



SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME



URBAN-NET

Deliverable 5.4

Proceedings from the Stakeholder Workshop 4 17-18 Nov 2009:

Prepared by Formas

December 2009

Project Title: Urban ERA-NET – Coordination of the funding of Urban Research in Europe
Instrument: ERA-NET (Coordination Action)
Contract no: 031342

Start date: 01 August 2006
Duration: 4 years

Dissemination Level		
PU	Public dissemination level	X
PP	Dissemination restricted to programme participants (including EC)	
RE	Dissemination restricted to groups specified by the consortium (including EC)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the Consortium	

Introduction

This deliverable principally consists of the presentations made at the Stakeholder Workshop 4 and reports from the four workshops. The presentations are available on www.URBAN-NET.org.



The Stockholm City museum, workshop venue.

**Proceedings from the URBAN-NET
Stakeholder Workshop 4 17-18 November 2009:
“European Research on Urban Sustainability”
17th to 18th November 2009, in Stockholm**

Contents

Invitation to Stakeholder workshop 4	5
Program.....	6
Welcome.....	8
Introductory presentations	8
URBAN-NET.....	8
Transdisciplinary knowledge production and capacity building.....	8
European research Funding	10
Future of Cities and Transport (FoCiT) - Proposal for a Joint Programming Initiative	11
Results from the first URBAN_NET call and information on the second.....	13
Resilient city – 5 project presentations	14
Sustainable Land Use Policies for Resilient Cities	14
DEGRA - CO	16
CURE – Cultural industries and urban resilience;	18
REPLACIS – Retail Planning for Cities sustainability	20
Integrating ecosystem services in urban spatial planning	21
Managing urban change – 3 project presentations	24
Dilemmas of urban network democracy.	24
Gender, Diversity and Urban Sustainability.....	26
Research network for climate neutral cities	28
Climate change – 3 project presentations.....	30
Urban Tourism and Climate Change.....	30
The potential impact of climate change on heat stress in different built structures and cities across Europe	32
Towards an optimisation of urban-planning and architectural parameters for energy use in Mediterranean cities	34
Group discussions	35
European Added Value	35
Integrated approach	40
Funding urban research	42
An anthology of essays based on funded projects.....	44
Study tour to Hammarby Sjöstad	46
List of participants	47



Invitation to Stakeholder workshop 4:

European Research on Urban Sustainability 17th to 18th November 2009, in Stockholm

The aim of the workshop is to disseminate results from ongoing research projects funded by URBAN-NET and to discuss key aspects of transnational research on urban sustainability.

Invited stakeholders are researchers, national and EU research administrators and policy makers etc. in the field of urban sustainability.

URBAN-NET, financed and promoted by the European Commission, is a network of 15 research funding or facilitating organisations in 12 European countries and UN-HABITAT. Its aim is to structure and coordinate research activities on urban sustainable development within the European Research Area, www.URBAN-NET-org.

The research projects. URBAN-NET has funded pre-research and research projects in a first call launched in January 2009. The pre-research projects aim at networking and preparation of research applications, and they include at least three national teams from different countries, not only countries participating in the call. Only the coordinator is funded. The pre-research projects will all end within this year or early next year. The research projects include at least three different national teams funded by URBAN-NET partner organisations. They will almost have reached midterm by the time of the conference. The funded projects illustrate the vast and complex research field of urban sustainable development, and the presentations will also serve as an input to the joint discussions on *added value* and *integrated approach*. Please find attached to this invitation the short descriptions of the call and the pre-research and research projects funded through URBAN-NET.

The added value is often mentioned as a general benefit of transnational cooperation in practice as well as in research. It suggests that the total value is more than its parts, but people keep asking what it precisely means. What is the added value at the European level, what does it signify at the national and local levels? The aim of a joint discussion is to form a common understanding of the concept so that we can use it with more confidence, not least in the evaluation of the full call that will just have been launched by the time of the conference.

An integrated approach is imperative in urban planning and management and in research funded by URBAN-NET. An integrated approach implies cooperation between different disciplines, professionals and sectors; between different levels of governance and short and long time perspectives. It poses problems for the researchers and also for the evaluators who are basically trained in disciplinary thinking. An integrated approach may not correspond to the thematic orientation of funding organisations.

Program

Tuesday 17th November

1230 REGISTRATION

1330 Welcome and aim of the conference, *Uno Svedin*, Formas

1345 URBAN-NET presentation, *June Graham*, SNIFFER

1400 The International Mistra Center for Sustainable Urban Futures, *Merritt Polk*, Human ecology, School of global studies, University of Gothenburg/Göteborg Center of excellence for Sustainable Urban Futures

1430 European research funding, *Karen Fabbri*, European Commission, Science Programme Officer

1500 Joint Programming Initiative “Cities of the Future / Transport”, *Wolfgang Polt*, Joanneum Research Forschungsgesellschaft mbH

1515 BREAK

1545 Results of the first URBAN-NET call and information on the second, *Ulla Westerberg*, Formas

1600 Sustainable land use policies for resilient cities, *Ayda Eraydin*, Middle East Technical University, Ankara

1615 DEGRA – CO Vectors for degradation process in privatized large housing estates built during 1950 – 1990 period. *Claudiu Runceanu*, ATU – Urban Transition Association, Bucharest, Romania

1630 CURE – Cultural industries and urban resilience; an explorative multi-level analysis of the contribution of cultural industries to urban resilience, *Robert Kloosterman*, AMIDSt/Universiteit van Amsterdam

1645 REPLACIS – Retail planning for Cities Sustainability, *Mattias Kärrholm*, Malmö University, Sweden

1700 Integrating ecosystem services in urban planning, *Johan Colding*, Beijer Institute & Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm

1715 Group discussion 1

1830 DINNER at Kafé Ryssgården, (City Museum ground floor)

Wednesday 18th November

0830 Dilemmas of urban network democracy. Functional networks, political equality and local elites in a comparative perspective, *Clarissa Kugelberg*, Uppsala university, Sweden

0845 Gender, Diversity and Urban Sustainability, *Sylvette Deneffe*, François Rabelais University, Tours, France

0900 Research network for climate neutral cities, *Ronald Wennersten*, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm

0915 Group discussion 2

1000 BREAK

1015 Urban tourism and climate change, *Ingegärd Eliasson*, University of Gothenburg

1030 The potential of climate change on heat stress in buildings and cities across Europe, *Sofia Thorsson*, University of Gothenburg

1045 Towards an optimisation of urban-planning and architectural parameters for energy use in Mediterranean cities, *Marina Neophytou*, University of Cyprus, Nicosia

1100 Group discussion 3

1145 BREAK

1215 Group presentations/discussion

1300 Conclusions

1315 LUNCH at Ryssgården (City Museum) and Hotel Anno 1647

1415 Bus leaves from the City Museum to Hammarby Sjöstad, GlashusEtt, Sickla Kaj

1430 Guided tour from GlashusEtt, *Malena Karlsson and Björn Cedequist*

Welcome

Uno Svedin, Professor, Formas, welcomed the wide array of stakeholders to Stockholm, the capital of the current European presidency. He gave a colourful introduction to the workshop starting in medieval times, and the long lasting investments in urban space, and ending with the grand challenges of today discussed at the Lund Conference and in the COP15 in Copenhagen to come.

Introductory presentations

URBAN-NET

June Graham, SNIFFER, coordinator of the URBAN-NET project.

The project has resulted in a searchable database of European research programmes completed within the last 5 years or ongoing. A Thematic Research Framework (February 2009) was developed through a comprehensive consultation process including all partners and relevant stakeholder groups. The first common call resulted in 11 funded projects which will be presented during this workshop, and a second call will be launched within two weeks.

The URBAN-NET project will end in July 2010, and we are discussing possible futures - a new project with new funding or a self-funding consortium. These possibilities will be further explored during the workshop.

For more info: www.urban-net.org

Transdisciplinary knowledge production and capacity building

The International Mistra Center for Sustainable Urban Futures

Merritt Polk, Human ecology, School of global studies, University of Gothenburg, The Göteborg Consortium

The following text is a summary, the presentation is available at www.urban-net.org

In May 2008 Mistra invited Swedish universities to establish a new large scale interdisciplinary research centre focusing on sustainable urban development and involving collaboration with Swedish cities and other investors, including international partners.

The Göteborg Consortium, consisting of various research institutions, public bodies and semi-public companies, etc. will receive funding for 10 years to produce innovative solutions for sustainable urban development in all of its varying forms and contexts that are academically relevant, practically effective and socially relevant. The proposal was approved in August this year.

Objectives:

- Coordinate research and practice for sustainable urban futures.

- Mobilise the necessary will and capacity needed for tangible changes towards sustainable urban development.
- Develop a world leading centre for transdisciplinary knowledge production and capacity building.
- Promote international collaboration, knowledge exchange and impact.

Transdisciplinary knowledge production and capacity building means:

Innovative knowledge production that specifically targets the integration of academic research with practitioner expertise and knowledge for problem solving in specific contexts.

The capacity to promote and facilitate processes that integrate the goals, definitions and agendas of diverse actors and stakeholders within the urban development arena.

Transdisciplinarity:

1. Focuses on applying knowledge in specific contexts,
2. Transgresses disciplinary boundaries,
3. Incorporates non-academic stakeholders,
4. Addresses the role of socially robust knowledge, and
5. Recognises the need for more practically oriented evaluative criteria (Nowotny et al. 2001)

5 Pilot projects:

1. Multi-level governance for sustainable urban development
2. Building for climate change: Implementing adaptation
3. Urban empowerment: Cultures of participation and learning
4. Business Driven Sustainable Development
5. Urban games: Mutual learning for sustainable development

Transdisciplinary paradoxes to reflect upon:

Inclusion	vs. setting up boundaries
Flat hierarchies	vs. effective governance
Autonomous organizations	vs. the aims of the collective
Open communication	vs. specific documentation needs
Time-consuming joint planning	vs. dynamic result-focused processes
Scientific excellence	vs. practical relevance
Concrete results	vs. intangible outcomes

European research Funding

Karen Fabbri, European Commission, Science Programme Officer, (DG Research)

The following text is a summary, the presentation is available at www.urban-net.org

Why EU research?

- Foster multi-disciplinary approaches & innovation to tackle complex issues of today
- Stimulate creation of multi-national partnerships: academia, research, SME, industry, public authorities, etc.
- Tackle cross-border issues and foster international cooperation
- Build and strengthen Europe's RTD capacity (ERA) in a globalised world
- Support the definition and implementation of EU policies
- Subsidiarity – not to duplicate what is being done at national level.

153 “urban” projects – urban disasters, urban planning tools, urban transports, spatial planning etc. have been funded in the framework programs 5 – 7. More funded projects can be found under other titles such as transport, security, SSH, etc. “City of tomorrow”. FP5 funded 110 projects for 136 M€.

Visions for the future - 3 grand challenges:

- unprecedented urban growth
- impacts of climate change
- natural resource scarcity

Cities should move to resiliency – key research areas are transition strategies, holistic thinking and integrated approach, ecological footprint, future-orientated and:-

Joint Programming Initiatives, JPI

The Joint Programming is a EC initiative proposing that member states develop and implement common *Strategic Research Agendas* (SRA) addressing *major societal challenges*. Joint programming is a *voluntary process* providing a *framework for cooperation*. It does not need to involve all member states in each specific initiative, but it should ensure that there is a *critical mass of resources*. JPI will be implemented by developing a common *vision*; defining a Strategic research Agenda, specific objectives and related deadlines; implementing the SRA and monitoring results so as to ensure maximum *impact*. EC is willing to provide a *secretariat* for JPI to facilitate the process. High level *political support* is important. Joint programming provides an opportunity to streamline/rationalise existing portfolio. More *stakeholders* – main actors affected by societal challenges – must be involved.

Different approaches will be applied. Both a top-down and a bottom-up approach will be used to identify research themes. Existing regional, national and eventually EU level funding instruments will be taken into account.

