example of public-private partnership (PPP) adapted to a very particular context i.e. a period of economical crisis and austerity (which obviously raises concerns about sustainability and social justice). This Governance Intervention is highly shaped by this context which is interesting to highlight.

7. In which project deliverable(s) or other documents can information be found on this situated (i.e. place specific) Governance Intervention?
- Snapshot - Athens: Stavros Niarchos Cultural center. Coded in Zotero (Naturvation_05)
- SNFCC Impact Study (from the SNFCC). Coded in Zotero (Naturvation_04)
- Interview with Panagioti Kotsila (UAB team) on 06/04/20.

b) Additional basic characteristics, links to earlier UrbanA work

8. EU Project-context of the intervention:
- a. Has the intervention been developed or studied in the context of an (EU-funded?) project? (please name the project, its duration and include a link to the project website here).

The intervention has been studied in the framework of a EU-funded project called NATURVATION (2016-20).[2] The project focuses on nature-based solutions (NBS) applied and implemented in urban contexts and aims at identifying how NSB governance and innovation can address urban sustainability challenges.

- b. According to WP3’s database of approaches, which approach(es) does the intervention best fit under? Where applicable, please indicate if the intervention is found in a project that has been explicitly mentioned in the database.

The intervention best fits under the Nature-based solutions approach. However, only the overall project (i.e. Naturvation) is mentioned but not the intervention itself.

- c. Have some project deliverables been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4?
Some deliverables of Naturvation’s project have been coded in the context of UrbanA’s WP4. However, none of these deliverables refer to SNFCC’s case.

9. Problematization and priority:

- a. How exactly has inequality and exclusion been problematized (by whom) in the context of this intervention?

From the perspective of the SNF, inequality and exclusion has been problematize in terms of:

- Inclusion and accessibility. The SNFCC offers very low entry fees (compared to other cultural attractions) and free-of-charge activities (Naturvation_04: 13). The SNFCC is accessible for people with special needs (disabilities).

improving the quality of life for the local community. This includes: improving the appearance and attractiveness of the areas, increasing the access to green amenities, enhancing local businesses, providing health benefits (cleaner air and offering opportunities for exercises) making the neighborhood safer (Naturvation_04: 35-41).

- b. Has the achievement of justice explicitly been named as a major motivation behind the intervention?

From the perspective of the SNF, justice is understood in terms of citizens’ well-being and wealthfare. In that sense, it is one motivation among others behind the intervention.

- c. Which drivers of injustice does the intervention address? (see Database of drivers of injustice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of injustices</th>
<th>Based on WP4 coding</th>
<th>Based on own assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusive access to the benefits of sustainability infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material and livelihood inequalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Racialized or ethnically exclusionary urbanization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uneven environmental health and pollution patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unfit institutional structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Limited citizen participation in urban planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. **Weak(ened) civil society**

c) **Actor constellations**

10. **Who initiated the intervention?**

The intervention was initiated by a private actor, the Stavros Niarchos Foundation (SNF) that came to the Greek State and proposed to build the cultural center. The SNF is a non for profit foundation held by a very rich family of ship owners in Greece (the foundation does mainly charity works and operates in Greece and internationally). However, this project has a longer history that involves various actors (see Q. 17)

11. **Who are the envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention? (both at a local level and higher, if applicable)**

The envisioned beneficiaries of the intervention are: the public sector institution (e.g. school or hospital); non-government organization/civil society; private sector/corporate/company; citizens or community groups (based on the list provided in Naturavation webpage).

It seems more generally that the intervention will benefit Athenian visitors, because of the cultural activities offered by the center. To some extent, the intervention also benefits the Greek population. At a time when the country was facing a financial and austerity crisis that deteriorated its international image, the center can be a source of national pride and international recognition (i.e. the cultural center seek to be a “global role model of environmental sustainability and also to contribute to the valorisation of greek culture and heritage).

12. **Who else is (going to be) involved in the intervention, and what was/is their main role?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor types</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Actor name and role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid/ 3rd sector organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social entreprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For profit entreprises</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The Stravos Niarchos company (SNF CC SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Greek National Opera (public)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Which particular interactions among various stakeholders (stakeholder configurations) were crucial in enabling the intervention to emerge successfully? This could include direct or indirect impacts on interventions.

The intervention could emerge successfully because the SNF came to the state with a project already set-up (i.e. the configuration, the design but also the PPP) that the Greek State only had to agree on. The State - weakened by the crisis at this time - did not call for tender but was offered a predefined project. In that sense, the intervention emerged because it was one-sided. In addition, the SNF benefited from the support of the National Opera and the National Library that requested the foundation for help to relocate. Thus, the SNF came to the Greek State with a strong proposal and offered a lot of money at a time when the Greek state was sorely lacking it.

14. To what extent, in what form and at what stages have citizens participated in the shaping of the intervention?

The SNFCC is a top-down intervention since “the conceptualization, design, type of uses and technical execution of the whole SNFCC project were top-down” are driven by the SNF (Naturvation’s webpage). There was no kind of participatory process that includes citizens in the decision making. From the SNF’s perspective, a sort of participation was conceptualized ex-ante. Visitors or citizens could individually raise some claims by writing an email to the foundation on a dedicated platform. In addition, information days were organized during the construction where people could come and get informed about what was happening there.

A public committee - composed of the maires representatives of the state as well as the ministers of culture, education and finances - was held from the beginning towards the end of the project to look at it and discuss what was happening. However, the role of the committee was only consultative. It did rather figuration than significantly contributed to the decision-making.

15. How are responsibilities and/or decision-making power distributed among actors?

The SNF was the main decision-maker of the project. It conceptualized the whole approach while the Greek State had only to agree on that project and to sign the law that enforced this Public-Private Partnership (PPP). The SNF was responsible for the whole vision and decision making of the conceptualisation, design and technical execution of the cultural center. In addition, the SNF pre-decided a list of companies that were to be contracted to build but also to maintain the center after its completion. Then, the cultural center was donated to the Greek State which under the supervision of the Ministry of Finances (Naturvation’s webpage) undertook its full responsibility.
The cultural center is composed of three organizations. Two of them are hosted there, the National Library and the National Opera and the third is a management company called the SNF CC SA that was created by the foundation and donated to the State. It belongs now to the ministry of Finances, although the executive team (circa 40 employees) works as if it was under private supervision of the SNFCC.

Decision-making power is centralized by the SNF. The State and the two national institutions hosted there lost a significant part of their autonomy because they are bound to the law (i.e. the PPP) that gave great powers to the SNF. They have not the agency to choose how to manage the place but also to choose the companies they will hire as well as how they will spend their money. If the State and the public institution do not comply with these rules, the foundation will legally withdraw the amount of money they donated (under-conditions of compliance with these rules) and the State will have to pay all back (interview with P.).

It appears that despite the public-private nature of the project (due to the co-ownership between the Greek state and the SNF) the cultural center is rather privately managed which prevents any kind of “bottom-up or self-managed activities” (Naturvation_05: 4).

16. Exclusion:

- a. Which stakeholders or social groups were excluded (at which stages)?

Exclusion occurred during the conceptualization of the project and after its completion. First, the shaping of the intervention was centralized by the SNF and excluded citizens (there were no participatory process nor public consultation) as well as a set of companies that could have engaged with the project (in the conceptualization phase, the construction or the maintenance). Since the SNF decided in advance its collaborators, lots of public and private actors (i.e. architecture, construction, maintenance companies) were excluded: “there has been no active consultation and engagement involving end-users in defining the project and subsequently monitoring service quality” (Naturvation_05: 4).

Second, exclusions occurred after the completion of the center and targeted visitors of the center.

- Exclusion in terms of accessibility: because it is not located in the city center of Athens and is not connected to it with a metro line, the center is not so easy to access, especially for people without a vehicle (i.e. students, elderly) (there is a parking lot but not free of charges).
- Class-based/financial exclusion. The Opera had slightly increased the price of its ticket (to cover the cost of the rent due to the foundation). This also raised the question of who is able to pay for going to Opera in Greece at a moment of crisis? The cafés and restaurants of the cultural center have been contracted by the SNF and are a bit pricier than any kind of neighborhood cafés. In addition, a membership card, for which one pays a certain fee, gives to members the possibility to reserve places in the free-activities, to have cheaper parking rates and to enjoy more activities offered by the center.
- Public/private indirect exclusion. The cultural center and the park are public but are privately managed i.e. private guards are surveilling the park rather than municipal officers. This means that visitors do not know who defines the rules in those premises. It is a form of indirect exclusion (interview with P.)

