URBAN-NET

URBAN-NET
Deliverable 4.3

Proceedings of Stakeholder Workshop 3:
Joint activities - climate change in the urban context

Prepared by Nicis Institute
(Leaders of work package 4b)
May 2009

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	

Table of Contents

1   General Description

- Workshop title: joint activities – climate change in the urban context
- Date: March 31st and April 1st, 2009
- Venue: CAOP, Lange Voorhout 9, The Hague, The Netherlands

The URBAN-NET Workshop in The Hague brought together 45 professionals from URBAN-NET's partner countries. In four sub-sessions, participants, experts and URBAN-NET members several options for possible joint activities were discussed. These options had been selected through an extensive survey, in which URBAN-NET members could indicate in which possible activities they were interested. In addition, it was decided by the URBAN-NET consortium to focus on climate change issues, as this was identified during the previous Stakeholder Workshop in Berlin as one of the future research areas on urban sustainability in Europe. Participants of the workshop all chose their own sub-session, in which the activity was presented by an expert, discussed by all and subsequently a shortlist of favoured activities was produced.

The Workshop was prepared and organised by Nicis Institute, in conjunction with the other Management Group members from URBAN-NET and SenterNovem.

2   Background information workshop

The overall ambition of the workshop was to work towards the development of joint activities in the realm of climate change between national urban research programmes and/or research funders, with the input from the end user to assure usability and practical implementation of the end results.

A majority of the world's energy consumption takes place in cities or due to the transport of goods between cities. This proportion is set to grow as the United Nations forecast projects three in five people in the world will live in cities within the next twenty years. This global trend toward increased urbanisation has as a consequence that climate change impacts in most countries will mainly affect urban populations, not rural or traditional settlements. Thus, climate change and urban growth are inseparably linked, and general issues of sustainability require an urban focus. In addition, cities are not only vulnerable to changes in climate, but they also have great potential to bring about innovative and easily reproduced solutions.

Selected possible joint of activities for the workshop (points awarded):
1. Shared dissemination events (31)
2. Dissemination of good practices (23)
3. Establish a list of relevant indicators (21)
4. Community of practice (16)
5. Joint applications for EU funds and programmes (10)

Other proposed activities, which were not selected (points awarded):

- Coordination/clustering of nationally funded research (8)
- Elaboration of common priorities/strategies/procedures (8)

- Develop policy instruments based on existing indicators (8)
- Transnational evaluation calls (6)
- Staff exchanges (5)
- Jointly funded research (5)
- Exchange/sharing/mutual opening up of means (3)
- Pool of evaluators (3)
- Urban sustainability research kit (2)
- Multi-national or common evaluation criteria (1)

3   Objectives and main tasks

The URBAN-NET consortium has agreed that, during this workshop, it will focus on climate change in the urban context. This theme also comes back in the Research Framework adopted by the network. The joint activities that are to be developed need to be durable in character, that is, they need to commit to action for the longer term and not be a one-off meeting or text.

The tasks of the workshop were to:
- Get acquainted with the possible joint activities that can be undertaken (i.e. results of the survey);
- Further deepen the knowledge of selected joint activities in separate workshops through brainstorming and clustering;
- Draft recommendations to the URBAN-NET consortium regarding facilitating of joint activities;
- Setting up of consortia of partners that will develop specific joint activities.

4   Programme overview

The workshop was set up as a two-day event, starting with a plenary session on day 1 and closing with the sub-sessions. The sessions were set up to be alike in character: first, there was a presentation by a European expert, serving as an introduction to the possible activity. Subsequently, the group facilitator launched a brainstorm, during which ideas for specific activities were gathered. After a break, the ideas were categorised and divided into viable and non-viable options. Towards the end of the day, each group had to have selected three options with which they wanted to continue and commit to. For a detailed programme, please refer to Annex 1, appendix 1.

For practical reasons, the sub-sessions on dissemination events and dissemination of good practices were combined into one sub-session. In total, there were four sub-sessions.

- *Session 1/2: Dissemination activities*

Shared dissemination events can take the form of seminars, roundtables, workshops or more general conferences. To make the joint activity durable, this could mean that partners opt to organise an annual, or bi-annual conference on relevant and topical urban themes. Another option is to participate in events organised by others and to set up a consortium that will endeavour to participate in relevant European conferences.