The first JPI was on Alzheimer's. One of five clusters submitted in Oct 2009 was on urban research. The first programs to be launched in 2010 are on cultural heritage, food and agriculture.

Info: http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=news.document&N_RCN=29663

Sources:

EU funded projects: <http://ica.cordis.lu/search/index.cfm?dbname=proj>

Environment Programme (FP7) : http://ec.europa.eu/research/environment/index_en.cfm;
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/environment/about-env_en.html

Seventh Framework Programme: <http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7>

RTD info magazine: http://ec.europa.eu/research/rtdinfo/previous_en.html

EMM – to register as expert evaluators <https://cordis.europa.eu/emmfp7/>

DG REGIO- Urban Dimension:

http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/guides/urban/index_en.htm

Future of Cities and Transport (FoCiT) - Proposal for a Joint Programming Initiative

Wolfgang Polt, Joanneum Research – Institute for Technology and Regional Policy, Vienna

In the following, the status of a proposal for a Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) is briefly presented, which is currently being developed by a number of EU Member States (MS). The proposal concerns areas, which might be of interest for the URBAN-NET members as well as for the network as a whole when considering future options.

‘Joint Programming’, that is the alignment of Science, Technology and Innovation Policy initiatives of the EU-MS, was initiated to complement the STI initiatives on the EU level (Framework Programme and others) with a more concerted effort on the level of the MS by trying to (i) jointly address “grand challenges” for our societies, (ii) by means of direct member-state cooperation (and funding). Currently, there are intense debates on the EU level to identify suitable topics for which there is a rationale for concerted action. In the course of this debate, the original number of proposals has been scaled down to a shortlist of topics, a few of which will be selected in December to be further elaborated, with others being prepared for a ‘second round’ of approvals possibly due mid-2010. Concrete modes of funding and governance of the JPIs are still to be determined.

Among the proposals having made it to the ‘shortlist’ is one stemming from a merger of two proposals by Austria and The Netherlands respectively, namely ‘The Future of Cities and Transport (FoCiT)’ (which is still a working title and subject to later changes, if deemed necessary). Countries having indicated interest or participated so far (that is up to beginning of November) in the elaboration of the proposal are Austria, Belgium, France, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Italy, The Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and the UK. Austria, the Netherlands (as the original proposers) together with France and Italy currently act as ‘core promoters’ of the proposal. This list surely will have expanded when this paper is published.

The starting point for the proposal was that a number of societal, environmental and economic challenges are especially prevalent in cities, among which figure most prominently: (i) demographic/social change (ageing, conflicts between generations, new social tensions, integration of minorities) (ii) resources: sustainable energy provision and waste management, (iii) traffic (social, economic and environmental costs of car-based traffic), (iv) urban and interregional / international transportation systems (systems efficiency, safety, reduction of

the ecological footprint; redefining the role of cities as transportation and communications hub), (v) global development (factors like globalisation influencing the role of urban systems within international and interregional division of labour).

But cities are not only the focal points of challenges, but also of potential answers to these challenges, as they are hubs of invention and innovation, act as test beds and lead markets for generic (societal and technological) solutions, and very often are the locations of large scale infrastructures and applications. In addition, there is a specific European dimension to urban environments: the “uniqueness” of the European city, specific urban patterns and policy environment and heritage. Thus, this topic is perceived as a very appropriate one for a JPI by the promoting countries.

The strategic objectives of the proposed JPI would be to ensure the “liveability of urban areas”: improving social cohesion, quality of life and safety, securing the basic needs of the citizens, housing, energy supply, mobility, health systems and maintenance. To this end, this vision envisages to create ‘model cities’ throughout Europe, based on new approaches to urban planning (participation & mediation, integrated foresight, forecasting) with fully developed communications infrastructures (broadband internet services on fixed lines and mobile, WIFI networks, transport management systems), with sustainable energy systems and networks (i.e. Smart Grids, Hydrogen), as well as energy efficient building concepts and mobility solutions (i.e. e-mobility, co-modality, etc.).

To arrive at or to approach this vision, it is, in our view, necessary to have a systemic perspective which combines technological and societal perspectives analyzed by trans-disciplinary teams; striving for both technological and societal innovation, to develop a learning European community on urban development and for transfer of good practice and to establish multi-stakeholder processes (policy, local/urban government, transportation industry, energy industry, construction, intelligent homes/ ‘domotics’, ICT, etc.).

In further developing this proposal, we seek to build on recent and current initiatives, e.g. the initiative under the German presidency, which resulted in the ‘Leipzig Charter’ on Sustainable European Cities’, existing ‘model-cities/districts’¹, the SET-Plan/and the ‘Smart City Initiatives’, with the objective to trigger a mass market take-up of energy efficiency technologies by supporting ambitious and pioneer cities and related initiatives like the current G8-Technology Initiatives (e.g. on Smart Grids). And of course on the URBAN-NET and the stock of knowledge developed in this context. It is not yet quite clear which position a JPI would have with respect to the different instruments currently in place. An approach which might probably be the most promising one is one that views the JPIs as a new and integrating approach which provides an umbrella for new and existing R&D structures, institutional settings and programmes.

As next steps in the elaboration of the Joint Programming Initiative “FoCiT”, it is foreseen that a workshop will be organized in February 2010, bringing together not only MS representatives, but also existing ERA-Nets and other initiatives to discuss the content and relative positioning of the various instruments. It is further envisaged that the proposal will be further developed during spring 2010 and approval at the EU level is sought.

¹ e.g. Stockholm, Tübingen, Freiburg, Barcelona (‘eco-cities’), Amsterdam (modal split), Vienna (waste management, eco-renovation), London (congestion pricing), Mannheim (smart grids), Paris (rental e-mobiles), Lübeck (waste water treatment)

Results from the first URBAN-NET call and information on the second

Ulla Westerberg, Formas, coordinator of the URBAN-NET calls

The first call, also called the pilot call, was launched in January 2008. The scope was broad – sustainable urban development, though Dutch researchers had “Resilient city” as their only option, which was a rather broad theme. 10 organisations in 8 partner countries funded the call.

There were two options for applicants:

1) Research projects with a duration of minimum two years. Researchers from at least three of the countries funding the call had to cooperate. 2) Pre-research projects for networking etc. with a duration of one year. Researchers from minimum three countries had to cooperate, but only one of these had to be a country funding the call and only the coordinator would be funded.

Researchers were to be funded by a funding organisation in the country where they were based. There was no common pot.

The result was 26 eligible applications, of which 11 were funded. They involved more than 70 researchers from 13 countries. The evaluation was made by an independent panel of experts. The funding organisations made a proposal for funding based on the expert evaluation and with due consideration to the funding commitments of each organisation. Most projects started at the end of 2008, which means that the pre-research projects have almost come to an end and the research projects have one more year to go. There was a really wide range of topics as will be demonstrated by the project presentations that will follow.

The second call was launched on the 27th October and will close on the 15th January. The scope is broad also in this call: “Climate change, Sustainable land-use and integrated management in an urban context”. It is based on the URBAN-NET Strategic Research Area and a discussion between the 6 organisations in 5 of the 8 countries funding the first call. The economic crisis was the main reason for the reduced number of countries this time.

There is more funding and longer duration for the projects this time. Researchers from at least three countries have to be involved in each project. Two of these countries have to have organisations funding the call. The “third” could be any country, but the researchers from this country must be able to show that they can fulfil their part of the proposed project. This was a way to make it easier for the researchers to form consortia, and especially for those with ongoing projects who want to apply in the second call and with researchers from countries participating in the first but not in the second call.

An integrated approach, i.e. inter- and transdisciplinary, is imperative, and what that means will be one of the two main themes for discussion in the workshop. Applicability is also important. The proposals should have a spatial dimension. Urban policy is the common ground for cooperation, and climate policy is a growing area of urban policy. Added value, finally is the most important reason for cooperation, which is the other of the two main themes for discussion.

Resilient city – 5 project presentations

Sustainable Land Use Policies for Resilient Cities

Department of City and Regional Planning, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, TURKEY

OTB Research Institute for Housing, Urban and Mobility Studies, Delft University of Technology Delft, THE NETHERLANDS

Faculdade de Engenharia, Universidade do Porto, Porto, PORTUGAL

Faculty of Architecture – Technical University of Lisbon, Lisboa, PORTUGAL

Nordregio, Nordic Centre for Spatial Development, Stockholm, SWEDEN

Background

Today, the European urban landscape is changing profoundly under different dynamics. It is possible to observe urban sprawl in the form of fragmented development outside the city, polycentric development at city region or regional scales as well as urban shrinkage. On the other hand, there is a continuous change in the inner cities that are accelerated by the transformation of urban economies and the new functions attributed to the cities in this new era defined by global economic imperatives. The economic conditions as well as the changing ecological pressures necessitate effective land use policy instruments both to confront the problems at hand and assessing conditions of uncertainty. Creation of an integrated-land use policy and to increase the ability of urban systems to absorb changes, reorganize and develop in a sustainable way has become increasingly important.

The main aims of the project

This research aims to evaluate new policy instruments in different planning contexts and compare the consequences for the cities that have diverse dynamics and to identify the sustainable land use policies in order to increase the resilience of the cities with diverse dynamics.

- 1) **Analyse current urban policy instruments**, their implementation and their effective results (having sustainability as a reference point)
- 2) Design and apply, in a number of selected case studies, an **evaluation methodology** focused on sustainable planning
- 3) identify the **main successes and failures of each planning practice** under analysis, and the **main underlying reasons** - compare the results obtained for the different cities
- 4) Provide a number of **solid contributions to the wider theoretical debate on sustainable development**

The partners of the project

The research draws on case studies from four countries where urban dynamics are very different. These differences and specific development paths will be further explored and illustrated. Turkish cases are used to evaluate policy instruments to control urban sprawl

under conditions of rapid urban growth and population expansion. Portuguese cases are used to assess urban policies both under condition of urban shrinkage and urban sprawl. Dutch cases are used to evaluate policy instruments under conditions of moderate urban growth within a polycentric urban structure. Swedish cases are used to evaluate policy instruments under conditions of moderate urban growth but this time within a more mono-centric urban structure.

The organisation of the research

The research comprises 6 work packages

WP1. Defining and categorizing the dynamics and regulations in city regions in different countries and defining the basis for frame of analysis

- Literature review and identifying key concepts of the theoretical framework
- Identifying the growth dynamics in selected city-regions in different countries
- Review of policies, regulations and instruments introduced in recent years

WP2. Analysing current urban policy instruments

- Description of the socio-economic and spatial development characteristics of the city regions and defining new models of urban land development
- Developing an inventory of instruments for managing urban change in selected cities
- Selection of case studies and putting case studies in general framework

WP3. Evaluating policy practices and assessing the ability of planning to achieve sustainability

- Developing a framework for assessing the policy instruments: defining the evaluation questions, the criteria and the indicators
- Defining different conceptions of success in plan implementation in case study city-regions (conformance-based approaches and performance-based approaches)

WP 4. Identifying successes and failures of each planning practice

- Defining the criteria for successful or unsuccessful plan implementation
- Analysing the selected cases in the case study regions based on the criteria selected to identify successful and unsuccessful implementation of plans-processes

WP5. Drawing conclusions and identifying policy implications from the evaluation of the planning practices

- Analysing each study region to see how the policy implementations contributed to the sustainability and resilience of the cities
- Developing conclusions

WP6. Disseminating the research results and defining the outcome

- Current State-of-art in research
- Up to now the studies related to WP1 and WP2 are completed which includes,

- The literature review and identifying key concepts related to diverse urban
- development patterns as well as the components of resilience
- Underlying urban development characteristics and dynamics of the different countries and the main reasons behind these trends with specific reference to the case study city regions
- Review of policies, legislation, regulations and instruments introduced in recent years in different countries (Turkey, Netherlands, Portugal and Sweden)
- Description of the socio- economic and spatial development characteristics of the city regions and defining new models of urban land development (Istanbul, Rotterdam, Lisbon, Porto, Stockholm)
- Defining instruments for managing urban change in selected cities
- Selection of case studies and putting case studies in general framework

DEGRA - CO

Vectors of degradation process in privatised large housing estates built during 1950 - 1990 period. Specific diagnosis methods for living conditions

Project coordinator:

ATU – Association for Urban Transition, Bucharest, Romania

Project partners:

INSA- Lyon, France

Pact Arim Rhones Alpes, Lyon, France

HURA – Housing and Urban Research Association, Sofia, Bulgaria

Berlage Institute, Rotterdam, Netherlands

Delft Technical University, Delft, Netherlands

Research area: DEGRA-CO and the Resilient City

Our *research project* proposal brings to the international debate the mass collective housing problems after their privatization in Romania and Bulgaria. In many European cities, the post-war collective housing estates served only as dormitories and many became or are about to become deprived neighbourhoods, where social exclusion and spatial segregation act as interrelated urban policy problems. But the knowledge and the experiences are highly different from one country to another. The gap between the Western cities and the Eastern European ones is even deeper.