- b. Is there any indication why this may have happened? With what outcomes? Has anything been done to overcome such exclusions?
Some measures have been taken to involve more citizens. This includes since 2013 the possibility for citizens “to view the construction site and learn about the SNFCC scope, organization and future plan”. However, this is only information and has not to be mistaken with effective public participation. The document underlines that “public participation and citizen engagement for transparency and promotion of the public interest are hard to achieve in privately initiated NBS” (Naturvation_05: 4).

d) Enabling conditions for the implementation of the intervention

17. What circumstances or events are reported to have triggered the intervention? (In what ways?)

The context of the financial crisis and austerity and development that shaped the intervention. First, the project came after a long history related to the place where it is set-up. The area was formerly a horse racing place, then hosted the Olympic game in 2004 and was abandoned afterwards. Local inhabitants asked the municipalities to turn it into a public green space. Before the crisis hit, the State promised that a public park would be created in that area, but after 2008-09 the project failed. At this time, the National Opera and the National Library requested SNF for support to support their facilities or even to relocate. Then, the SNF came to the state with a project that would somehow meet both the resident request (i.e. to do something with this abandoned place and to provide green amenities) and the request of the two institutions.

In addition, in a context of crisis and austerity as well as environmental challenges (air pollution, degraded area) and with a view to restoring Greek image through cultural valorisation (Naturvation’s website), the creation of a sustainable and innovative cultural center hosting two major cultural institutions was positively welcomed by citizens. The project developed in circumstances under which the Greek State, weakened by the economical crisis and austerity, was not able to pay for any alternative project nor even to be proactive and match a call for tenders. The intervention only became possible by the establishment of a public-private partnership (PPP) designed by the SNF.

18. Are particular substantive (multi-level) governmental policies considered to be highly influential in the genesis and shaping of the intervention? (If easily possible, please specify the policy, the policy field and the governance level mainly addressed, and characterize it along Appendix 2: Policy typology)

The establishment of a public-private partnership (PPP) made possible the intervention to emerge. The scheme - as a kind of a loop - is the following: the state provides the land, the private entity makes the construction and the state manages its functioning” (Naturvation_05: 3), and donates it to the state which is responsible for it. This PPP consisted in a signed agreement - a law - between the Greek State and the SNFCC foundation which has been ratified by the Greek parliament (Law 3785-2009) (Naturvation’s webpage). The agreement entails that the state has to fulfill the agreed terms and conditions (i.e. especially regarding the selected collaborators) unless the donor has the right to withdraw its donation. The two institutions hosted by the SNFCC remained autonomous but endorsed new financial responsibilities and did not have the agency to manage the building facilities.

19. What constitutional responsibilities and rules does the intervention build upon? In other words, what rights, powers, and/or responsibilities, does the country’s constitution (in a broad sense) award municipalities, states, utilities, NGOs, citizens etc. and how does this impact the intervention?
The law defining the PPP is a presidential decree which has been ratified by the Greek parliament. Practically, the PPP has been conceptualized by the legal team of the foundation and submitted to the Greek government that issued accordingly a decree.

20. According to project material/and or interviews, in what ways have particularities of (local) political culture influenced the character and success of the intervention? (i.e. trust in political institutions, citizens’ will to interact with policy makers and vice versa, traditions of cooperation etc.)

The intervention occurred at a moment of despair and of mistrust and disillusion from the citizens towards the Greek State. Local inhabitants have been waiting for a long time for something to be done with this degraded area and the State had not the capacity to do anything at that moment. The donors appeared and proposed to pay for building something for the people. It undertook a providential figure which matches the philanthropic and well-known image of the Niarchos family and foundation: “Ok so the State is not able to do anything so we need some rich man to come and save us.” (Interview with P.)

“I think it can cut people, and the state as well and the government as well, in a weak moment where it’s like “somebody is willing to give us money actually when everybody wants to take money away from us. Because at that moment with the dept, everybody was losing their salaries, their retirements. Then a big donator comes and says: "ok, I’m going to throw millions of euros to make something for you" (interview with P.).

21. What are financial arrangements that support the intervention?

The financial agreement is the following; the state provides the land (public property), the SNFCC foundation covered the all the cost for designing and building the center (private funds) and then donated it (under conditions) to the state which controls its functioning and its management by the complex SNFCC SA (publicly run). However, the viability of the project depends on the capacity of the state to cover the high running cost of the structure. The money comes respectively from “the parking lot and the renting of cafes and restaurants, and of other spaces for events” as well as the fees (rent or/and “management fees) paid to the SNFCC SA by the Greek National Library and the Greek National Opera for being hosted by the center (only the the latter is a profit -organization) (Naturvation_05: 3).

22. Have any of the above conditions changed within the intervention’s timeframe, which have (significantly) influenced it in a positive or negative way?

n/a

*Note: Certain contexts, which provide opportunities to learn from other relevant experiences, may also be a supportive framework condition. Please see section h, questions 26 + 30 on learning context.*

e) Obstacles to successful intervention implementation

23. What obstacles to implementing the intervention (both generally, and in this particular context) have been identified, relating to:

- a. Regulatory framework

The potential obstacle could have been the legal framework because this particular PPP in a form of “donation under-condition” is quite specific and might oppose some juridical principle (regarding the
State autonomy for instance). However, the legal team of the foundation conceptualized this legal agreement and dealt with any potential obstacles related to its complexity.

- **b. Legitimacy**
  
n/a

- **c. Public awareness**
  
n/a

- **d. Finances**
  
n/a

- **e. Others (please name)**
  
n/a

f) (Institutional) Work done to overcome obstacles

24. What has been done by each central actor group to overcome which particular obstacles in the way of successfully implementing the intervention? (this may include institutional Work - maintaining, disrupting, and creating new rules, applying to both formal laws/ regulations and informal norms and expectations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of obstacle</th>
<th>What work was/is being done to overcome this obstacle and by what actor groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The complexity of the legal agreement (the PPP)</td>
<td>The legal team of the foundation established itself the agreement and submitted ready-made to the State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**g) Reported outcomes**

25. What are reported outcomes of the intervention? This may include economic outcomes, political outcomes, ability to reach sustainability and justice targets, etc.

The positive outcomes are:

- The new facilities for the National Library and the National Opera
- The park that provides green amenities especially for local resident
- Overall, the cultural center is quite busy and people come to it

However, the project raised concerns about:

- Low autonomy of the State and the two institutions that are hosted there. They have no agency to choose how to manage the building and have to comply with the terms set-up by the foundation.
- “Cultural appropriation” (interview with P.). The way that the place is promoted and marketed tends to symbolically privatize public properties and institutions. For instance, many Athenians say that they go to the Niarchos Center or Niarchos Library although the National Library is a cultural heritage that belongs to the State and does not belong to the Niarchos family and foundation.
• Gentrification. Just after the project was announced, speculation started in the area and in the last five years, the prices in the neighboring municipalities have risen to 20% which is one of the highest percentages in Athens. This gentrification is related to culture and green amenities.

• Financial risk for the state. The State is taking financial risk from the moment it undertook the responsibility of running the center after its completion. The center was extremely expensive to build (sustainable and innovative design and huge area covered) but is also very expensive to maintain because the selected companies contracted by the SNF are mostly above the market prices. At the same time, the State is bound to the agreement signed with the foundation and is responsible for the financial viability of the project. In case of economic failure or bankruptcy, it would be the State debt and taxpayer money paying for it.

h) Learning involved in establishing the intervention

Please fill in any information on social learning that has occurred in this intervention (conceptualized here as “Learning context, content, and process” in line with the FOODLINKS project)[2]. Where possible, please differentiate your response into learning done by specific actor groups.

Learning context

(i.e. the configuration and social environment enabling the learning process)

26. According to the TRANSIT project’s four mechanisms for empowerment – i. funding; ii. legitimacy; iii. knowledge sharing, learning, and peer support; or iv. visibility and identity – please briefly describe the following, and indicate where the intervention has been developed or supported as part of which formal collaborations, networks or projects:

• a. any previous experiences in the same urban context (e.g. city...) that the intervention is (reportedly) building upon? This could include any relevant experiences in the same or another sector.

n/a

• b. any inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere that have (reportedly) been important in the emergence of this intervention?

n/a

Learning content

27. Has any acquired knowledge (e.g. technical knowledge, awareness of local political procedures etc.) been reported as particularly helpful to this intervention?