Dissemination of good practice can be attained via various means, the most obvious being the Internet or publications. There is already an URBAN-NET database online. Participants could decide to maintain this database and its website and add a minimum of templates each year so as to keep the website up to date. Another option is that a consortium aims to publish articles on relevant urban themes each year.

- *Session 3: Indicators*

Within the field of urban sustainability, there is a wealth of indicators and benchmarks enabling researchers and policy-makers to monitor progress. In most cases, the sets of indicator used to monitor urban sustainable development are not balanced and are overwhelmingly environmental in nature. At present, there is no practical, policy-oriented or scientific consensus about the right mix of indicators that define integrated sustainable urban development. The development of a framework linking quantitative and qualitative indicators – and, eventually, benchmarks – can be used as a policy instrument to monitor progress in the domain of integrated urban sustainable development.

- *Session 4: Community of practice*

In general terms, Communities of Practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly. More specifically, it is a platform, both virtual and real, bringing together professionals from various disciplines to share knowledge and initiate further joint activities.[1] Such a group could, e.g., deploy any of the above-mentioned activities or decide to launch a targeted project, e.g. the setting up of a system to measure the economic appreciation of urban territories.

- *Session5: Monitoring EU funds and programmes for joint applications.*

The European Commission has many interesting funds and programmes from which money can be obtained. Some of them have an urban dimension. A consortium formed under this specific activity could set up a monitoring team which will keep an eye on what calls for tenders are published and subsequently writes proposals or recommends others to do so.

5   Participants

The participants of the workshop were nominated by national URBAN-NET partners. Each partner could nominate two participants or experts. They were selected on the basis of their interest in either of the selected possible joint activities and because of their affiliation with the theme of the workshop, cities and climate change. Participants came from the following backgrounds:

- Local/regional political or administrative decision makers;
- Researcher: from research institutes and universities;
- Net-worker and multiplier: urban networks, professional umbrella associations and NGOs;
- Research and programme manager from URBAN-NET partner countries.

A full list of the attendants is attached to this document (see Appendix 2).

---

[1] For a general description of Communities of Practice, see: http://www.ewenger.com/theory/index.htm.

6   Plenary session

After a warm welcome by the workshop's moderator, Wim Hafkamp, scientific director of Nicis Institute, a general presentation on URBAN-NET was given by Paul Sizeland from Sniffer. He stepped in for the project's coordinator, June Graham After a short introduction to the URBAN-NET project, Paul Sizeland stated the core focus of the network, based on the following activities:
- Promote integrated research on urban sustainability issues;
- Engage wide community of research professions;
- Identify common strategic issues;
- Emphasis on interactions between existing research and emerging priorities;
- Results and experience of existing fora.

In addition, the project's aims were also highlighted:
- Stimulate and coordinate research funding to address pressing issues
- Bring stakeholders together to help inform development of innovative policies
- Identify and address transnational requirements for research, share good practice
- Support implementation of the European Research Area in urban research field
- Support and inform development of legislation, policy and strategies

In order to achieve this, URBAN-NET delivered a document in which an understanding of current and future research priorities is outlined. Also, a framework for collaborative research was set up, as well as opportunities for partnership exchange and knowledge. Other products include a European urban sustainability taxonomy, research profiles of 28 countries, etc. Also, a pilot call was launched, resulting in 25 proposals, with research consortia made up of teams from three to five countries involving in total 170 researchers from 12 countries. Eleven of these proposals are funded through a total of 10 URBAN-NET partners. Four of the projects had climate change as their starting point: Climate neutral cities, increased risk for heat stress, affects on urban tourism, energy use in relation to urban geometry. Other research topics include; democracy networks, gender aspects in urban sustainable development, ecosystem services, retail planning, privatised large housing estates, and cultural industries. URBAN-NET has also launched its research database, detailing around 80 research programmes from all over Europe. New templates will be uploaded so as to make sure the database becomes bigger and a reliable source of knowledge on urban research programmes in Europe. During the second Stakeholder Workshop in Berlin in June 2008, a research framework was decided upon and consequently developed by the network. The four themes are:
- Sustainable land use
- Quality of life
- Integrated urban management
- Climate Change

Paul Sizeland concluded his presentation by explaining the role of joint activities within the URBAN-NET project, as it is the last step before the final call, and by reflecting on possible future activities of the network.