The level of ownership in the urban housing ensembles is close to 100% in Romania and Bulgaria, therefore, it can be claimed that it is a rather specific context. Because of that, the simple comparative approach with the Western large housing estates is less important than the confrontation of examples, ideas and working methods.

Physical degradation is the visible part of a more complex socio economic decline characterising the privatised large housing estates. There are courses that have a snowball effect on the future of these housing estates in terms of quality of life in the neighbourhoods,

competition between cities, and market position within the city. The DEGRA-CO project focuses on the degraded condominium areas and proposes an integrated approach for analysing the various dimensions of the urban decay of privatised housing estates, in order to provide a correct estimation of the scale and intensity of the decay phenomena. Only through an integrated diagnosis, may the decision makers imagine creative intervention scenarios for a sustainable development of the whole city through local housing policy decisions.

Research question and methodology

The main goal of our research proposal is the solid understanding of the degradation processes occurring in the condominium housing estates, both at the urban scale and building scale. While in France and in The Netherlands, there are already specific procedures for identifying degradation, for classifying problems and for preparing intervention projects, in Romania and Bulgaria, the existing situation of condominium estates remains difficult to evaluate both from qualitative and quantitative points of view. Therefore the research question of our project is: what is the common knowledge and how can the degradation processes of the privatised housing estates be understood both at the building and at the urban scale?

The processes of physical degradation have many other causes than the physical aspects; the lack of maintenance is also caused by the socio-economic characteristics of the living environment, the quality of the inhabitants, etc. Thus, such a complex problematic demands an integrated (and integrative) approach by considering all the aspects involved in the process of degradation: physical, socio-economic, ecological, etc. Moreover, the cause-effect relation is not that clear all the time. Sometimes the roles might change, the apparent “effect” plays the role of the “cause” (e.g. the degraded condominiums are the effect of both physical degradation and of the lack of maintenance due the low resources and capacity of involvement of the inhabitants; but in time, the degradation creates a negative image of the neighbourhood, with consequences on the quality and social composition of the inhabitants).

The project creates opportunities for continuous exchanges of knowledge between the national teams, providing an international competence in understanding the complex degradation processes. Moreover, it facilitates an interdisciplinary approach both inside the local teams and in the larger team as well. The meetings held in the countries participating in the project, with field visits, analyses, presentations made by the local stakeholders, allow a common understanding of the degradation processes without neglecting the national specific aspects.

Methodology

The approach of the research topic made the subject of rich debates during the first meetings organized with all the consortium teams. Thus, each national team has to prepare the content of the national research report, following a commonly agreed structure. In this manner, the various aspects of the degradation will be integrated first at the national level (this should be the “vertical” integration), then for each section of the structure, the national reports will be transversally integrated leaving room for confrontations among the various national specific situations (the “transversal” integration).

Results

The topic of large housing estates built during the same period of time, but which are mainly public property (as social housing) has been already analysed through several projects, RESTATE project being one of the most interesting of them. The transnational cooperation in research over this topic has been already clearly demonstrated through these existing examples.

By focusing on the privately owned units in these ensembles, the project brings the confrontation between the various ways of understanding housing property in condominiums in relationship with the social role of these areas of housing, and with the social categories of dwelling owners. Through this confrontation between the French context and definitions, the Romanian and the Bulgarian ones, and also with the somehow different Dutch one, the added value of this research projects relies on the fact that generally accepted ideas and knowledge from every country are placed under a question mark. By doing so, important aspects of this urban reality are decomposed and recomposed, allowing a richer understanding.

CURE – Cultural industries and urban resilience;

An explorative multi-level analysis of the contribution of cultural industries to urban resilience

Partners: The Netherlands, Bulgaria, France, Israel, Sweden, Turkey

Coordinator: **Robert Kloosterman**

R.C.Kloosterman@uva.nl; A.M.C.Brandellero@uva.nl

University of Amsterdam

Planning and International Development Studies

Amsterdam Institute for Metropolitan and International Development studies

Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Project overview

Cultural industries are making a significant contribution to the economy of places. Old factories are now being converted into offices and places for all kinds of cultural industries. They boost economic growth and employment and at the same time they also add to the quality of places. Cultural industries, in principle, have the potential to increase urban resilience and adaptability, as they are one of the mainstays of the emerging post-industrial urban economies and unique sources of innovation for the future of Europe.

Notwithstanding the rapidly rising number of publications on cultural industries, there has been little or no attention paid to the cultural industries' role in urban resilience. The recognition by the European Commission of the role of the cultural industries in context of the Lisbon Agenda further stresses the relevance and urgency of analysing the relations between cultural industries, resilience and sustainable urban development. This *pre-research* partnership addresses this gap, as it focuses on the exploration of the capacity of European urban systems to absorb changes, reorganise and re-develop using the potential of their urban cultural industries.

Not only are these industries important in economic terms, but they have the potential to contribute to more complex processes of urban (re)development. In fact, they are not only able to generate material benefits for the urban economy and society as a whole, directly and indirectly, but they also provide cities and neighbourhoods a higher – although not precisely measurable – quality of life in terms of immaterial benefits. From this standpoint, they have the potential to contribute urban resilience in various ways on different spatial levels and to strengthen urban sustainability in all of its four dimensions: environmental/physical, economic, social, and cultural. There is considerable evidence that small cultural businesses are central to

urban regeneration. Cultural industries are indeed mostly located in urban settings. Only urban milieus can provide the critical mass (of both producers and consumers), the diversity (including the openness to newcomers and their new ideas), and the proximity (enabling the formation of networks and intense face-to-face contacts) that are highly conducive to cultural production. Furthermore cultural industries are a set of industries that are overwhelmingly dominated by micro, small and medium sized businesses: the types of business that are central to cities long-term economic growth and innovative capacity. Lastly, cultural industries have higher than average rates of foreign-born and female participation.

As a starting point in our analysis, the partnership is looking at the conditions for the development of stable and sustainable cultural industries. We take an approach which looks at cultural industries in the framework of the inter-relations between urban environments and economic systems.

While CIs manifest a spatial anchorage, they also call upon inter-relational spaces, where relationships between actors become ‘the workplace’ in some sense. If we take an approach which highlights an ‘up-stream/down-stream’ model, we should look at spatial footprint of creativity and the impact (social, economic, ecological) of cultural industry activities (for instance in the social division of labour, changes to the organisation of working conditions and new forms of entrepreneurship, revitalisation of areas, export levels, tax earnings etc.). The question of geographies of impact is very interesting and pertinent: at a local level, we could look at the transformation of neighbourhoods (also in terms of impacts on real estate values and use) and the use of space by cultural industries in everyday practice; but there is also a trans-local dimension, calling upon a more ‘culture-centred’ issue of the circulation of cultural industries products and their consumption on a global scale. In this sense, it would be interesting to look at the links between different actors in the value chain and their spatial connections.

We take an approach which seeks to dissect the following aspects of the impact cultural industries have in terms of:

- Ecological relevance: cultural industries produce benefits in terms of quality of the urban environment. They are mainly urban activities, located in city-centre areas, usually in reconverted old industrial buildings easily accessible by public transport. The socio-spatial analysis of the cultural industries in the selected cities carried out in this pre-research work will reveal preliminary patterns in the use of the urban space – how space is used for living, working and leisure activities. It will give insights on the mobility patterns of the creative workers and on what kind of resources are used.
- Social/Cultural: our analysis of urban resilience through the cultural industries will have social and cultural relevance as numerous studies have already demonstrated that cultural industries contribute to social cohesion and social inclusion, to the empowerment of citizens, and to cultural diversity.
- Economic: cultural industries are a unique source of innovation for the future of Europe. The pre-research work will allow for a better scientific understanding of the role of cultural industries as major source to absorb the external shocks of globalization. If the cultural economy would indeed be a major development direction with a high level of competitiveness for the next decades, this study could have extensive implications for investments and policy-making across Europe at the urban, national and EU level.

We make use of GIS tools, as a mapping and analytical reference to analyse the relations between cultural industries and spatial frameworks.

Our project's over-arching aim is to: 1) use the international network to construct a preliminary mapping of cultural industries in the selected cities; 2) design a framework for the international comparative analysis of cultural industries in the selected cities; 3) operationalize the research questions more in detail in terms of urban resilience and sustainability; 4) Prepare the application for the final URBAN-NET call or a suitable FP7 call.

REPLACIS – Retail Planning for Cities sustainability

REPLACIS is a co-operation between Portugal (Lisbon and Oporto University), France (Angers University), Turkey (Bilkent University) and Sweden (Malmö University). The project is coordinated from Portugal and lead by Professor Teresa Barata Salgueiro at Lisbon University.

Project Summary

Urban sustainability can be associated with how diversified retail systems respond with efficiency to the needs, wants and desires of different kinds of consumers. Recent trends show that different urban retail facilities have distinct levels of resilience and that these can be empowered by sector and spatial planning policies.

REPLACIS intends for a better understanding of the role played by consumption in the production of new urban developments. It also aims at comparing the resilience level of different urban retail areas by a set of indicators. City retail facilities are in the project read from a double perspective, (i) as the appraisal of retail landscapes as material artefacts selling of goods and services, and (ii), as the understanding of outlets and shopping areas as places of experiences and social distinction. The project puts a special focus on how contemporary public spaces transform into consumption objects used by retail developers and place makers.

The methodology to assess the vulnerabilities and the adaptive capacity of the urban shopping districts and retail environments will combine two sets of indicators. One is based on quantitative data and evaluates the dynamics of shopping districts. The other is anchored in qualitative data gathered by observation studies, questionnaires and interviews; and it looks for the understanding of the process of change, identification and assess of consumer's values, the sense of place, and how this is answered by the retail environment.

The urban sustainability approaches of today often claim compact cities with liveable centres and well preserved neighbourhoods as a common goal. Simultaneously, global trends are deepening both similarities and challenges, producing new urban policies, driven by competitiveness, and engaged on cultural or consumption-led regeneration projects. However, every city looks different and a successful policy in one place does not necessarily lead to the success of another one with different social values, institutions and rules. By using transnational research, the project will try to encompass both similar and different aspects of the different countries, trying to fix a set of comparable indicators that can be applied in different urban socio-spatial contexts. Through the social learning in case studies and an interactive approach between scientists, policy makers and retail stakeholder, it will be possible to assess the vulnerabilities and the adaptive capacities of shopping areas and to think about the policy options to promote urban sustainability with the lens of retailing.