• a. from previous experiences in the same urban context

n/a

• b. from inter-city partnerships, or transfers from experiences elsewhere

The foundation is an international foundation that has experience in the management of different kinds of PPP. The legal team has most probably already some experience in establishing some sorts of PPP.
Concerning the construction of the building, Renzo Piano, the architect hired by the foundation is one of the top names in sustainable construction. The SNFCC was inspired by other international large-scale certificated LEED Platinum (including the Water+Life Museum, USA; Clinton Presidential Library, USA; Vestas Technology Center, Denmark; Taipei 101, Taiwan; Park Ventures, Thailand) (Naturvation_04: 46). The intervention is then a matter of elite expertise and know-how but it did happen as a close process.

Overall, both regarding the PPP procedure and the construction, it seems that the foundation operated on its own with its own resources and knowledge without necessarily involving the municipality: “I don’t think there was a lot of back and forth with the local authorities” (Interview with P.).

Learning process

28. In what ways has the intervention been adapted to specific circumstances of the targeted urban context based on the learned content reported in question 27?

Nothing about governance arrangements.

However, regarding sustainable construction, the infrastructure has been adapted to the local context i.e. a Mediterranean environment. For instance, the park is landscaped with plants specifically adapted to the Mediterranean climate (e.g. do not require a lot of water) (interview with P.).

29. Based on your answers to question 24, how has overcoming obstacles (reportedly) contributed to the learning process?

There was not really a learning process since the potential obstacle (i.e. the legal complexity of the PPP agreement) was overcome internally by the foundation.

30. Please list any tools that enabled the learning process (e.g. various Knowledge Brokerage Activities from pg. 24 of FOODLINK’s Deliverable 7.1 - linked in footnote) and the actors involved in using them.

Importing knowledge by employing people specifically qualified and recognised in the field (of sustainable construction).

i) Learning involved in establishing interventions elsewhere (transferability)

31. Suggestions regarding transferability.

   a. Have any suggestions been made about a replicability, scalability or transferability of the intervention? [e.g. in the documentation of the intervention in a project or the press? Links would be perfect]

The potential of the project is to launch a dynamic of innovation in the area and to pledge local actors to consider the PPP.

From the perspective of the SNF, the SNFCC is “a role model of environmental sustainability across 3 dimensions: environmentally friendly design and construction, environmentally friendly operations,
biodiversity & local ecosystem enhancement” and achieve a LEED Platinum certification (i.e. a sustainable label (naturvation_04: 44)). However, nothing is mentioned about transferability of the project. What is a “global role model”? Is that only inspirational?

Replicability however is mentioned in relation with the type of PPP: “SNFCC can serve as a model for future cooperation between public & private initiative in similar projects” (Naturvation_04: 65).

- **b. Transferability to what kind of contexts has been suggested?**

The context is not specified. This could take place in any major city (capable of hosting such big cultural institutions).

- **c. Who has made the claims?**

The claim of transferring the model of PPP is made by the SNF.

- **d. What limits to transferability to broader contexts have been discussed?**

The prerequisite of establishing such a project (including the use of innovative techniques) is to find private funds (Naturvation_05: 4). However, the document highlights that “this prerequisite (generous funds from a private actor) is however not easily replicated in other projects”.

In addition, concerns have been raised regarding the risks and the loss of autonomy of the Greek State. It seem this kind of governance arrangement will not occur in a city or country having a robust or healthy financial situation because no public actor will accept the terms offered by the foundation: “I think that the fact that it happened in Greece in a moment of crisis was very key to the way things happen” (Interview with P.).

32. In what forms has the learning process, including stories of overcoming obstacles, been recorded for, and/or made accessible to city makers also from elsewhere?[2]

n/a

33. Have any signs of collaboration, support, or inspiration already been reported between actors involved in this intervention and others that follow its example? (e.g. in “follower cities”?)

“Neighbouring municipalities have started to explore ways of capitalising on the new project (the SNFCC) to attract development funding” (Naturvation_05: 4).

j) Structural learning

34. Has the intervention influenced higher-level governance arrangements such that sustainability and justice are considered (together) in a more durable, structural way? In other words, are there any observations about more structural, long-term changes as a result of the intervention?

- For example: new programs run by local councils, new modes of citizen participation, new mediating bodies
- Is there other evidence that the project has contributed to enhancing sustainable and just governance in cities in a general sense?

n/a
k) Reflections on important governance concepts

35. What other aspects of governance, that were not covered above, are important to highlight, too?

n/a

36. From your perspective as a researcher, which word or phrase characterizes this Governance Intervention most concisely? (Please attach your name to the characterization) In other words, what is the biggest takeaway from this intervention about governance arrangements?

For the researcher that studies the project, it is important to highlight that it is a donation under non-negotiable legal terms. It is a very special form of PPP: “it’s like a kind of temporary or a donation but a final outcome of state responsibility” (interview with P.).

Appendix 1: Three modes of governance
(from NATURVATION project)

NATURVATION’s NBS-Atlas distinguishes three categories of governance arrangements (dubbed “management set-ups”):

- Government-led (Gov)
- Co-governance or hybrid governance (mix of responsibilities between government and non-government actors) (c/h)
- Led by non-government actors (NGO)

Alternatively or additionally, the following four modes of governing (as distinguished also by Bulkeley/Kern 2006 and Zvolska et al. 2019) could be used as a typology: Castan Broto/ Bulkeley 2013:95

1. **Self-governing**, intervening in the management of local authority operations to “lead by example”;
2. **Provision**, greening infrastructure and consumer services provided by different authorities;
3. **Regulations**, enforcing new laws, planning regulations, building codes, etc.; and
4. **Enabling**, supporting initiatives led by other actors through information and resource provision and partnerships

Appendix 2: Policy typology
(from NATURVATION project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(administrative, command-and-control)</td>
<td>Mandatory fulfillment of certain requirements by targeted actors</td>
<td>Legislations, regulations, laws, directives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic (financial, market-based)</td>
<td>Financial (dis)incentives to trigger change by providing (new) favourable (or unfavourable) economic conditions for targeted actors</td>
<td>Positive incentives include subsidies, soft loans, tax allowance and procurements. Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incentives are taxes, fees and charges.

**Informative (educational)**

They aim at providing information or knowledge to target actors in order to increase awareness and support informed decision-making accomplish or prevent social change.

Information and awareness raising campaigns, informative leaflets, advertisements in different media.

**Voluntary**

Commitment and/or actions beyond legal requirements, undertaken by private actors and/or non-governmental organisations.

Voluntary actions and agreements.

---

**Footnotes**

1. Background to this question: Our four main criteria for selecting particular Governance Interventions and develop rich descriptions of them were: A) The intervention has been studied in a specific urban context (e.g. city), B) this context is located in Europe (and, preferably, the study was EU-funded), C) the intervention considers to a large extent sustainability AND justice (at least implicitly), and D) it is well-documented, ideally including assumptions or even critical reflections on enablers and barriers to implementation and on transferability (i.e. ‘de-contextualizability’). Additionally, we aimed at a diverse portfolio of domains (see Q2.) and governance modes (see Q5): https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nCPcUd-COIQ1MsBjir20_F1CBbnS-u6HqKH9nNLshivQ/edit?usp=sharing.


4. If easily possible mention sources for your association of roles.


7. Feel free to include learning that has been made available through EU project documentation, intervention initiatives, or other channels. In addition to the forms in which the learning process has been shared with others, please indicate whether the learning process that’s being shared has been recorded in a self-critical/reflexive way.
Annex 4: Preliminary booklet of Enabling Governance Arrangements

The following booklet was provided alongside the agenda in Annex 5 to participants prior to the “Berlin” Arena. It therefore does not contain the final Enabling Governance Arrangements (section 5.3), which include participant inputs from the Arena and have undergone a final review round by UrbanA consortium members.
BOOKLET

This booklet presents the work done by UrbanA partner, the University of Freiburg, on governance for sustainable and just cities. It also serves as the basis of discussions and debates at the “Berlin” Arena.

There’s no obligation to read it all, but please have a scroll through to familiarise yourself with the definitions in the glossary, and keep this booklet close-by during the Arena.

You’ll find links to short explanatory videos and colourful vignettes (by Carlotta Cataldi) as well, to make the pages fly by!

ABOUT URBANA

Urban Arenas for Sustainable and Just Cities is a three-year H2020 EU-funded project to map, assess, distil and communicate a portfolio of approaches and tools to city-makers, in order to support them in transforming their cities into sustainable, just, and thriving urban and peri-urban environments. Our goal is to synthesize and transfer knowledge, breaking silos and building new networks for transformative change.
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### GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>All the formal and informal political processes (involving communities, civil society, public, and private actors) that aim to enable and direct collective action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Interventions</td>
<td>A set of real-world initiatives analysed by UrbanA that simultaneously promote environmental sustainability and justice, and which were observed and/or supported by EU-funded projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Scenarios</td>
<td>A set of abstract narratives, based on individual Governance Interventions, which aim to a) inspire city makers to think outside the box, and b) point them to detailed, context-specific information on the intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Governance Arrangements</td>
<td>A combination of actor constellations and institutional settings that were identified as being supportive of multiple real-world initiatives for sustainability and justice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION TO ENABLING GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

Building on the work done within the Rotterdam Arena (approaches to just and sustainable cities) and the Barcelona Arena (drivers of injustice), the “Berlin” Arena aims to support governance for just and sustainable cities by digging into how to guide collective action towards sustainable and just cities.