The key-note speaker, professor Ingemar Elander, elaborated on the topic of cities and climate change. Prof. Erlander works for the Centre of Urban and Regional Research (CUReS) at Örebro University in Sweden and is a specialist on urban areas and climate issues. According to him, three important issues in the field of urban research have not received a lot of attention:
- cities in the global south;

- climate change adaptation (most research is on mitigation);
- the relationship between practice and research.

From a social science point of view, research on climate change issues should more often be related to more basic research on issues such as political power and its implication. Local governments have so many other policies to grapple with, for example, social issues and issues of economic development, that sometimes they do not *choose* to deal with or find solutions for problems in the realm of climate change. Another issue, a relatively new one, is the financial crisis and the relationship between climate change and economic sustainability.

Professor Elander stressed the importance of local climate policies or agendas. The Global Report on Human Settlement indicates that the manner in which cities are planned, managed, and governed, as well as how urban residents live, will to a large extent determine how they are affected by climate change. During the presentation, attention was also paid to the differences between mitigation and adaptation. Mitigation deals with the question what has to change in terms of human activity to reduce or mitigate the impact of climate change, i.e. what visions are necessary, what scenarios are relevant and what proactive policies are useful. When it comes to adaptation, the question how local governments, in cooperation with citizens, can adapt to, or anticipate, the negative effects of climate change that are already visible (for example, extreme weather).

To concretise the presentation, Professor Elander highlighted two examples from Sweden, Sundsvall[2] and Växjö[3]. Both cities have a different local context, as the first has a large scale industry (chemistry, paper and pulp industry) and the latter has only a small scale industry and knows no severe environmental problems. However, both have extensive sustainable development policies. For more information on the two cities, please refer to professor Elander's presentation on the URBAN-NET website.

---

[2] http://www2.sundsvall.se/EngMapp/EngFrame.htm
[3] http://www.vaxjo.se/VaxjoTemplates/Public/Pages/Page.aspx?id=1661

7   *Results from the sub-sessions*

For practical reasons, the sub-sessions on dissemination events and dissemination of good practices were combined into one sub-session. The following four sections provide summarised notes on the different sub-sessions, detailing the outline, presentations, discussions and outcomes. The remarks form the basis for the next step in the process of setting up joint activities (the implementation plan for joint activities). In addition, attention will be paid to the closing of the workshop: the distillation of 7 possible joint activities and committing to these activities.

7a   Shared dissemination events and dissemination of good practice

This session was a combined exercise, since the two possible activities did not draw the large crowds that were expected based on the survey results (number one and two respectively). However, the two activities could be easily combined in one session since the common denominator is the topic of disseminating.

Shared dissemination events
In the field of dissemination events, URBAN-NET had asked a representative from EUROCITIES to explain something about their work, especially with regard to their annual conference, the EUROCITIES AGM, which draws a large crowd and is a very well known event. On behalf of EUROCITIES, Ms Sinéad Mullins, from the Brussels Office, provided information on EUROCITIES as a network, giving details on the several working groups (forums) that have been established within the network and are also used to disseminate and exchange knowledge.

In the realm of climate change, there have been several initiatives from EUROCITIES, the most well-known being the Covenant of Mayors and the Climate Change Declaration, signed by mayors from all over Europe. In addition, EUROCITIES organised a French presidency event in the final semester of 2008. In the fall of 2009, the city of Stockholm will host EUROCITIES 2009 annual general meeting; approximately 450 attendees are expected. The most important aim is to attract high level speakers, which, in turn, attract more participants. Ms Mullins indicated that it is important to use as many channels (Brussels office, host cities or host organisation) as possible to make sure such speakers are booked. However, it is even more important to make sure that these efforts are coordinated. Also, last-minute cancellations are part of the game: you never know for sure whether they will actually be able to attend. EUROCITIES lessons for the URBAN-NET consortium can be summarised as follows:

- use every possible channel to push your message;
- personal contact where possible;
- don't underestimate the power of a good PR opportunity;
- be ready for last minute surprises.

Dissemination of good practices
With regard to the dissemination of good practices or other sources of information, the URBAN-NET consortium approached the European Environmental Agency (EEA), located in Copenhagen. Birgit Georgi, project manager urban issues, gave a presentation and

explained in more detail how dissemination processes run at the EEA. The aim of the EEA is to ensure that decision-makers and the general public are kept informed about the state and outlook of the environment. The accompanying vision for the EEA is to become recognised as the world's leading body for the provision of timely, relevant and accessible European environmental data, information, knowledge and assessments.