In short, the research project aims to achieve the following objectives:

- To investigate the urban retail changes and its driving forces and how planning policies in different countries are dealing with this issue in order to promote the urban sustainability.
- To offer insights on the role played by consumption and retailing in the production of the postmodern city, namely through the new urban retail environments, consumption-led regeneration projects, and the “public” space generated by these new urban developments.
- To conceive a theoretical and methodological framework to assess the resilience of different urban retail areas to back the spatial planning policies concerned with the urban sustainable development and the competitiveness of the traditional retail facilities and shopping environments.
- To compare the resilience level of different urban retail centres by a set of indicators in view of recent changes induced by the new retail dynamics, with special reference to the *malling* of centres and peripheries, the spectacular consumption-led regeneration of brown-fields and other post-industrial areas, the crisis of downtowns, and the decline of retail neighbourhood centres.

During 2009 the project has had two seminars, one in Angers (France) and one in Malmö (Sweden). So far the national teams have made general investigations of consumption evolution, retail building types and planning policies of their different countries. These were discussed in Malmö, September 2009. During the autumn 2009 the empirical studies of different retail areas of specific city regions have started. These will be compared and discussed at the Ankara meeting in April 2010.

Integrating ecosystem services in urban spatial planning

Participating researchers of the SUPER project:

Sweden: Johan Colding, Stephan Barthel, Henrik Ernstson, Cathy Wilkinson

Turkey: Azime Tezer, Fatih Tersli, Ozhan Ertekin, Ayse Ozyetgin, Ilke Aksehirli

The Nederland: Robbert Snepp, Wim van der Knaap.

Introduction

Spatial planning processes that more purposefully integrate social and ecological considerations into urban development are required if cities are to navigate towards more sustainable development. As argued by Grimm et al (2008)² the next frontier of urban ecology is comparative research between cities in different biophysical, economic, and political

² Grimm N. B., Faeth S. H., Golubiewski N. E., Redman C. L., Wu J., Bai X., and Briggs J. M. (2008). Global Change and the Ecology of Cities. *Science* 319:756-760.

settings. Involved researchers in the SUPER-project has taking this call at heart with exciting possibilities to make a real difference in the area of sustainable urban planning.

Since URBAN-NET funding was provided for the project in September of 2008 involved researchers established the name “the SUPER-project” for the research group, which stands for **Sustainable Urban Planning for Ecosystem services and Resilience**.

Project Description

Integrating ecosystem services in urban spatial planning explores how integration of the concept of ‘ecosystem services’ (ES) into urban spatial planning efforts could increase human wellbeing in cities and build resilience in relation to uncertain outcomes of urbanization and climate change. It is our view that ES represent the foundation of urban development and human well being in cities; however, spatial planning efforts to date have not incorporated processes and relations that are active in the generation, distribution and consumption of ES. Our research project therefore has the goal to contribute in closing this gap, and to develop principles and tools for integrating ES in urban spatial planning and governance.

In collaboration with a group of ecologists and spatial planners from Stockholm Resilience Centre/The Beijer Institute, the Wageningen University (The Nederland), and the Istanbul Technical University, the project seeks to identify critical aspects in current modes of spatial planning for building resilience of urban ES. Drawing on research, methodologies, and practical insights for dealing with ES in the three European city-regions of Istanbul, Arnhem-Nijmegen, and Stockholm, researchers will exchange knowledge and experiences for improving sustainable use of ES in European city-regions. Lessons learned are anticipated to be incorporated by urban planners and policy makers to make a real difference on the ground for improving cities’ readiness to address unwanted effects of urbanization and ongoing climate change.

Three central questions are being addressed in the project: 1. What are the **constraints** to address ES in current urban planning? 2. What are the **ongoing initiatives** to address ES in each city-region? 3. What are the **opportunities** to address ES in each city-region?

In our last workshop held in Istanbul in the beginning of April 2009, three different fronts in working with ES were identified to be pursued in research and through knowledge exchange: In the Istanbul case, the focus lies on mapping ES in the Omerli watershed catchment area. This watershed contributes to some 40% of the drinking water to the 12 million inhabitants of Istanbul, but faces uncontrolled urbanization that threatens the quality and supply of drinking water. Both the sheer size of the area and the vegetation and soils of the area facilitate biological and ecological processes supporting the flow of good quality drinking water. However, the area boosts with other categories of ES from recreation to biodiversity conservation. The main aim of the ongoing research project is to understand and translate the value of natural capital and ES so as to improve decisions and actions relating to the use of land, water, and other elements of natural capital for Omerli in order to mitigate unsustainable urban transformation of the watershed area.

In the Stockholm case, the focus lies on identifying critical aspects of stakeholder participation and integration when it comes to distribution and management of urban ES. In Stockholm, there has been a sterile conceptualization among policy makers and planners between built-up land and ecosystems, creating a false dichotomy of this relationship. With examples derived from natural resource management in common property systems, the research centers on how the institutional design of “urban commons” can be a way to develop more coherent frameworks for managing urban ES that also includes urban residents, social networks and interest groups in governance actions.

In the Arnhem-Nijmegen region, the focus lies on how ES more thoroughly can be accounted for in novel urban spatial designs. Sea-level rise is one important driver here that planners need to account for. Using the future development area of Arnhem-Nijmegen as an example, this case allows us to reflect on how structural designs can be a way to achieve a win-win ecology – or an “ecology for transformation” – in multiple land-use planning and on how to build capacity to deal with future urbanization paired with disturbances related to sea-level rise and climate change.

SUPER-Project related work and deliverables

We presently have 1 PhD, 6 Master and 2 Bachelor students writing their thesis work related to the SUPER-project, predominantly affiliated to the Stockholm Resilience Centre.

Besides the Istanbul workshop held in April 2009, we have an upcoming workshop in Stockholm, November 25-28 2009 and a planned workshop in the NL during spring 2010.

Publications and work-in-progress

1. Colding, J. *In review*. The role of ecosystem services in contemporary urban planning: A critical perspective on smart growth and green infrastructure planning. Chapter in upcoming Oxford University Press publication.
2. Barthel, S., Folke, C. and Colding, J. *In review*. Social-ecological memory for management of ecosystem services. *Global Environmental Change*.
3. Colding, S. and Barthel, S. Urban Commons. A social innovation towards sustainability. *Paper in progress*.
4. Ernstson, H., Barthel, S., Borgström, S. and Andersson, E. *Accepted*. Scale-crossing brokers and network governance of urban ecosystem services: the case of Stockholm, Sweden. *Ecology and Society*.
5. Ernstson, H. Social production of ESS. *Paper in progress*.
6. Ernstson, H. VanderLuew, S., Elmqvist, T., and Redman, C. et al. Urban transitions/Cities in change: on urban resilience and facing cross-scale interactions. *Paper in progress*.
7. Barthel, S., Colding, J., Ernstson, H., Tezer, A., Snapp, R., Van der Knaap, Wilkinson, C. et al. Ecosystem services and urban planning for the 21st century. *Paper in progress*.
8. Barthel, S., Colding, J., and Parker, J. Allotment gardening and the starvation trap. *Chapter in progress for Perspectives on regime shifts in social-ecological systems* (Sörlin, S. and Folke, C., eds). Publisher yet not decided.
9. Barthel, S., Colding, J., Ernstsson, H., Elmqvist, T., Jansson, Å, and Wilkinson, C. *Exploring ecosystem services in cities through the lens of resilience*. Edited volume to be approached for Cambridge University Press.
10. Ernstson, H. Social considerations of ecosystem services. Chapter 4 in *Exploring ecosystem services in cities through the lens of resilience*. Edited volume to be approached for Cambridge University Press.
11. Tezer, A, Aksehirli, I., and Ozyetgin, A. The role of the Omerli watershed, Istanbul for generation of ecosystem services. Chapter 6 in *Exploring ecosystem services in cities through the lens of resilience*. Edited volume to be approached for Cambridge University Press.

12. *Snepp, R. and van der Knaap, W. Resilience planning for climate change and biodiversity loss in The Netherlands. Chapter 12 in Exploring ecosystem services in cities through the lens of resilience. Edited volume to be approached for Cambridge University Press.*
13. *Colding, J., Barthel, S., Ostrom, E., Berkes, F., and Lawrence, A. The potential of urban commons for building resilience in urban social-ecological systems. Chapter 13 in Exploring ecosystem services in cities through the lens of resilience. Edited volume to be approached for Cambridge University Press.*

Managing urban change – 3 project presentations

Dilemmas of urban network democracy.

Functional networks, political equality and local elites in a comparative perspective

Marianne Danielsson, Nils Hertting and Clarissa Kugelberg

This pre-research project develops a European comparative study of urban functional networks, in which citizens participate in interactive decision-making together with public officials and other local actors to tackle policy problems, such as integration, public health and environmental issues – that is, aspects of social and ecological sustainability. A comparative approach will enable a systematic overview and analysis of the political conditions and democratic consequences of functional networks in contemporary urban politics. Into what different patterns and using what different procedures are participatory partnerships and functional networks developed and institutionalized? What meanings, purposes and strategies are attached to such urban initiatives and projects, and how are they related to variations in specific national and local political and administrative traditions and structures?

A reoccurring idea in debates on public policy is that governing has become a more complex task, demanding broad mobilization of resources and competence. When single authorities and hierarchical decision-making fail, solutions are sought for across formal divisions of authority, across organizations and sectors in the public sphere, and often in cooperation with private actors. Such organizations may be called functional governance networks or, simply, functional networks. Ranging from psychiatry to local environmental care or integration, the list of examples in which cooperation and coordination are seen as remedies for various public shortcomings is long. Moreover, cooperation is seen as instrumental for creating sustainable democratic decision-making. Such solutions are not least called for in urban contexts.

Functional networks, however, are not easily reconciled with representative democracy. Exercising political control over more or less independent and self-organizing actors is difficult, or even contradictory. Yet, particularly in urban contexts, the arguments for horizontal modes of policy-making and implementation are not only that they enhance efficiency and coordination, but also that they develop and “deepen” democracy. Thus, although citizen participation is repeatedly called for to serve as democratic anchorage in functional networks, we should not expect this to be an easy marriage in terms of informal and formal institutional solutions.

The aim of the pre-research project is to prepare the way for future cross-national research and the first phase of the pre-research project included organizing a network of researchers with knowledge about such urban processes in relevant countries and with whom we would be able to develop an application for a full research project. A conference took place in Uppsala during two days in March 2009 with researchers from Denmark, Finland, France, Spain, The Netherlands, England and Sweden. Now the teams from France: Yves Sintomer, Centre Marc Bloch, Berlin and Julien Talpin European University Institute, Paris and Sweden: Marianne Danielsson, Nils Hertting and Clarissa Kugelberg, Uppsala University, are developing research ideas, questions and design into a full research project in association with the teams from Spain, The Netherlands and Denmark.

Our aim is to develop shared research interests into common grounds for more systematic cross-case learning and national comparison. A key element of this research will be a systematic comparison of functional networks – that is different types of collaborative partnerships, citizen forums and public consultations, etc. – and their meanings and functions within different national and urban institutional contexts and cultures. Despite current globalization tendencies, we suggest that national differences in terms of political-administrative structures and cultures still condition the possibilities and problems confronted in attempts to democratize functional networks. More specifically, we would argue that the scope for local self-government and the character of civil society traditions are two important dimensions here. Functional networks in Sweden, with its strong local self-government – in terms of power of taxation, local elections, etc. – and with its corporatist tradition of a strong and professionalized civil society, may constitute responses to rather different circumstances than those in France, where the scope of the room for local self-government is traditionally more limited. Partnerships introduced from above within the political structure as an implementation strategy (as in England) would have a rather different meaning to people in Denmark, with its long tradition of independent community-based initiatives.

Another key element of the suggested research strategy is to combine different scientific approaches and include researchers from different disciplines. Understanding such new forms of governance, in which formal rules are few and working rules are subject to negotiations and re-negotiations, calls for microanalysis and ethnographic approaches and at the same time, we find it important to link our understanding of these processes to an analysis of formal positions and models of strategic action. The latter is important if we wish to hold on to the idea that democracy can be promoted through institutions for informed and reasoned collective public decisions. Thus, we propose to combine a political science perspective with an anthropological one, which implies combining deductive with inductive approaches, and actor oriented institutionalism with ethnographic research on the rules in use.