The overall aim of this phase of UrbanA is to identify principles, political structures and processes that can support a shift towards more sustainable and just cities. Such supportive principles, political structures and processes, may be established e.g. at the level of neighborhoods, municipalities, nation states, or transnationally (e.g. in EU funding programmes).

In preparation, the University of Freiburg has conducted an in-depth analysis of eleven Governance Interventions, featured in previous EU-funded projects, which aimed to improve urban sustainability and justice. On this empirical basis, including interviews with practitioners, ten Governance Scenarios and six Enabling Governance Arrangements were created.

Our wiki page holds all three types of these outputs.

Both the Governance Scenarios and the Enabling Governance Arrangements emphasize positive processes and interactions between different communities, municipalities, civil society and the private sector, that could be inspirational and potentially ‘translated’ across contexts, in various cities, to build sustainable and just urban futures. However, possible dangers or trade-offs associated with these arrangements are communicated as well.

Feedback on the Governance Scenarios was collected at the pre-“Berlin” Arena webinar. The Arena, and this booklet, focuses on the Enabling Governance Arrangements.
As explained in the video, the six Enabling Governance Arrangements arose out of actor constellations and processes that helped initiatives achieve positive outcomes for urban sustainability and justice. They are essentially patterns that were identified as enabling positive change in multiple initiatives.

While these Enabling Governance Arrangements show a potential applicability in several different contexts, it is not claimed that these arrangements will produce positive outcomes in all contexts or are the sole factors for bringing interventions to fruition. Rather, they need to be applied cautiously and adapted to local conditions.

On the following pages you will find six Enabling Governance Arrangements described with examples, critical reflections, and connections to the Covid-19 pandemic.
1) Create a comprehensive vision of change

Check out our two-minute video by clicking on the image, below:

![Video Thumb] #1 CREATE A COMPREHENSIVE VISION OF CHANGE

General ambition

A comprehensive vision of change is most influential when developed at multiple levels of governance, ranging from municipality-level visions to local visions for communities. While these visions encompass different scales and sectors, their convergence is important for supporting positive change. Visioning can include both abstract, deliberative processes about big questions, as well as practical details about specific projects.

1. Broad, Integrated Visions: A comprehensive vision of change towards sustainability and justice for an entire city can be built by integrating several small-scale interventions from different sectors. This can manifest itself in policies and laws. Key to this Enabling Governance Arrangement is therefore the interaction between different scales of urban planning and policy making.

2. Bottom-up, Community Visions: Community-based organizations can generate grassroots visions of change based on collecting residents’ goals, ambitions, and images of the future.
Examples

Addressing the first dimension

Superblocks, Barcelona

When creating and implementing so-called “Superblocks” in the city, Barcelona embedded them in multiple city-level policies. Very important, for example, was the “Citizen Commitment for Sustainability” which was first signed in 2002 by over 800 public, private and civil-society organisations. Superblocks are one of the several actions that are defined in the document and consequently, experience public support. In general, Superblocks are connected to different policies e.g the Municipal Action Plan, the Barcelona Mobility Pact (1998), the Urban Mobility Plan of Barcelona (2013-2018), the city’s Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Plan (until 2020) or the Barcelona Commitment to Climate, which creates synergies and gives the city a vision for comprehensive change, including Superblocks as one of the many means of reaching that change.

Addressing the second dimension

Vauban neighborhood, Freiburg

Vauban’s prospective residents as well as project proponents developed a shared vision on how to live in a more sustainable way i.e. parking free areas, sustainable mobility, affordable and inclusive housing etc. This shared vision was possible because of a convergence between municipal priorities and community aspirations for the new district.

Carnisse neighborhood, Rotterdam

In workshops organized by local organizations, residents were invited to develop a shared vision of the district redevelopment and establish an agenda for transformative and experimental actions e.g. create a community center, a shared garden etc.

Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance

Broad, integrated visions may overcome injustices caused by Unfit institutional structures and Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration. Unfit institutional structures as a driver of injustice refers to those aspects or functions of organizations, public offices, administrations and authorities that deal with urban governance and stand in the way of achieving just outcomes in urban sustainability. Uneven and exclusionary urban intensification and regeneration as a driver of injustice refers to the ways in which new urban developments might force trade-offs between the social and environmental goals of urban sustainability projects. It involves public efforts to improve a neighbourhood’s physical structure and boost its economy by attracting investment, usually in the sectors of real estate and tourism. In this Enabling Governance Arrangement, finding a balance between ecological sustainability, social and economic goals of a city is especially
important, as a comprehensive vision built on integrated planning should guide
the city in balancing these goals. Community organizations that actively work in a certain
neighbourhood may be better positioned to include voices of underrepresented groups in their area than
a municipality-led participatory process. Expressing a vision of the future through
different types of exercises (e.g. drawing) can empower certain groups (e.g. children
or people not speaking the same language) that otherwise might not have the
ability to express themselves in other types of settings. Thinking about how you
want your personal future to look like and how a project can help to reach that
future has a huge potential in connecting individuals to one another, in fostering a
sense of belonging and in generating momentum.

Critical reflection

A potential barrier to benefitting from a previously developed comprehensive
vision of change lies in its actual implementation in small scale interventions. There
is sometimes a gap between what is happening in smaller-scale-projects and with
bigger visions (and policies) as economic considerations often dominate the design
and implementation of even sustainability-oriented small-scale projects, leading to
ecologically unsustainable or unjust outcomes, also on a city-wide level. The
challenge then is not only the development of a comprehensive vision of change,
but to also empower it to actually shape small-scale interventions. Additionally, developing a comprehensive vision of change is a significant task that
community projects take upon themselves. It requires investing resources that
cannot at the same time go directly into changes in the project itself. Talking about
where to go with a project in the longer term at the cost of working less towards
tangible improvements also requires commitment, effort and belief. Especially
community projects that completely rely on voluntary work might not have the
capacity to do this. Projects therefore need to find a good balance between
thinking about a vision for their project and actively working to achieve tangible
results.

In some cases, different stakeholders may have conflicting visions of an area, or
initiative. There is even a risk, for example, for conflicting visions to create tension
between social and ecological priorities. In such a case, project managers would be
required to avoid a zero-sum game situation and instead work towards a solution
that addresses social priorities without compromising ecological sustainability.

Further examples

**Collserola Natural Park, Barcelona**

Striking a balance between dual goals of biodiversity protection and fulfilling local
citizens’ demand for greater access to green spaces and recreational activities was
very important for the Park. The Special Plan for the Protection of the Natural
Environment and Landscape of Collserola Mountain (PepNat) responded to the
challenge of preserving biodiversity while providing much needed recreational
ecosystem services, especially in relation to the high density of population in surrounding areas.

How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?

Under social distancing regulations, community projects cannot meet as normal and face restrictions when doing so. Online formats may not offer a good substitute especially considering the spirit that some community projects rely upon as well, thus making the development of a comprehensive vision of change harder.
2) Make space for adaptation and experimentation

Check out our two-minute video by clicking on the image, below:

General ambition

Adaptability within initiatives for sustainable and just cities means leaving space for careful modifications and detours along their path to fulfilling overarching visions. In other words, initiatives may benefit from continuously and collectively deciding how much they are willing to adapt their plans based on new information and circumstances. Therefore, adaptability requires regular internal reflection amongst initiative proponents on shifting political, social, ecological and economic conditions, as well as on new developments and knowledge from within the project. Openness to adaptation entails striking a balance between unresponsive devotion to pre-set agendas and a lack of persistence with decisions that have been made. A reflexive approach to adaptability can support initiatives' efforts to remain viable, gain influence, and stick to their transformative ideas. In many cases, a rudimentary level of adaptability is required to keep initiatives afloat amongst disadvantageous circumstances, such as the removal of important subsidies. In others, flexibility in short-term agendas may allow initiatives to take advantage of beneficial windows of opportunity.

While this type of adaptability is reactive, many innovative experiences benefit from proactively adopting an experimental approach to project design and implementation. An experimental mindset uses a “probe and learn” approach and allows room for mistakes and new developments, while still working towards long-term visions. Such a mindset can be embodied in an organization’s culture and structures. A critical mass of initiative proponents who uphold an experimental ethos will allow for more learning opportunities and creative ways to tackle seemingly unchangeable injustices and unsustainable practices.
Examples

**Carnisse neighborhood, Rotterdam**

Project proponents (mostly local organizations) had an overall vision of the project development but it was not set in stone. The idea was to translate an existing methodology about transition management and to make it custom fit to the local context. For instance, the creation of a community center was not planned in advance and was envisioned and initiated by local stakeholders. The project consortium was given a “carte blanche” for developing and experimenting with the Resilience Lab. Whereas most funded projects are predefined and have to follow a pre-established framework, the freedom given to the consortium partners enabled them to progressively develop and adapt their methodology to the local context. This freedom was crucial to the success of the Reliance Lab. The Resilience Lab was thus a “test bed for new methodologies and innovative practices”.

**Holistic neighbourhood development, Augustenborg**

An experimental approach was crucial; not being too uptight and learning from mistakes. This allowed for a great degree of adaptivity in the project. In the beginning of the project, many people shared this experimental mindset. However, when certain people were no longer involved in the project (e.g due to changes in department heads) and were replaced by others without this mentality, flexibility and adaptability started to get lost in the chain of command. Flexibility in project implementation thus disappeared when the critical mass of people no longer held a shared sense of responsibility and were more afraid of making mistakes.

**Bürger Energie Berlin, Berlin**

When energy company Vattenfall filed a lawsuit against the Berlin government's decision on remunicipalisation, there were high chances of the situation disfavouring BEB. Thus, to stay relevant and to achieve their overarching goal of green electricity production and provision, BEB is reinventing itself and working on numerous other projects including solar energy production. A BEB representative in an interview stated, ‘...adapting to the circumstances is very important because overtime ... circumstances change a lot. You have to constantly reflect whether your vision is still relevant and up to date and do we need to adapt and can we carry on'.

**Community land trust, Brussels**

While they try to develop standardized procedures when possible, the Land Trust team claims that it is essential to reflect upon and adapt to internal learning and external change: “We are constantly reflecting on things... For every part of the operation we regularly rethink how to do it. This happens at the level of the team, and also on the level of our working groups, partner associations, experts and other stakeholders, and the level of our board." (Interview with practitioner). Furthermore, from the beginning, the Brussels Capital Region, a major financial supporter of the Land Trust, was responsive to the initiative’s interests, allowing it space to develop its innovative ideas.
Vauban neighbourhood, Freiburg

“The municipality also implemented the principle of “Planning that Learns,” meaning that pilot initiatives would be experimented before being widely enforced. A prime example of this principle is the mobility concept of Vauban, which was first operated in one third of the district before being implemented in the whole neighborhood (Interview with practitioner).”

Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance

Adaptability in project design and implementation allows for responsiveness to changing social and economic conditions and better-positions initiatives to meet the shifting needs of those it serves. This governance arrangement attempts to address unfit institutional structures. The “unfit institutional structures” refer to the strict top-down approaches which limit knowledge generation and exchange, and to rigid bureaucracies and regulatory barriers which often result in sustainability policies that fail to address the realities of vulnerable residents. Furthermore, experimental mindsets may allow for more innovative thinking around how to tackle injustice, based on ideas from various actors, including local residents. This could help in finding solutions which would not arise from more risk/mistake-averse approaches to project design and implementation.

Critical reflection

When initiatives adapt too well to an environment that is structurally unsustainable and unjust, they risk to lose their transformative potential and integrity, e.g. as a ‘counter model’. Calls for adaptability can also help to pursue other agendas under the disguise of vague commitments to sustainability and justice. Due to flexibility in the design and implementation also unanticipated costs and challenges may incur. Furthermore, projects working with vulnerable groups may be more risk averse and try to minimize risk and experimentation to avoid harming these people (i.e. low-income residents developing social housing, can’t allow room for mistakes) (Interview with practitioner). It is rare that initiatives receive funding with “no-strings attached”, and instead most funded projects are predefined and have to follow a pre-established framework, consequently limiting adaptability. Therefore, funding may be contingent on measurement of progress with regards to reaching predefined goals. While stoically sticking to a present agenda might limit creative opportunities for overcoming problems, being “too flexible” could give an impression of incompetence and disarray, therefore reducing stakeholder confidence and commitment to the project.
How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?

This governance arrangement is essential for initiatives operating in the context of COVID-19 – a time of great economic and social uncertainty. The global pandemic necessitates a basic level of flexibility, as adaptation of many aspects, from daily activities to long-term strategic planning, may be essential for a project’s survival. Going forward, this situation presents a strong case for "building-in" opportunities for flexibility by leaving space for contingency plans, and encourages an experimental mindset to explore new ways of flourishing under vastly different circumstances.
3) Build bridges between separate stakeholder groups

Check out our two-minute video by clicking on the image, below:

---

General ambition

Metaphorically building bridges between separate groups of stakeholders often requires the establishment of formal or informal roles (institutionalisation) for individuals or organisations to intermediate, broker information and translate language between different stakeholders of a project. Such “intermediaries” play a crucial role by translating and enabling communication e.g. between civil society groups and governmental actors in order to realize a joint project. They have to be recognised in a way that both civil society groups and institutional/municipal actors feel heard and valued and thus build trust in stakeholders which follow different rationales and have developed different cultures of interaction.

More important than how exactly the intermediary operates is its function, which at its core is often about enabling communication and furthering democratic participation on a decentralised, local level. Therefore an intermediary can be of different nature e.g a single project manager, a committee/platform, an open-meeting space, a dedicated organisation or even a well respected community member. In some cases, like in the fourth example below from London, local governments can also serve and work as an intermediary between different stakeholders. Such bridging roles are not exclusively found between institutional actors and citizens. Connecting/ translating language/ and intermediating between interests of different departments within a municipality can be equally important (to break up ‘silos’ or to counter ‘compartmentalization’).
Examples

**Anti-gentrification resistance, Rome**

The role of anti-eviction platforms was crucial as they contributed to voice the claim and to represent the interests of evicted/targeted citizens. The anti-eviction platforms liaised between them and the municipality as well as the Housing Authority. However, they did not have a formal role in influencing policy making.

**Vauban neighborhood, Freiburg**

The “Vauban city planning council” was a consultative committee consisting of municipal actors, local parliamentarians and citizens. It can be considered as an intermediary as it was a place for discussion and mediation between stakeholders.

**Bürger Energie Berlin, Berlin**

There have been changes in terms of changing how the energy system can be imagined, who owns it and who participates in it. Political documents for example the coalition agreement in Berlin have some changes, particular attention has been given to citizens' participation in the energy sector. Now there is also legislation for tenants' energy self-consumption models which the citizen energy movement has contributed to (Interview with practitioner).

**Inner-city community energy, London**

The local government, Lambeth Council, which had a small group running a Low Carbon Zone served as an intermediary organization in the beginning which helped the team organize themselves and contact other relevant groups. The enabling configuration is the connectedness of this Council to various groups in the area. However, this group was small and had minimal capacity.

**Community land trust, Brussels**

The Community Land Trust in Brussels is a social real estate developer that builds affordable housing projects on collectively-owned land in Brussels for people with limited means. Collaboration between separate stakeholder groups is integral to the project as its managing board consists of civil society/housing organisations, private firms, social enterprises and the local government.

**Superblocks, Barcelona**

In several neighbourhoods, multi-stakeholder decision making processes have been formalized in local, regular working groups that are steering the design for their Superblocks. This was a result of the lack of participation processes in Poblenou and the municipality retroactively realizing that individual Superblocks have to be adapted to local particularities. The working groups also serve promotional purposes e.g. presenting the Municipal Action Plan to residents and engaging citizens, local associations, and local economy. They also try to find agreements between different voices and stakeholder interests.
Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance

This Enabling Governance Arrangement tries to overcome injustices caused mostly by the Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities as well as Unfit institutional structures.

Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities as a driver of injustice refers to the ways in which (access to) useful information and know-how around sustainable urban interventions, and their benefits, is not shared effectively or equally among social groups, sectors or disciplines and thus constrain the potential for both sustainability and justice. Creating bridging roles can help in overcoming barriers that certain disadvantaged groups might have, especially concerning the access to useful information of urban development projects around sustainability and justice. By translating the language of practitioners.academia to one that disadvantaged groups can connect to in a better way, they can also express their needs and potential fears around these projects furthering especially procedural justice as well as justice as recognition.