Gender, Diversity and Urban Sustainability

Sylvette DENEFFLE, France
Chris HUDSON, Sweden
Nicole ROUX, France
Lidewij TUMMERS, Netherlands

GADUS project comprises 7 academic partners (F. Rabelais University, TUD, Leibniz University of Hannover, BOKU, University of Westminster, Umea University, UPM) supported by 8 local authorities (Vienna, Helsinki, Munich, Hannover, Brest, Albacete, London, Umea), 2 Finnish Ministries and 2 NGOs in 8 European countries (FRANCE, NETHERLANDS, GERMANY, AUSTRIA, ENGLAND, SWEDEN, SPAIN, FINLAND).

1. Pre-research project

Cities reflect the discriminatory power structures in society in general. The Gender, Diversity and Urban Sustainability (GDUS) project will instigate and analyze experiments carried out in the field of urban policies which try to correct the discriminations arising from gender inequalities in the everyday practices of the city. The aim is to contribute to town-planning and social policies supporting urban sustainability. This project gathers researchers, professionals, politicians and citizens from 8 European countries (France, Netherlands, Germany, Austria, England, Sweden, Spain). It has the following ambitions: i) to develop new evaluation tools for urban policies that take into account the gender dimension; ii) to analyze the barriers to a satisfactory social urban development; and iii) to recommend best practices that lead to a sustainable urban development.

GDUS proposes a pre-research work programme which includes the selection of experimental cases; establishing a joint methodology; clarifying each partner's role in the project; and finalizing a coherent research proposal to be submitted within an URBAN-NET or FP7 call for proposal.

We wish to fulfill three specific objectives: precisely identify our operational field through the involvement of relevant local authorities; gather all partners during a large workshop to design the research programme; ensure the project's efficient organization and follow-up as well as the necessary bibliographical research on previous research in the field.

2. Weighing up of the work

A one-week seminar was organized in Tours (France) in December 2008 to prepare a proposal to the call ENV.2009.4.2.3.2. "Enhancing connectivity between research and policymaking in sustainable development". We worked on this proposal (Gender Awareness, Diversity and Urban Sustainability GADUS) up until January 09 in the way described in §3, below. Our proposal received a very positive evaluation, passed all the thresholds, and was ranked 10th. However, funding was only available for 3 proposals.

The members of the research network have continued to work together and we have presented our network at EU events such as the Social Polis Exhibition in Vienna (Austria) in May 2009. In September 09, we held a joint two-day seminar and workshop in Vienna in which almost all the members of the network participated. We discussed the future of our project and worked on a possible proposal to the URBAN-NET second call.

3. Information about GADUS project

3.1. Background

As the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities (2007) points out, holistic strategies and coordinated action are increasingly necessary in working towards sustainable cities, where problems regarding social exclusion, structural change, climate change and mobility are tackled in an integrated way.

The GADUS project will contribute to enabling policymakers to make more efficient and effective use of existing EU funded research on gender and anti-discrimination policies in developing a more sustainable urban development that both improves social cohesion and reduces impact on climate change.

3.2. Consortium

GADUS project comprises 7 academic partners (F. Rabelais University, TUD, Leibniz University of Hannover, BOKU, University of Westminster, Umea University, UPM) supported by 8 local authorities (Vienna, Helsinki, Munich, Hannover, Brest, Albacete, London, Umea), 2 Finnish Ministries and 2 NGOs in 8 European countries (France, Netherlands, Germany, Austria, England, Sweden, Spain, Finland).

GADUS is trans-disciplinary and involves researchers with a gender perspective working together from the fields of landscape planning, design planning, sociology, political sciences, architecture and urbanism. It combines theoretical concepts, methodologies and research from these disciplines thus bringing a holistic approach to the complexity of everyday life in cities and which is vital in achieving sustainable development.

3.3. Concept and Objectives

We choose to view social cohesion and sustainable development from the perspective of the need for gender equality. Gender Studies, as a cross-cutting interdisciplinary domain, are concerned with supporting everyday life through adequate housing, neighborhood services, meeting places, transport, etc. as well as through improving participation in and influence on the city's planning and decision-making processes. The time-space patterns, steered by essential everyday activities, cause considerable energy- and water consumption, mobility and waste-production. Taking into account these activities in territorial planning helps to achieve greater efficiency, thus reducing CO2 emissions, and enhances the acceptability of territorial measures addressing climate change and urban sustainability.

To enhance connectivity between research and policy making, we will carry out experiments with local authorities and other stakeholders to develop new integrative tools that will link research and practice in the formulation and implementation of sustainable policies. In this way, we will contribute to the transfer of scientific analysis through knowledge brokerage, and improve policy making with regard to sustainable development and climate change.

The objectives of the project are:

- to organize this knowledge across EU-member states and to explain its implications for practice and policies;
- to create an inventory of good practices;
- to investigate the best way to exchange this knowledge with practitioners, policymakers and relevant citizens groups;
- to experiment with innovative methods for knowledge exchange;

- to evaluate the experiments for their usefulness and impact;
- to compare and interpret the results and findings of the experiments and to draw out recommendations for different scales of development, stakeholders and types of planning system;
- to disseminate the results of the entire project across the member states by a variety of means.

Research network for climate neutral cities

Contact person:

Prof. Ronald Wennersten
 Department of Industrial Ecology
 School of Industrial Engineering and Management, KTH
 Phone +46 87906347
 Email rw@kth.se
www.ima.kth.se

The project is financed by the EU URBAN-NET programme and coordinated by Department of Industrial Ecology, KTH, Stockholm. The aim of this project is to have a series of workshops in order to develop research questions and reflect on the problems and benefits of transnational and interdisciplinary cooperation in Sustainable Urbanism. The workshops focus on European cases and will not deal with the North-South dimension of the problem.

The project is aiming at formulation research questions in relation to the integration of climate aspects in urban planning process for urban districts in Europe, to make a minimum contribution to climate change. The districts should also be adapted to different consequences of climate change. Experiences from other projects have shown the importance of broad stakeholder participation in developing more sustainable urban areas and also the development of clear visions in early development phases. The visions should work as uniting images of the future but they must also be based on a long term sustainable concept. The vision should be possible to break down in more details and form the basis for action plans and follow up.

In the project a series of workshops are planned using back-casting scenarios in order to reveal important research questions. Back-casts are not intended to reveal what the future will be, but rather to weigh up a number of possible futures, and decide on the implications and preferable options, and then to map out steps on the way to achieving a goal. The project will draw on experiences from Tool Sust, a project completed a few years ago in which a back-casting approach was developed in collaboration with local stakeholders in five European cities. Several 'Images of the Future' were formulated for household consumption in sustainable cities and some important methodological lessons were learnt that will be of use here. The method itself consists of several stages:

- Recruiting researchers with different backgrounds and carrying out an initial workshop to generate ideas about what a climate neutral urban area might look like
- Back-office work to produce new inputs for workshops and to formulate three or four tentative Images of the Future

- Carrying out additional workshops where the Images are presented, validated and where developments paths are identified and research questions are formulated.

Sustainable Urbanism as a concept of course involves many different aspects and because of the vague nature of the concept it has sometimes been criticized. Sustainable Urbanism cannot be defined from the research community but is basically a political concept involving values about which kind of future urban areas we want. However when we are talking about environmental impacts of urbanism the research community has an important role in formulating goals and effects of different visions for the future. One of the main aspects of environmental impacts of urbanism is climate change. Often mitigation and adaption to climate change has been discussed as a global issue. More and more however the role of local initiatives in climate change mitigation and adaption has been. We believe that on a local level there is a great need for cooperation between actors in the society like authorities and companies and the research community to formulate more sound bases for visions when tackling the problems of climate change.

The Department of Industrial Ecology, KTH, is working together with the City of Stockholm to evaluate initiatives in sustainable urbanism and to create plans for new more sustainable areas in Stockholm. The city of Stockholm has also created a network with around 15 other cities in Europe. The overall aim of this network is to support the integration of climate aspects in urban planning process for urban districts in Europe, to make a minimum contribution to climate change. The districts in the cities should also be adapted to different consequences of climate change. One objective with the network is to test, discuss and exchange experiences and ideas around the on-going work in cities to create new climate neutral urban districts in Cities in Europe. The network will focus on mitigation possibilities, concerning energy use and efficiency in buildings and transports. The objective of this URBAN-NET research network is also to create networks between city planners and researchers.

The workshops

Pre-planning workshop (May 2009)

During this workshop the structure of the first workshop was planned concerning participants and discussion points. The following topics were selected:

- Is Climate Neutrality or other similar concepts fruitful for creating condensed visions for urban development?
- How can we use scenario methods in participatory planning approaches linked to the visions?
- Methods for evaluating, verification and comparing climate neutrality approaches
- Important research issues related to the topics discussed
- How should the further work in the network be organized?

Workshop 1 held during 17-18 September 2009:

During this workshop 21 researchers from the network met during two days to discuss the topics described above. The results from this workshop will establish a base for using a participatory back casting approach in formulating visions for sustainable urbanism and climate change.

In order to get stakeholders to work in a certain direction it is important to create visions which should be broad but which can act as a discussion platform for development of urban areas. Climate Neutral Cities or City Areas can be such a concept. Other concepts that are often used are Low Carbon Cities, Zero Emission Cities, Energy Positive Urban Areas etc.

The first workshop discussed these different concepts, which could serve as platforms for creating visions of sustainable urbanism. An important part of the first workshop was also to collect experiences from the participants own projects and to collect material for formulating visions for coming workshops.

Urban development is a long process and urban areas will be there for a long time so it is also important to build in flexibility for changes in visions and pathways during the development process. This issue was also discussed in workshop 1.

After this first workshop we will have back-office work on a web based discussion forum to produce new inputs for workshop 2 and to formulate three or four tentative images of sustainable urban areas using a back casting approach.

Workshop 2:

In this workshop the Images are presented, validated and developments paths are identified and research questions are formulated. This workshop will be held beginning of 2010.

Expected results and outcomes from the workshops

The results and outcomes from the two workshops are expected to be:

- An active network of researchers and planners in the area of Sustainable Urbanism with focus on mitigation and adaption to climate change.
- A report on important research issues in the area which can be used by the network for applying for research funding.
- A guideline for using a participatory back casting method in creating visions for sustainable urban areas with focus on climate change mitigation and adaption.

Climate change – 3 project presentations

Urban Tourism and Climate Change

This is an interdisciplinary research project, including scientists from Sweden, Portugal and Turkey, within the European collaboration program URBAN-NET. The Swedish part of the project is funded by Formas, the Swedish Research Council for Environment, Agricultural Sciences and Spatial Planning.

Sweden– University of Gothenburg & University of Gävle Ingegärd Eliasson (Coordinator), Sofia Thorsson, Igor Knez and Gabriella Olshammar
Portugal - University of Lisbon Henrique Andrade, Eduardo Brito Henriques and Raquel Machete
Turkey – Middle East Technical University, Ankara Ayda Eraydn, Bahar Gedikli and Özlem Edizel

Background, aim and expectations

Previous research has indicated an urgent need for more knowledge and local consequence analyses on urban tourism as related to global climate change and sustainable development. In some countries tourism will grow in others it will be reduced or transformed. This change will have a significant impact on the economy, employment, environment and social life. The question is – is Europe prepared?

The project is based on the hypothesis that urban tourism in Europe will change in relation to global climate change. The aim is to investigate cross-cultural differences (3 climatic/cultural zones: Sweden, Turkey and Portugal) in thinking (awareness, emotions and behaviours), attitudes, decision structure and urban plans in relation to urban tourism and climate change. For this purpose, tourists, decision-makers, market and knowledge-structure are approached.