Unfit institutional structures as a driver of injustice refers to those aspects or functions of organizations, public offices, administrations and authorities that deal with urban governance and stand in the way of achieving just outcomes in urban sustainability. Trying to bridge between e.g. different municipal departments is key to overcoming silo-thinking and for the development of projects that integrate justice in urban sustainability governance. Institutionalising a role to translate language between municipal actors and underrepresented groups is also central when trying to commit to a meaningful participatory process.

Critical reflection

As mentioned, intermediaries have to meaningfully consider voices of all involved stakeholders of a project. They therefore possess a very powerful role, as they can steer the project in certain directions by favoring some voices over others. This is especially important in justice-oriented sustainability governance as the past decades have shown that certain entrenched interests (economic, class-based, race-based…) have been given priority in urban governance. This means that intermediaries have to know about types of barriers that different groups of underrepresented citizens might face. These barriers can be very unique for e.g. women, children, undereducated/poor residents or people who are underrepresented because of their race. Sometimes, exclusion of underrepresented voices may therefore even happen with intermediaries that are supposed to include very different groups of citizens, as it is very difficult to recognise these barriers if you come from a position of power yourself. Intermediators may also play a highly problematic role if they disguise or downplay actual differences in objectives between different actors (e.g. achieving ‘green growth’ vs. ‘overcoming capitalism’) for the sake of harmony, a feeling of common purpose or the success of tangible projects. Furthermore, intermediaries are not
always neutral/impartial. They might be biased toward one type of institutional logic (or a way of doing things) or toward the priorities of the intermediary host (or “bridging platform”). This may cause conflict and undermine the bridging efforts. Finally, a general issue that stands in the way of more just and sustainable cities is the project by project basis on which municipalities operate. This prevents long-term improvement of projects and leads to the repetition of similar mistakes, also related to stakeholder communication processes. Intermediaries, which are exposed to a variety of voices inside their cities, need to outlive singular projects and act as the long-term memory of the city, possibly as an institutionalised entity. This would truly improve not only communication between citizens and municipalities, but also between different departments inside the municipality itself - breaking up compartmentalization.

Further examples

**Holistic neighborhood development, Augustenborg**

In Augustenborg, Malmö, each city department has its own unit designed for community engagement (e.g the Highway and Parks department, the Culture department...). On a city level, these units can be brought together through an intermediary organization connecting neighbours, the city, housing companies, local companies. These departments could then become the core of long-term structured development processes, acting as an institutionalized intermediary and memory while transferring knowledge in and between cities.

**Vauban neighborhood, Freiburg**

The collaboration between citizens and the municipality was not always easy because each group had to adapt to the institutional logic of the others. For instance, when a joint working group of city administration, parliamentarians and civil society organisations invited a representative of Forum Vauban to take over a permanent seat in a consulting role, Forum Vauban welcomed this decision of the city as a step of opening up to hear their perspectives. Nevertheless they were not always satisfied, because the citizens were expected to adapt fully to the logic of urban planning as it prevailed in the city administration.

How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?

Institutions and processes that rely on different people to meet are facing restrictions concerning the number of people that can participate or even making meetings impossible at all. Purely switching to online formats does not seem feasible here as these bridging organizations build on low-entry barriers. Online meetings/formats could be a higher hurdle especially for older or less educated people as well as people who do not speak the language properly making the work of bridging roles more difficult.
#4 COMMIT TO A MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION PROCESS
4) Commit to a meaningful participation process

Check out our two-minute video by clicking on the image, below:

General ambition

Meaningful participation means that citizens’ inputs are seriously considered in inclusive design and governance processes, that they visibly shape initiatives’ outcomes, and thus can influence the status quo in urban sustainability and justice. Such a process is also cognisant of who is invited and capable of participating, since otherwise it runs the risk of becoming a further driver of injustice. Committing to a meaningful participation process is important for both municipality-led and community-led initiatives. Depending on the topic, meaningful participation might mean something different. For mostly technical topics (e.g. the building of a stormwater system), the goal of a meaningful participation process could be to create a dialogue with residents to give the possibility for expressing potential doubts and misconceptions. This might then offer the opportunity and resources for residents to be made co-responsible for other aspects of the project. Participation processes have to be aware that engagement might decline over time if no physical outcomes of the participation can be seen in the area. Additionally, institutions have to commit long-term to the process in order to build up trust and give residents the belief that their own time and energy investment is not wasted but is part of a long-term vision to change the area positively.

1. On the side of municipalities: Municipal actors need to acknowledge and embrace the value of citizen participation in project development and trust civil-society in visioning and implementing projects. This type of collaborative governance entails a clear definition of roles and responsibilities and could even mean seeing each other as equally legitimate to engage in the project as partners (e.g. between municipal actors and citizens).

2. On the side of civil society: Committing to a meaningful participation process in bottom-up initiatives can also entail a thoughtful mix of deliberative and practical approaches to citizen participation. Practical, ‘hands on’ participation opportunities can help make projects more inclusive as they allow for people from diverse backgrounds to contribute. Public participation in the form of volunteering can be crucial for the initiative’s operation and legitimacy.
Examples

1. On the side of municipalities
   Vauban neighborhood, Freiburg

The citizen-led Vauban Forum was invited to participate in the “Vauban city planning council” (a consultative committee within the city council) which indicates that the municipality recognizes citizens as legitimate partners in the project development.

Holistic neighbourhood development, Augustenborg

In Augustenborg, all physical changes were discussed in advance with residents, giving them the possibility to express their suggestions and observations, thereby having the possibility to adjust and modify the plan. All actions were agreed on together with residents. Some aspects of the project were co-designed by residents, as they were considered as experts and bearers of specific and territorially grounded knowledge. In total, approximately 20% of the residents participated in the project. Several of their ideas were implemented into the neighbourhood, such as developing the open storm water system in a more natural process that enhances the area’s urban biodiversity Key here was to strike a good balance between short-term change of the area (where residents see fast changes as a result of their own participation) and long-term commitment of institutions (so residents see a bigger vision behind the project and feel like their time and energy will contribute to something greater).

2. On the side of civil society
   Inner-city community energy, London

Citizens have been the founders and drivers of the intervention from the very beginning. The intervention’s cooperative structure relies upon community engagement in order to function (financial investment, regular meetings, decision-making etc.) and the intervention engages with a wider community base in order to address energy poverty and provide opportunities for employment and learning. Additionally, further consultation with local residents informed the initiative’s problem definition (deliberative approach), and hands-on involvement (practical approach) in the creation of solar panels and internships led to increased interest and participation.

Community land trust, Brussels

Future building residents are essential actors in the planning process. From a very early stage they are central in visioning and realizing the creation of their future community land trust home. Furthermore, residents make up one third of the Trust’s board members.

Carnisse neighborhood, Rotterdam
To make the project more inclusive, project proponents developed two types of participation methods and invited residents to engage in a more deliberative one (e.g. visioning the district) and more practical one (e.g. developing activities in the community center and community garden).

*Bürger Energie Berlin, Berlin*

Bürger Energie Berlin would not have been able to establish and grow the way it did without the contribution of volunteers. Most are students, mainly graduates from the field of renewable energies, but there are also retirees who want to use their free time to help the cooperative. According to an interviewee, “Among the most important factors for the cooperative being alive and working to realize its goals is that we have a lot of people as volunteers giving their time and putting in their efforts [...] The two general managers are essentially doing what needs to be done from coordinating all the activities to implementing new ideas and doing all the nitty gritty and everything. However, that wouldn't have been possible without the larger membership base that is gradually increasing”.

*Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance*

Committing to a meaningful participation process should help overcome one driver of injustice previously explored by UrbanA, **Limited citizen participation in urban planning**. This refers to the limited involvement and engagement of citizens and citizens’ initiatives in decision-making around the planning, design, implementation and/or evaluation of urban sustainability-oriented interventions. By increasing the opportunity for serious consideration of citizens’ needs and desires, as well as providing the chance to take an active part in shaping initiatives, the status quo of urban sustainability and injustice can be called into question. This also means reducing barriers to participation for specific marginalized groups, such as single parents or low-income individuals, by providing childcare options or some form of financial compensation for their time. This effort can help increase procedural and representational justice in urban sustainability governance.

*Critical reflection*

Participation processes can be a driver of injustice if they are not planned very carefully to foster inclusivity, but are, for example, ignorant of who is invited and capable of participating. Participation can be reliant on the capacity of citizens to self-organize and advocate for their interests. If participatory processes do not include marginalized voices and their priorities, outcomes will not be socially just. In some cases, participation is reliant on the capacity of citizens to self-organize and advocate for their interests from a logistical perspective, meaningful participation processes can be costly and time intensive, and therefore not feasible for initiatives with limited financial resources. In a required participatory society, the need to organise participatory processes can risk placing extra burden on those who take part and shift responsibilities from the public to private realms, especially if municipalities do not have the resources to organise such processes themselves.
Further examples

Vauban neighborhood, Freiburg

In Vauban, housing was primarily accessible to homeowners rather than to tenants. Indeed, about 76% of the district is dedicated to homeowners (including cooperatives). However, becoming an owner is not accessible to everyone because it entails very high entry costs. Additionally, building one’s own house takes a lot of time (at least 5 years), which not everybody can afford.