A realistic expectation of the results obtained from this two-year project comprising new research partners from three different countries across Europe is to identify research related problems and possibilities. Results will be compiled in a database that can be used for future urban tourism research, recommendations and strategy developments across Europe.

Methods & Results

Workshops and project meetings are very important methods for integration of researchers, stakeholders and results in the project. We know from similar work that shared goals, regular contacts, identification of research products as well as high levels of trust and respect are extremely important ingredients for successful interdisciplinary research. Given this, we started with a kick off workshop in Gothenburg in March 2009 including participants from the three national teams. Topics for the first meeting were the design of the project and development of surveys. The first preliminary results were discussed at a follow up meeting in Ankara, October 2009. A third meeting is planned for spring 2010 in Lisbon and a final workshop will be held in Gothenburg by the end of 2010. Workshops and meetings on national levels including local stakeholders are carried out in parallel in all three countries.

During summer and autumn 2009, parallel case studies including questionnaires and interviews have been carried out in Sweden, Portugal and Turkey. A basic set of questions are used in all countries for the respondents in the four groups; tourists, decision-makers, market- and knowledge-structure. The basic questionnaires were written in English and then translated into appropriate languages. The Swedish group also included the residents of Gothenburg in their survey.

For several of the case studies we have used professional companies for the administration of the questionnaires. In Gothenburg, for example, 1000 tourists were approached at 10 different tourist-gathering-places. Questionnaires were delivered in three languages: Swedish, English and German. For each tourist who agreed upon participation the name, e-mail and phone number was documented. Every person was then provided with a questionnaire, answer envelope and e-mail log-in-code. A first reminder was sent out after a week and a second after two weeks. By this procedure 578 answers were obtained. To reach respondents within the market, decision and knowledge structure we also used structured interviews, workshops and meetings.

In order to transfer knowledge within the project group each national group have written two reports. One of the reports describes the *national decision making structure on tourism* and the second report describes *the case study area*. These two reports will be used both as a base

for the future analyses of empirical data as well as a comparison of the status of decision making tourism in the three countries.

Future work

Up to this date, November 2009, more than half of the planned case studies have been carried out. Analysis of the empirical data have started and will continue in parallel with case studies in order to be able to reach the goal of the two-year project by the end of 2010, i.e. to provide a database on urban tourism and climate change that can be used for future research, recommendations and strategy developments.

The ambition is that the empirical data gathered during the first two years should be turned back to the stakeholders (decision, market and knowledge structure) as related to the implementations of climate change consequences. Results from the three countries, so far, indicate that even though there is almost a consensus among stakeholders' knowledge and awareness about the future decrease/increase in tourism demands and preferences, they do not, generally speaking, plan for the practical implications of these consequences.

A future project will therefore include a challenge to develop methods on: how to engage more measures by the market structure, how to make knowledge more practical and create public awareness, how decision makers and planners can integrate the process and make them more familiar about possible measures. In order to be able to do this the project group will apply for the second URBAN-NET call in January 15, 2010.

Gothenburg, November 11,

Ingegärd Eliasson, professor & project coordinator.

The potential impact of climate change on heat stress in different built structures and cities across Europe

is an interdisciplinary pre-research project, including scientists from Sweden, Germany and UK, within the European collaboration program URBAN-NET funded by Formas, the Swedish Research Council for Environment, Agricultural Sciences and Spatial Planning.

Research partners:

Sofia Thorsson (Coordinator) and Ingegärd Eliasson, Urban Climate Group, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Helmut Mayer, Meteorological Institute, University of Freiburg, Germany

Marialena Nikolopoulou, Department of Architecture & Civil Engineering, University of Bath, United Kingdom

Advisory partners:

Dr Franziska Matthies, WHO Regional Office for Europe, Italy

Associate professor Igor Knez, Department of Education and Psychology, University of Gävle, Sweden

Background

The mean air temperature in Europe is expected to rise 2 - 6 °C by 2100. In temperate climates, a 2-3 °C increase in average summer temperatures will double the frequency of periods characterized by extremely high temperatures. This means that heat waves will

become more frequent, more intense and last longer. The World Health Organisation (WHO) acknowledges that the future increase in temperature will have profound effects on the health and well-being of citizens in Europe. In order to mitigate the problems with intensified heat stress and design better cities and outdoor public places quantitative information on factors determining outdoor thermal comfort is required.

The aim of this pre-research project has been to:

- i) Carry out a pilot study, including simulations of future heat stress in different urban forms and cities across Europe
- ii) Present and discuss the results from the pilot study at an European workshop held in Göteborg September 24-25, 2009
- iii) Write a full joint URBAN-NET or FP7 (Environment programme) research proposal, based on the discussions and gaps of knowledge, research needs and common research interests that were identified at the workshop.

Pilot study

The aim of this pilot study was to i) analyse the influence of urban geometry on outdoor thermal environment, expressed as the mean radiant temperature (T_{mrt}), which is one of the most important factor influencing the human thermal comfort and ii) calculate the potential future change in heat and cold stress between different urban places.

The city centre of Göteborg, Sweden was selected for case study. To quantify the influence of urban geometry on T_{mrt} four urban places with different built geometries within the case study area was selected for more detailed analysis, i.e. a large square, a small courtyard, a north-south oriented street canyon and an east-west oriented street canyon. Two datasets were used, i) hourly meteorological data for one typical year (1977) and ii) statistically downscaled data from two GCMs under two emission scenario (medium and high). The SOLWEIG 1.0 model was used to calculate the T_{mrt} and the physiologically equivalent temperature (PET) thermal index was used to quantify the perception of the thermal conditions and the physiological stress by a collective of people.

The study showed large T_{mrt} differences within short distances both on hourly, daily and annual average, as a result of the urban geometry, e.g. street direction, spacing and width, building height etc, which controls the amount of solar radiation that reaches the ground and building surfaces and reflection of short-wave and long-wave radiation. On hourly-average T_{mrt} differences of up to 32°C were found between the large square and the adjacent narrow street canyon. On a daytime and annual basis, the differences were up to 14°C and 6°C, respectively. Results from the pilot study showed that in a future warmer climate, occasions with strong and extreme heat stress is expected to triple, from 50 to 151 hours in Göteborg by 2100. This means that occasion with extreme heat stress will be more frequent. On the other hand the number of hours with strong and extreme cold stress will decrease by in average 400-450 hours or 20-25% in winter. For the city of Göteborg, with its cool summers, variable weather and few air conditioned buildings, the increase in heat related mortality is unlikely to be compensated for by the decrease in cold-related mortality.

European workshop

On 24-25 September 2009 a European workshop on the potential impact of climate change on heat stress in different built structures and cities across Europe was held in Göteborg with invited researchers working with urban and regional climate, urban planning, thermal comfort and risk analysis. The aim of the workshop was to present and discuss the results from the

pilot study as well as to give an overview of past and ongoing research and to identify gaps of knowledge, research needs and common research interests on heat stress and climate change in cities across Europe.

Outcome of the pre-research project

The results from the pilot study were presented at the seventh International Conference on Urban Climate (ICUC7) in Yokohama in June 2009. The paper was selected to showcase the leading edge research presented at the conference and has been invited for submission for a special volume of the International Journal of Climatology.

A European research network/cooperation, consisting of researchers working within the field of heat stress and climate change in cities across Europe was established during the workshop in Göteborg, Sweden. Next meeting will be held in Kassel, Germany in April 2010.

Based on the discussions at the workshop in Göteborg gaps of knowledge, research needs and common interests were identified, which will constitute the base for a full joint URBAN-NET or FP7 (Environment programme) research proposal.

Towards an optimisation of urban-planning and architectural parameters for energy use in Mediterranean cities

University of Cyprus, Dept of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Nicosia, Cyprus,
(coordinator)
National Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology, Sofia
University of Gävle, Sweden

Recent studies on the influence of climate change on Northern European cities suggest that within 50 years they may experience a climate close to that of South European cities today. This has enormous resource implications when the design and layout of the urban fabric and the individual buildings are not well suited to mitigate extreme conditions. There is therefore a strong need for strategic designs to be developed which would mitigate such environmental changes. Whilst the general cause of overheating of cities is well known, it is not well understood how much influence different urbanization characteristics as well as the building materials have on the intensity of the city overheating.

This *research project* aims to investigate the influence of urbanization in terms of architectural parameters in relation to energy use. Most research hitherto has addressed individual street canyons flows, and the effect of the canyons aspect ratio and orientation. This research will focus on the whole real city, its overall form and the street network, which can be seen as a ventilation network removing heat. In particular, the project will address a typical Cypriot urban site as a generic Mediterranean case.

The complexity of the problem requires an inter-disciplinary approach involving both computational and experimental methods: Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) simulations, wind tunnel laboratory experiments and field measurements of surface heat flux.

Group discussions

European Added Value

Facilitator: *Thilo Petri*, TÜV Rheinland, Moderator: *Gé Huismans*, SenterNovem

Background

One of the main aims of ERA-Nets is to generate added value through transnational cooperation. Activities should be carried out that have better results when they are not implemented solely nationally or at EU-FP7 levels.

At the beginning of URBAN-NET there were intensive discussions on what could be “added values” of transnational cooperation activities in the field of research for urban sustainability. Now after more than 3 years of experience URBAN-NET wanted to come back to this issue and conclude what added values we experienced and where additional potential for such could be detected for future activities.

These questions were explored in three subsequent “added value sessions” with different stakeholders at the Stakeholder Workshop in Stockholm.

Workflow of the session

The sessions which lasted 45 and 60 minutes respectively, were started with a brief input presentation on “European Added Value”, presented by the facilitator. The presentation included possible "provocative" statements from the view of different stakeholder groups of URBAN-NET. The aim of this procedure was to quickly start off and stimulate the discussion by challenging the participants with statements they could agree or disagree with.

Following this a brainstorming session with cards was carried out in two turns. In the first phase the following question was posed:

a) *What is your experience with “European Added Value”?*

After 5 minutes the filled out cards were selected. Some were read out and discussed by participants. Through this method every stakeholder was able to give at least one statement or opinion and thus to actively contribute to the session.

After a short discussion round the second question was posted:

b) *What do you suggest to improve the “European Added Value”?*

Again cards were filled out and collected. The given statements and ideas were discussed by the full group afterwards.

After the session all filled out cards we collected, clustered, analysed and subsumed in this report further.

Although the session was prepared for the 4 main stakeholder groups listed below, the participants were mainly researchers and programme managers.

- Researcher
- Programme Manager (Funding organisations)

- Practitioners from local level (policy makers, urban planners and managers)
- European Commission officers.

Despite of the shortness of time, one can conclude that the sessions went well and relevant input was received and discussed which will enrich the URBAN-NET future activities.

Session outputs

The following statements and ideas were discussed among the participants of the three groups.

“What is your experience with European Added Value?”

Starting off with this session it was said that URBAN-NET – by its trans-border cooperation - enabled beneficial activities that would otherwise not have been generated. URBAN-NET, as an URBAN-knowledge network would be filling a gap in Europe. It was agreed by participants of one session that in a merging Europe such transnational activities will be crucial and indispensable in the future. This holds particularly true for the field of urban development since the learning and exchanging factors would be relatively high.

Furthermore the importance was argued not to reduce transnational cooperation potentials only to coordination and resource efficiency in research policy. Instead one should look at benefits achieved by research itself and the aim to bring research results into practice.

The following aspects were discussed:

Raising quality of research

The point was made that the quality of research was enriched due to several different mechanisms. Through transnational cooperation projects researchers gained access to more research fora and networks.

In relation to that the benefits for international comparative research were highlighted. It gives the chance to understand complex dynamics and broad concepts better because one could easily categorise and study those complexities. The circumstances for such kind of research studies were considerably improved now, because more relevant data would be available due to better accessibility (“more data means better results”) but also due to overcoming the language problems. By trans-border cooperation similar phenomena can be studied in different contexts and the validity can be enhanced.