Carnisse neighborhood, Rotterdam

The Resilience Lab took place in the context of withdrawal of the state welfare structures and financial support by redirecting the responsibility to the local inhabitants and citizens. In that sense, the Resilience Lab is a solution given the context of a required “participatory society”.

How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?

Under Covid-19, in-person activities have been severely restricted, which naturally limits participation processes. While online methods such as participation apps, surveys, and video conferencing may be able to make up for some of the loss, and possibly make participation more accessible for some, like for example, mobility-impaired individuals, the lack of in-person gatherings makes meaningful and truly inclusive participation processes more challenging. This is especially true for participatory initiatives which include, and/or rely on, collective in-person involvement from volunteers.
Enabling Governance Arrangements

5. Tap into Existing Community Networks
5) Tap into existing community networks

Check out our two-minute video by clicking on the image, below:

---

General ambition

Emerging initiatives need to ensure they connect to and learn from existing community networks that are working on similar issues. This can involve the sharing of (human) resources, learning from individuals from community initiatives elsewhere, and knowledge sharing about organizational structures, problem solving, and electronic tools. Consulting experts in the field could also be important here, especially in the beginning of a project. It can also be helpful for initiatives to tap into networks that have experience in similarly structured interventions or share a common ideology. Beyond learning outcomes, this could provide an integral basis of support for emerging projects.

Learning from other communities can support emerging initiatives with the resources and expertise to increase their legitimacy and gain political and public support. There is also much to gain for organizations to teach others: sharing knowledge with newer projects strengthens networks within and between communities, bolsters an organization's reputation and legitimacy, and offers opportunities for additional organizational support.

Examples

Foodsharing, Berlin

Foodsharing groups tapped into the resources of the national network to develop locally, especially they used the same online platform as well as the same principles and organizational structure. Social resources were also used to gain legitimacy as Foodsharing is well known in the food sector. This helped regional groups to develop partnerships with food retailers of supermarkets or possibly to gain support from local institutional actors, such as community centers, as hosts for public fridges. Moreover, Foodsharing was able to successfully become established in Berlin because there was already a thriving sharing economy in the city. Tapping into communities engaged in sharing economies for services, mobility, clothing, etc. provided the adequate public engagement foodsharing needs. Lastly, Foodsharing has been able to extend beyond its organizational network to support initiatives starting up elsewhere. The group YUnity originates from Foodsharing.
and develops online platforms and tools that enable others to start their own food sharing network.

**Vauban neighborhood, Freiburg**

Housing Cooperative Networks in Germany inspired, to some extent, Vauban project proponents. Specifically, they benefited from the expertise of the cooperative confederation regarding economy, law and tax policy.

**Community land trust, Brussels**

The ability of many (15) community associations to self-organize and present a united appeal for the establishment of the CLTB was very important for the intervention’s emergence. Additionally, CLTB learned from experiences in experiments for alternative affordable housing in and outside of Brussels.

**Bürger Energie Berlin, Berlin**

BEB is supported by a large number of alliances including cooperatives, ethical banks and renewable energy companies. The cooperative expanded fast in numbers and donations through synergies with the networks established by other energy cooperatives and movements in the field of energy and politics. Schönau Cooperative EWS has been instrumental in the success of BEB by passing on knowledge and expertise. Whereas, in order to reach out to people and inform them about the cooperative they worked together with the media, a network summit called “NetzGipfel”, and took part in demonstrations and other events to inform people about their initiative and to get more participants.

**Superblocks, Barcelona**

The Urban Ecology Agency is led by Superblocks visionaire Salvador Rueda, and was an important source of expertise in designing and implementing this project in Barcelona. The City Council also engaged multiple community networks through the creation of neighborhood working groups. Local residents and stakeholders were important representatives. Their participation supported the design of individual Superblocks with respect to the neighborhood’s character and was critical for gaining public support of the project.

**Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance**

This Enabling Governance Arrangement tries to overcome injustices caused mostly by the Weak(ened) civil society and Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities as well as Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism.

Weak(ened) civil society as a driver of injustice refers to the ways in which collective civic groups that share common interests (other than the state, the market, or the family) are either not constituted and impactful enough to influence and benefit from sustainability efforts or are indeed constrained by interventions that carry sustainability objectives. Tapping into resources of existing community networks
can reinforce and strengthen the organization and help access the benefit of sustainability efforts. Furthermore, forming alliances with other movements increases legitimacy as well as (generally) public support which helps to overcome regulatory or political barriers.

Lack of effective knowledge brokerage and stewardship opportunities as a driver of injustice refers to the ways in which (access to) useful information and know-how around sustainable urban interventions, and their benefits, is not shared effectively or equally among social groups, sectors or disciplines and thus constrain the potential for both sustainability and justice. Tapping into resources of existing community networks includes sharing information and skills. It allows grassroots groups to stay informed and to learn about sustainability urban interventions and increases opportunities to engage and benefit from them.

Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism as a driver of injustice refers to processes of privatization, commercialization, budget cuts and state withdrawal from various sectors and how they can undermine urban sustainability, guided by an ideology of unfettered economic growth which often aligns with austerity policies. Creating alliances with other community networks can provide grassroots initiatives with resources (human, financial or organizational) from which they are deprived. However, in this context, relying on internal community resources may be at risk of reinforcing the roll back of the state, that is, the delegation of regalian responsibilities to citizens and to voluntarily-run organizations.

This Enabling Governance Arrangement is also related to the approach of Co-learning and knowledge brokerage as it aims to facilitate the circulation of ideas, understandings and cutting-edge research across a diverse set of actors in society.

Critical reflection
Connecting closely to already existing initiatives may deprive newly emerging initiatives of their distinctive and innovative character and may limit their appeal to particular social groups. Another downside of this Enabling Governance Arrangement is that it may contribute to a roll-back of the state. Strong community networks operating in a certain domain (food, housing etc.) can alleviate state deficiencies. As far as they replace the state in its responsibility to organize the provision e.g. of sufficient food or housing, such initiatives may be instrumentalized in line with a neoliberal logic by compensating or even fostering a roll-back of the state. This relates to the driver of injustice: Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism. Also, it cannot be assumed that initiatives are willing to share their information or novel expertise if they perceive others as potential “competitors” (for public funding, participants, etc.). Furthermore, since many initiatives for sustainable and just cities are unique “trailblazers”, the advice from other community groups may be limited. Much of the learning has to still come from the context of the initiative itself.

Further examples
**Inner-city community energy, London**

As a pioneer organization, Repowering London offers professional services such as legal, structural, financial, and marketing aid, to other upcoming community energy projects. However, there is an ongoing internal debate regarding what information Repowering is willing to open-source and what they maintain as exclusive expertise that should be protected. Furthermore, Repowering had limited expertise to draw from in the sector and therefore had to learn through the process of innovation. From an interview: “It wasn't like we got an answer from other people and they helped us out. It was the other way around. We trail-blazed the whole sector” (Interview with practitioner).

How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?

In the context of the pandemic, some public institutions engaged in supporting a variety of economic sectors but did not provide adequate assistance in many social sectors. Civil-society organizations have complemented deficiencies in public social assistance especially in the sector of food and housing by providing meals or temporary housing for those in need. Tapping into resources of existing community networks provides such emerging local initiatives with 'internal' resources (i.e. as internal to the community) that the public sector is unable to provide them with. This support allows community groups to survive and pursue sustainability and justice goals in cities in a context of selective governmental interventions.
#6 Develop Resilient and Self-Sufficient Financing Arrangements
6) Develop resilient, and self-sufficient financing arrangements

Check out our two-minute video by clicking on the image, below:

**General ambition**

Many community-led initiatives for sustainable and just cities rely on public funding (subsidies, grants etc) to carry out their activities. But changing political priorities and economic crises can restrict this funding. Developing a financial arrangement that contains a well thought-out value proposition, delivery, and capture, as well as considering the model's risks, such as being tied to single sources of funding, will make them more resilient in the face of austerity. However, this is no easy task, since many community-led projects serve low-income residents and cannot rely on them to finance it. Additionally, since funding sources and business models (often) also reflect the values of the organization using them, community-led organizations and projects may have to think carefully about accepting funding from bigger institutions, as it potentially may conflict with their own political views and environmental and societal goals. But high quality interventions can also be relatively low-cost, both in start-up costs or in upkeep, which reduces risk of investment without reducing potential positive impact.