Receiving better value for money

It was argued that in a globalising world urban development problems and research are not refined to national borders anymore. This holds more and more true since an increasing number of challenges are having a supra-national character. Research has always been working internationally, this is not new. However, it is seen as a necessary step forward that research policies and funding mechanisms are also catching up with both the demand of transnational cooperation and the facts that this has been started by some researchers already. According to some researchers in the groups this initiative should be mainstreamed in subsequent steps.

Additionally it was stressed that more information can be exchanged and results generated for the same amount of national resources which means that national resources are more efficiently used.

Boosting urban research and their effects in national countries

Both researchers and programme managers pointed out, that transnational activities have an underestimated effect back on the national level. It was reported that more money on urban related research was invested in some countries. It would otherwise not have been spent on urban national research solely.

In some examples internationally generated knowledge and solutions received a better credibility for research and local politicians. It was expected that these are having a better quality.

In many national areas it was observed that there is greater impact if outsiders with different backgrounds would point on problems and bring in approaches as well as solutions. This is even more true if a transfer of knowledge from stronger to weaker knowledge environments is involved.

Avoiding duplication and mistakes

The research arenas in most thematic fields in Europe are highly fragmented. This is also valid for research on urban development. In most cases there is not enough transparency on carried out research in other countries which leads to a duplication of activities. By transnational research, gaps of knowledge can be easily detected and interim results fed into current and future research. Mistakes can be avoided through transfer of experience from other countries and other circumstances. Furthermore, new research ideas are better generated.

Capitalising on networking and economies of scales benefits

For the generation and carrying out of meaningful research, contacts and networking particularly with other disciplines, cultural backgrounds and perspectives are essential prerequisites. Transnational cooperation provides a foundation for networking for actual and future work.

Capitalising on learning and environments of exchange

As suggested before, researchers need to exchange in order to capitalise on their research, ideas and experiences. As experienced by session participants, the international perspective is a much broader scope for gaining useful exchange of information, new ideas and inputs. URBAN-NET was said to provide a good learning environment between countries and researchers.

The same is valid for research policy and research management. There were clear benefits for exchange and learning of research and programming procedures among the countries.

Mutual learning experiences (high-tech and low tech) were also reported from the practitioner's level. As decision makers are seeking new ways of tackling urban challenges, approaches become relevant which are practiced in other cultures. That means for example that a North Western city such as Stockholm could learn from approaches and experiences from a South Eastern city such as Istanbul (e.g. urban agriculture and gardening).

According to session participants pan-European learning and cooperation will be playing an increasing role in the future.

“What do you suggest to enhance the European Added Value?”

In the second phase, options for improvement of the added value though URBAN-NET were brought forward by session participants.

The following points were discussed:

Again it was agreed that URBAN-NET has had a good start which should be secured and followed up in the future. The network should be strengthened and its vision should incorporate new issues for the long run. In this respect the foundation of an URBAN-NET EU-liaison and support office was proposed.

Follow up of current URBAN-NET calls

By one session group URBAN-NET was requested to monitor the research projects while they are proceeding and evaluate the results after the projects have ended.

To enhance the quality of research carried out by the funded projects, the benefits of a horizontal exchange between all URBAN-NET projects (network meetings) was highlighted. That could function like a learning programme, where researcher can generate synergies between the running projects.

It was also said that the pooling of new generated and available knowledge as well as the take-up by end-users should be shifted into the centre of deliberations.

Results and relevant outcomes should be either directly published by URBAN-NET or the publication should be facilitated (website, books, pdf etc). It was recommended to do so not only in English but also in national languages to enhance the meaningfulness and options for an uptake of the results in all countries.

Re-design upcoming URBAN-NET calls

It was objected by one programme manager that ***transition costs*** of the calls were often too high. At the same time there has been personal experience that the results are often relatively poor as compromises affect outcomes negatively. That should be considered by URBAN-NET when designing calls and carrying out the subsequent monitoring.

The ***limited participation of URBAN-NET countries*** in calls was strongly criticised. Researchers from particular countries are not able to be involved since their home country is not participating. Participation of more countries in the calls would give possibilities for research activities. In relation to that it was argued that a real common pot would be helpful in order to give more freedom and more possibilities for matchmaking. Such an action would make sure that all A-evaluated projects can be funded and there are no difficulties because of “funding-arithmetics”.

It was demanded by several session participants to ***more focus the URBAN-NET*** joint activities, namely the ***calls*** and projects and to provide clearer targets from the outset.

The suggestion came up to fasten the establishment of ***transdisciplinary and multi-sectoral consortia*** with active partnerships of academia and research centers, public authorities (all levels), SME and other stakeholders to tackle issues and provide practical solutions to societal problems.

Most researchers argued that transnational cooperation would be highly beneficial. However, it would take more time for the building of a consortium, the development of a research design, the preparation of a proposal as well as for the carrying out of actual research. Thus ***longer project durations*** were suggested (3-5 years) that could meet the higher demands. In relation to that it was suggested that the extra expenses for travel should be considered appropriately when deciding on project budgets.

It was pointed out that the *application procedures* would be demanding and the success rate comparatively small. A two step procedure might help to ease on this. As for the application period there was a request for a longer time span to more systematically find new partners.

Many researchers criticised the problems arising from different *national regulations* which make the management and coordination of a project rather difficult and time-consuming. It is obvious that national funding systems are not designed and are not yet ready to support transnational cooperation. Thus, regulations among funding organisations should be harmonised to avoid negative impact on the projects.

The possibility of carrying out *pre-research* projects was discussed. On the one hand they were welcomed because circumstances could be discussed that would not have been discussed otherwise. On the other hand it was considered to be better to develop and enhance a project in the first phase of a funded project.

Suggestions for additional URBAN-NET activities

URBAN-NET was called on putting much more efforts on *lobbying with Europe at research and practitioners' levels* ("Get more involved! Go and lobby in Europe!"). It should also get more involved in other programmes at European level e.g. on the influencing of agendas, calls as well as project and programme monitoring and evaluation. Own activities should be better coordinated between national and EU-funding activities.

Suggestions were made to spread and *enlarge the network* and foresee accession of nations bordering EU such as Russia.

It was suggested by one participant to *start training and education* on research contents, the need of trans-national work and the management of such an undertaking among young researchers.

The suggestion was brought forward to *improve URBAN-NET's information and communication capabilities*. That means the network should be more transparent on projects and planned initiatives. A better announcement of all relevant calls relevant at European level - including FP7 calls was prompted.

Several participants raised the issue of *language problems*. The non existing common language both between countries and disciplines is perceived as a serious drawback for the project work, because one often cannot fully use the potentials of transnational cooperation. URBAN-NET was asked to put more attention on that issue.

Conclusions

The workshop sessions brought up a wealth of experiences, perceptions and further ideas, which could not be expected before the sessions.

In general the URBAN-NET experience was perceived as "really useful" by most session participants. The network is seen as a facilitator making learning and cooperation at European level possible. Options were established that could not have been generated otherwise.

By the network's activities real added value seems to have been generated and this is starting to get visible now.

However, some very good improvements were suggested that should be considered by the consortium in a follow up and further development of the network.

There is still much scope for further enhancements!

Integrated approach

Facilitator: *Marije Breukelman*, Nicis, Moderator: *Stephen Midgley*, SNIFFER

Background

One of the main characteristics of the URBAN ERA-NET is to stimulate and promote an integrated approach to urban sustainability research. The integrated approach is a recurring topic within URBAN-NET: it is mentioned on the website, in the strategic reference framework, in the call texts, and so on. For example, in the call, the integrated approach is described “*as integrating social, economic and ecological dimensions – it is imperative and inter- and trans-disciplinary research teams are a means to manage the complexity of the urban problems. Social, economic and environmental dimensions must be considered.*”

Thus, since the integrated approach is a very important and recurring issue for the network, URBAN-NET wanted to ask researchers as well as representatives from funding organisations how; what are the obstacles?, what has been learnt over the years? There were three separate sessions in which these questions were elaborated upon. All sessions had a different make-up: in one of them there were only researchers present, and in the other two, there was a mix of researchers, funders and ‘others’.³

Workflow

As mentioned, there were three sessions, each lasting 45 minutes. Stephen Midgley gave a short introduction on the topic. He showed that the integrated approach was already an integral part of EU documents, such as the Leipzig Charter, and that it was also present in URBAN-NET documentation as well as the stakeholder workshop itself. All in all, it is a very well known concept, but in this session we were keen to make an inventory of the problems encountered as well as the opportunities. Participants were asked how they had interpreted the integrated approach. In addition, they were asked (each stakeholder from his or her own perspective) what the obstacles are, the gaps (i.e. where there is much to gain).

Session output

Integrated approach – different aspects

During the sessions we spoke about two different features of the integrated approach, so to say. The first is the integrated approach for research disciplines, as was mentioned in the first paragraph, combining social, economic and ecological dimensions of research. Overall, participants felt that this was something that went rather well, although important factors for success are time, money, open-minded people who are strong in their own discipline.

The second kind of integrated approach is related to the decision-making process: the science-policy-practice interface. This was felt to be a more challenging process, in which there is much to gain.

Keywords

The main keywords that came back during each of the three sessions were the following:

³ The participants of the workshop can broadly be characterised as follows: researchers, programme managers (Funding organisations), practitioners from local level (policymakers, urban planners and managers), European Commission officers.

- Time: researchers indicated that it takes time to get to know each other, to be able to work together, trust each other and come to productive results. However, usually time is limited and once the project comes to an end, the cooperation usually ceases to exist also. It was indicated that time will allow researchers to build more durable cooperation methods and will be more fruitful in the end.
- Money: closely related to the time issue, are money matters. The possibility of working together is created by funds, and when these are limited, or cover a short period of time, working together becomes more difficult for the researchers.
- Open-mindedness: researchers need to be open minded to other disciplines for the cooperation to be fruitful. It is easy to say you want to work together, but you have to be willing to accept that what the others contribute can be useful as well. It is not just your own perspective that is worthwhile, the other research dimensions can contribute just as much. However, it is also essential that researchers are strong in their own field, since this brings the best knowledge to the table, thereby combining the best in the different fields.
- Meet at the beginning: for a project that works in an integrated manner, it is imperative that researchers meet at the beginning of the project.
- Capacity building, linkages:

Observations

During the sessions, there were some issues that came back every time. One remark that aptly summarised the view of participants was that although it 'is easy to say that one wants sustainable cities, but when looking at how to do this, you realise the differences' between actors. Therefore, a lot of investment is needed in bringing together policy makers, scientists and decision makers. Even though the moderator tried to steer the discussion toward integrated approaches on the research level, it was striking that almost every time this was tried, the discussion went back to the science-policy-interface level. Many participants indicated they the biggest problem or obstacle was not so much in the research field itself, but more between the different layers of science, policy and practice.

One participant said that researchers used old-fashioned methods of communication and were therefore unable to bring the message across. He also indicated that it was the researcher's task to disseminate knowledge. However, some researchers replied that even though they wanted to do that, it was hardly ever budgeted for in their projects and was something they had to do on their own accord and in their own time. In addition, policy makers do not always see clearly how they can use research results. Researchers, on the other hand, are valued for their academic input (such as publications in relevant journals, books, etc.) and not for their cooperation with or contribution to policy fields or practice.

These examples show that there is a lot to be gained from further support for the integrated approach in the science-policy-practice interface. It seems that the different stakeholders do not always know how to find each other, how to make time for this and how to prioritise.

Ideas

There is a trail of knowledge from research to practice, but it is neither quantified nor qualified. Sometimes the trail is clear and picked up by different actors, but more often the dissemination trail is diffuse. One of the ideas presented during the workshop was that of the Göteborg Centre of excellence for Sustainable Urban Futures. This institutionalisation of the science-policy-practice interface may force the different actors to work together, by creating the possibility to do so. It facilitates the interface, encouraging the exchange of knowledge, as well as getting the right people together in one place.