**Examples**

*Inner-city community energy, London*

After the steep decline and cancellation of the FIT subsidy for community energy, Repowering London sought out alternatives such as private investment and conducted pilot projects for a peer-to-peer energy trading system. Repowering took measures to reduce exclusion of low-income residents and energy beneficiaries by keeping the threshold investment for members relatively low, around £50. By making the project more inclusive with low barriers to entry, community workshops, and open general meetings, they were also able to increase their community basis and strengthen their community funding sources. They also created a Community Energy Efficiency fund for non-investors, further increasing alternative revenue streams.

*Foodsharing, Berlin*
Foodsharing is run by unpaid volunteers, including developers, foodsharers and foodsavers and refuses any public funding or subsidies. Relying on their own resources is part of the political line of the organization as it tries to operate without financial transactions. Foodsharing members promote the “free”.

**Community land trust, Brussels**

Although CLTB faces obstacles in growing their budget in tandem with their organization, their revenue streams are highly diverse and thus could be resilient enough to maintain stability if one funding source dries up. While 40% of their budget relies on government subsidies, the other 60% comes from a variety of grants, household mortgages, membership fees, ground leases, crowdfunding, and donations. Importantly, CLTB launched the cooperative “Common Ground” in January 2021, which partners with the social economy sector to attract private and citizen finance for land purchases and management under the CLT model. Finally, the CLTB's first project was their pilot, but with a business model proven successful they can be eligible for additional, long-term support.

**Superblocks, Barcelona**

The Superblocks interventions are seen as a relatively low-cost, high-impact initiative. The highest expenditures were attributed to upfront costs for construction and reworking city transport, with little additional costs for maintenance. Furthermore, because the Superblocks project is embedded in many other sustainability and development plans in Barcelona, their funding source is relatively secure.

**Relation to justice in urban sustainability governance**

Developing resilient and self-sufficient financial arrangements for urban sustainability and justice initiatives may address the consequences of Unquestioned Neoliberal growth and austerity urbanism, a driver of injustice previously explored by UrbanA. This refers to processes of privatization, commercialization, budget cuts and state withdrawal from various sectors. While this arrangement does not address the root causes of neoliberal austerity urbanism, it may lessen its impact on urban sustainability and justice by enabling initiatives to remain financially viable and therefore to continue their operations. However, special care will need to be taken to ensure that these financial schemes do not exclude low-income groups who cannot afford to pay for the benefits of the initiative themselves and are of little relevance to potential sponsors.

**Critical reflection**

While developing a financial arrangement that is able to remain viable amongst public funding cuts and other ripple effects of economic crises may make an initiative more resilient and therefore able to continue delivering its benefits to communities, it may set a precedent for underfunding similar initiatives, thus downplaying responsibility for collective welfare. In other words, public authorities may be tempted to limit public funding and support in the future if they see that
organizations can “make it on their own”. This could in turn reinforce the driver of injustice which the arrangement is trying to circumnavigate. There is also a risk that projects in low-income communities cannot afford to financially support initiatives nor gain the necessary start-up investment if the project is untested. Community members may be hesitant to invest in a project without a sense of trust that they will receive a return-on-investment.

**Further examples**

*Inner-city community energy, London*

One notable obstacle was the difficulty raising funds (£58,000) from community members for their first solar installment (BES1). Since it was a new project, with no track record, individuals were hesitant to invest. Additionally, while many made pledges, this proved not to be a reliable indicator of actual financial support. Once BES1 was established, it was easier to find investors for the others because the community had more trust in the organization and had seen an instance of success.

**How does this enabling arrangement play out under the conditions of a pandemic?**

The Covid-19 crisis has highlighted the importance of developing resilient financial arrangements for any initiative. In such a crisis, sources of funding are directed to new immediate priorities, such as health care and social supports, meanwhile governments around the world wrack up huge debts. In the long-run, economic recovery stimulus may be positive for urban sustainability and justice initiatives if it is directed towards a just green recovery.
**CLOSING REMARKS**

You made it to the end! Thank you for reading.

These *Enabling Governance Arrangements* are work in progress: they will evolve based on your input at the Arena.

After the Arena (i.e. throughout summer 2021) your feedback on these and additional Enabling Governance Arrangements is very welcome on our [Wiki](#) and/or via email to spaeth “at” envgov.uni-freiburg.de.

Examples that illustrate or contest these governance arrangements from a wide variety of geographic contexts are appreciated.

See you on the 18th and 19th!
Annex 5: Overview of “Berlin” Arena Agenda

The following agenda was provided to participants prior to the event.

UrbanA “Berlin” Arena

Governance for Sustainable and Just Cities

March 18 - 19, 2021

Concept

Since the 1990s, governance for sustainability has aimed at an integrated consideration of environmental aspects and social justice. However, contemporary political processes are often still rather narrow in how they frame problems and possible solutions. How might we overcome this, and how can we learn from others who have done so?

Building upon the previous work done in UrbanA to map approaches for sustainable and just cities (Rotterdam Arena) and identify drivers of injustice in urban sustainability governance (“Barcelona” Arena), the “Berlin” Arena will be centred on how to guide collective action towards sustainable and just cities.

Overarching questions

What types of governance arrangements are supportive of sustainable and just cities?

How can learning from city to city be fostered?

What concrete action should be taken to improve governance for sustainable and just cities?

People

The University of Freiburg, and the UrbanA consortium and fellows are happy to welcome a diverse group of scholars and practitioners from across Europe, including guest appearances by activists from the following Berlin based initiatives: Changing Cities, BürgerEnergie Berlin, and Donut for Berlin.

Check out our community miro board for makers and participants of the arena!
### Practicalities

To familiarise yourself with the Arena's key concepts, please scroll through the Enabling Governance Arrangements Booklet. Please also make sure you have the latest version of zoom to enable the self-allocation function. The zoom invitation will be shared with you via email on March 17th.

### Agenda for Day 1, March 18

#### Session 1 (10:00-12:00)  Governance for sustainability and justice – Examples from Berlin and beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 10:25</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction to the Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25 - 11:05</td>
<td>Live interviews with Berlin-based initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl. break)</td>
<td>○ Boris Gotchev, BürgerEnergie Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Isabell Eberlein and Denis Petri, Changing Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05 - 11:55</td>
<td>Group discussions on governance themes in the Berlin initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl. break)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:55 - 12:00</td>
<td>Outlook on the day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Session 2 (12:15 - 13:00)  Personal exchange with Berlin practitioners (optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:15 - 13:00</td>
<td>Open rooms with Berlin practitioners for informal conversation and exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Boris Gotchev, BürgerEnergie Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Arwen Colell, BürgerEnergie Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Denis Petri, Changing Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Nicole Hartmann, Donut for Berlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Session 3 (14:00-16:00)  Exploring European governance experiences – What enables sustainable and just cities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00 - 14:45</td>
<td>Sharing insights from Session 2 and presentation of Enabling Governance Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl. break)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45 - 15:50</td>
<td>Group discussions on individual Enabling Governance Arrangements and brainstorm of new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl. break)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:50 - 16:00</td>
<td>Closing remarks of Day 1 in plenary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda for Day 2, March 19

**Session 4 (9:00 - 9:45)**  | Informal mingling in booths (optional)

9:00 - 9:45  | Self-allocate to private rooms to mingle with other participants, or play chat roulette

**Session 5 (10:00-12:00)**  | How can learning from city to city be fostered?

10:00 - 10:40 (incl. break)  | Presentation on translocal learning for just and sustainable cities

10:40 - 11:30 (incl. break)  | “Talking” option: Interactive exchange on learning between cities  
                                   | or  
                                   | “Listening” option: Presentation and interview with Donut for Berlin

11:30 - 12:00  | Sharing insights in plenary

**Session 6 (12:15 - 13:00)**  | Informal mingling in local clusters (optional)

12:15 - 13:00  | Open space: Promote a topic to be discussed or mingle with other participants in your geographic area

**Session 7 (14:00-16:00)**  | Towards an agenda for justice in urban sustainability governance

14:00 - 14:10  | Revisit key takeaways from the Arena

14:10 - 14:20  | Concluding reflections from Georg Wagener-Lohse, Donut for Berlin

14:20 - 15:15 (incl. break)  | Group discussions for agenda-building

15:15 - 15:45  | Collecting insights from group discussions

15:45 - 16:00  | Wrap-up and outlook into the future of UrbanA