Conclusions

The workshop brought together actors from different backgrounds and from all over Europe. In each session, experiences were shared and perceptions were elaborated upon. The most interesting feature of the sessions was that almost everybody agreed that a lot of progress had been made in the field of integrated research (social, economic, ecological), but that there was a lot to be gained from integrating the fields of science, policy and practice. There is a lot of knowledge produced by researchers, and there is a want for this by policy makers, etc, but it remains difficult to integrate these dimensions of the urban arena. Participants indicated that they would also like UN to play a role in facilitating the relation between research and policy/practice. The network can form a central finding place of integrated urban research for policy makers and practitioners.

Funding urban research

Facilitator: *Anne Querrien*, MEEDDAT/PUCA, Moderator: *Kristina Björnberg*, Formas

Joint programming and URBAN-NET2 were discussed in two sessions with basically different groups. The workshop welcomed two countries not yet members of URBAN-NET, Denmark and Poland, one representative from the DG Research Environment. From Austria we had two attendees, one from URBAN-NET and the leader of the Joint programming initiative on City of the Future, and URBAN-NET members from Sweden, Bulgaria, France, Portugal and Turkey.

JPI – Joint Programming Initiative

Austria is in favour of Joint Programming (JP), but does not think it will cover all European urban research activities. Urban research is developing on several layers and this will go on. But the idea of JP is to bring together national efforts, either funding by specific national programs, or by marking money in existing programs. It is an opportunity to participate in European research within national frameworks. The Joint Programming is to be multiplayer, systemic, interdisciplinary, to embrace the whole field, but this does not seem easy to “sell” to other countries” who ask for tight focussing.

Austria thinks the funding for a transnational coordination at the European level will not be big enough to form a strong group.

DG Research believes that JP is a good idea, but the boundaries and the focus of the current proposal concerning urban issues have to be changed. Now it is primarily concerned with technology, i.e. transport. All other aspects of urban research would have to be funded by other mechanisms if the proposal remains unchanged.

DG Research underlines the positive intent of JP. It is not a question of money only, but also of gathering efforts in Europe to solve important problems, like the Alzheimer disease which was the first Joint programming. The aim of JP is to integrate cities and firms in the management of research. JP may be a strategic umbrella for a wide range of research projects, and related to building with other funding programs. But at the moment it is difficult to know if JPI will be only another tool for funding or an umbrella for a wide range of research projects.

Bulgaria means that Joint Programming could be useful because politicians don't understand the integrated approach, which is the core of URBAN-NET.

Sweden underlines that the project presented is not ready yet, and that we must be grateful to have this opportunity to enter the discussion. Even if the project is already focussed, it is not as focussed as the ones already going on in health. If JP would be focussed within urban sustainability, like the former joint programs, it would not cover the whole field anyway.

Sweden concludes that Joint Programming seems at the right institutional level, i.e. that of Ministers. Institutions linked with research funding are waiting for such a high level initiative. Researchers are waiting for guidance, and so are stakeholders. Joint programming is very important but may be built slowly. For the preparation of joint programming we need a transnational coordination which will contribute to shape Joint programming.

The conclusion is that a transnational cooperation like URBAN-NET is very important, we must apply for an URBAN-NET2.

URBAN-NET2

The main task then is to attract more countries, especially from the new member-states in URBAN-NET.

Poland informs that they are interested in URBAN-NET, for the second round, and think that it is a rather specific form of ERA-NET.

Austria agrees to be in the URBAN-NET2, if cities are present to organise applications of the concepts developed in research at the local level.

Denmark is definitely interested in urban sustainability research, but feels that the institutional situation is very confused.

Poland wants the participants not to forget other funding programs like the article 169, used by the Baltic countries. In the case of water issues a transversal ERA-NET on water management has been obtained, but it may not be the case in other fields.

The future of URBAN-NET could perhaps be seen in other funding programs than the FP7, like COST for instance, or SSH (?) Governance and democracy.

URBAN-NET needs to capitalize its results on subjects that interest politicians like Climate neutral cities for instance, and to communicate it in a more popular way.

Portugal and Turkey points out the necessity to include urban mobility in the research themes developed in URBAN-NET to fit better with the Joint programming definition. All participants stress the *Integrated approach* as the main feature of URBAN-NET, its "selling"

position. But Bulgaria and Austria have doubts about the capacity of stakeholders to understand this objective.

DG Research informs that in the call appearing in 2010 for 2011 funding there will be an item for a cooperation network preparing Joint Programming.

Austria congratulates participants for this idea of URBAN-NET2 as a preparation for Joint Programming. This creates a real opportunity window for the network

Conclusion - we need an URBAN-NET2:

- to develop what is an integrated approach of urban development and urban ecosystems, of housing and urban mobility
- to organise an extension of URBAN-NET 1 in the gap before the call 2011
- to extend the network toward new countries
- to extend the network toward new participants: cities, firms, NGOs
- to prepare the call 2011 for URBAN-NET 2
- to participate in Joint programming negotiations
- to organise URBANET-2 as a preparation of Joint programming.

An anthology of essays based on funded projects

Facilitator: *June Graham*, Moderator: *Ulla Westerberg*

Plans for an anthology of essays based on the funded projects were discussed with researchers in the three groups of project presentations. The discussions started with reflections of the presentations that were made just before.

It was evident that the concept of resilience had a very broad meaning. Four of the projects had applied for funding within the theme of “Resilient city”, which was the only option since they included Dutch researchers. The fifth project, on retail planning, included no Dutch researchers but all the same was placed in this group which gave it an interesting range of themes from planning for “shopping” and cultural industries to land use policy, privatised neighbourhoods in decay and ecosystem services.

The next group, “Managing urban change”, included three pre-research projects; network democracy; gender and diversity; climate neutral cities. The first two had grown since the application and had used the pre-research resources to write applications for research projects. The third was an existing network of researchers and cities that used the resources for strengthening the research part of it. The group thought that “Managing” was too mechanic or instrumental as a title. “From awareness to implementation” or “Governance and participation” were other proposals.

“Climate change” – why not add “in the urban context”? There was a proposal to make a film e.g. from field studies.

The anthology was discussed and afterwards summarised in the following “rules” for the authors of the essays:

- The objective of the anthology is to promote URBAN-NET and transnational research cooperation, e.g. if URBAN-NET applies for an extension of the project, to bring to events like the one we are planning for World Urban Forum etc, (Contact us if you have other ideas for joint dissemination).
- The overall aim is to demonstrate the diversity of urban research and the (imposing) capacity for transnational research cooperation. The red thread is the diversity of the research area and its close connexion to everyday urban practices.
- The style should be lively and "conversational" - for a main target audience of practitioners, policy makers.
- Describe the research area and position your project. Explain why your project is so urgent and what makes it so very interesting. Reflect on how your project is related to "resilient city"/"governance and participation" (formerly managing urban change – you can suggest something else)/"climate change in the urban context" (or simply climate change?). Describe the research problem and maybe expected outcome. Don't go into lengthy descriptions on methodology.
- Submit a normal word document without fancy formatting, 6 to 10 pages, including any images. These should be sent separately, preferably as JPEG files, highest resolution possible. No PDF files.
- Last day for submission is 31 January – we need time for editing and printing and will need to have a printed version ready in March. Mail your contribution to us. We may suggest changes which might after all be necessary to fit all papers into one coherent anthology. We will also write an introduction describing the background etc. to bind all the papers together.

Study tour to Hammarby Sjöstad

Hammarby Sjöstad is a new district in Stockholm where the City has imposed tough environmental requirements on buildings, technical installations and the traffic environment, from day one. Stockholm Water Company, Fortum and the Stockholm Waste Management Administration have jointly developed a common eco-cycle model designed to ensure organic recycling throughout Hammarby Sjöstad – known as "The Hammarby Model". This model is the thread that binds together the entire environmental programme and demonstrates how the various technical supply systems are integrated.

We had a guided tour outside by *Björn Cedequist*, City of Stockholm, and a presentation at the information centre, GlashusEtt, by *Malena Karlsson*. For more information:

<http://www.hammarbysjostad.se/>.



List of participants

Andersen	Hans	Statens Byggeforskningsinstitut (SBI)	Hørsholm
Anguelieva	Karina	Agency for Sustainable Development and Eurointegration - Ecoregions	Sofia
Aubertel	Patrice	MEEDDATPUCA	Paris
Barthel	Stephan	Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics	Stockholm
Batchvarova	Ekaterina	National Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology	Sofia
Björnberg	Kristina	Formas	Stockholm
Bratoeva	Anna	National Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology	Sofia
Breukelman	Marije	Nicis Institute	The Hague
Cachinho	Herculano	Lisbon University	Lisboa
Christina	Christina	Formas	Stockholm
Colding	Johan	Beijer Institute & Stockholm Resilience Centre	Stockholm
Corte Real	Maria	Foundation for Science and Technology, Portugal	Lisbon
Denefle	Sylvette	François Rabelais University Tours France	Tours
Eliasson	Ingegård	University of Gothenburg	Göteborg
Eraydin	Ayda	Middle East Technical University	Ankara
Ernstson	Henrik	Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics	Stockholm
Ertekin	Özhan	Istanbul Technical University-Dept.of Urban and Regional Planning	Istanbul
Fabbri	Karen	European Commission	Brussels
Graham	June	SNIFFER	Edinburgh
Henriksson	Anu	Nordregio	Stockholm
Hertting	Nils	Uppsala University,	Uppsala
Hudson	Christine	Umeå University	Umeå
Huismans	Gé	SenterNovem	Utrecht
Hårsman	Björn	Royal Institute of Technology	Stockholm
Ivanova	Petja	Association for integrated development and sustainability	Sofia
Kloosterman	Robert	AMIDSt/Universiteit van Amsterdam	Amsterdam
Knez	Igor	University of Gävle	Gävle
Kugelberg	Clarissa	Uppsala universitet	Gävle
Kärrholm	Mattias	Dep of Urban Studies, MAH	Malmö
Lundgren	Christina	Formas	Stockholm
Mendes	Clara	Universidade Tecnica de Lisboa	Lisbon

Midgley	Stephen	SNIFFER	Edinburgh
Neophytou	Marina	University of Cyprus	NICOSIA
Nylund	Katarina	Malmö University	Malmö
Olshammar	Gabriella	University of Gothenburg	Gothenburg
Past	Daniela	Federal Environment Agency	Vienna
Petri	Thilo	TÜV Rheinland Consulting GmbH	Cologne
Polk	Merritt	University of Gothenburg	Göteborg
Polt	Wolfgang	Joanneum Research Forschungsgesells. mbH	Vienna
Power	Dominic	Uppsala University	Uppsala
Querrien	Anne	MEEDDATPUCA	Paris
Rafailov	Anton	Rafailov Consult Ltd.	Sofia
Roux	Nicole	Université de Bretagne Occidentale	Brest
Runceanu	Claudiu	ATU - Urban Transition Association,	Bucharest
Sandberg	Mats	University of Gävle	Gävle
Schmitt	Peter	Nordregio	Stockholm
Schylberg	Katarina	Delegation for Sustainable Cities	Stockholm
Skurzyński	Piotr	National Centre for Research and Development - NCBiR	Warsaw
Stroink	Klaus	TÜV Rheinland Consulting GmbH	Cologne
Svedin	Uno	Formas	Stockholm
Tasan-Kok	Tuna	Delft University of Technology	Delft
Terzi	Fatih	Istanbul Technical University	Istanbul
Thorsson	Sofia	University of Gothenburg	Göteborg
Tummers	Lidewij	Leibniz Universität Hannover	Hannover
Ustaoglu	Eda	Urban Institute Ireland	Dublin
Wennersten	Ronald	Royal Institute of technology	Stockholm
Westerberg	Ulla	Formas	Gävle
Wigö	Hans	University of Gävle	Gävle
Yilmaz	Harun	TUBITAK	Ankara