To that extent, the EEA produces several reports: five-year state and outlook reports, EEA signals, EEA reports and technical reports. In addition, EEA briefings (fact sheets) are produced, as well as a live map. Indicators and scenarios are also developed. All these means of communication are for specific target groups and serve a specific purpose, so as to serve the target groups in the most efficient way.

The EEA communicates also via its website, writing web articles and posting videos. With regard to communication, there are several options. The first is direct communication, for example via the website (internet, notification service, mailing, distribution of reports and briefings). The other option is more interactive communication, namely attending exhibitions and giving presentations at conferences, etc. In addition, there is also networking, a highly interactive way of communicating. For this, the EEA uses contacts within the European Commission (DG Environment, DG Energy and Transport, DG Regio, DG Agriculture, Eurostat, Joint Research Centre), but also the different member states and the Urban Development Group. Last but not least, the EEA tries to interact with international organisations, such as the World Health Organisation, The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the United Nations.

According to Ms Georgi, networking is essential for organisations or networks working in the urban realm. This is because there are many sectors involved in the issue, and because all levels of government are involved. In addition, there is a European urban dimension, but no European responsibility for urban issues. Therefore, networking with the different stakeholders is final. After networking, organisations can learn from each other, and disseminate the new knowledge according to the so-called 'snowball principle'.

- In conclusion, the EEA explains that there are different products and different ways of dissemination for different objectives and stakeholders;
- one-way communication is the basis;
- a combination with interactive products and different forms of dissemination is more effective;
- networking and joint activities can be highly effective and sustainable due to learning by doing and the 'snowball effect', but it requires more resources and is, as a first step, limited to the selection of stakeholders;
- all in all, a mix of targeted actions is necessary.

Brainstorm, selection of activities and feedback to plenary session
During the session, the participants shortlisted several activities they deemed interesting and useful. During the plenary feedback, the following activities were mentioned: a research database, visual mass media, an URBAN-NET conference, transferability of good practice, exchanges, mainstreaming of good practice, profiteering, tailored messages, contextual practice, city comparisons, impact evaluation, communities of practice, co-creation of knowledge. In the feedback presentation that was given by Paul Sizeland, all activities are explained in more detail. The presentation can be found on the URBAN-NET website.

Some of the activities mentioned above were already deployed by the network, such as the research database, which is up and running on the URBAN-NET website, and the

suggestion of a community of practice, an activity which was dealt with in another session of the Stakeholder Workshop. Therefore, a vote was organised so as to see which of the activities were favoured.

The first activity that was selected, was the transferability of good practice, in which it can be examined how good practices are transferred. One could investigate practices that have gone east to west or south to north. It aims to understand ways to transfer good practice from a local to a more wider spectrum.

The second activity which proved to be quite popular, was the co-creation of knowledge. This activity involves scientists and stakeholders getting together in research (internalise dissemination – learning by doing), i.e. collective designing and the embedding of knowledge transfers.

Last, but not least, the group opted for visual mass media, thereby addressing mass audiences using media like films, documentaries, using "you-tube", networking websites, etc.

7b   Establishing a list of relevant indicators

In his presentation, Koos van Dijken from Nicis Institute tried to answer a wealth of questions regarding indicators, the most challenging being *are indicators important*? In addition, he asks whether indicators are lacking, and also what are good criteria.

The fact that indicators are <u>important</u>, stems from the fact that they measure the need for political action by showing undesirable developments and trends. The mantra *what get's measured, get's done* is very important: indicators stimulate action. Indicators serve several other purposes as well. They measure the impact of policies on countries, regions and cities. In addition, they make it possible to evaluate strategies.

In his presentation Koos van Dijken explained that there are hundreds of economic, social and ecological indicators that can be used to define important elements of sustainable cities. There are even various indicators that are labelled as 'indicators of sustainability'. These indicators are sometimes developed after thorough scientific research and a conceptual framework is the basis of the proposed indicators. Other indicators are chosen because they are empirically available or the basis is even more pragmatic or opportunistic. Therefore, a lot of indicators are already existing and it is recommended not to reinvent the wheel.

Another disadvantage is that available data varies considerably within countries and particularly among them. Regarding the comparability of indicators it is important to note that comparisons can only be made at the national and NUTS-2 level[4]. This means that indicators are not comparable at the city and neighbourhood level. In addition, there is (still) no consensus about the right mix or set of indicators. All in all, this makes it increasingly difficult to compare context, different institutional frameworks, process elements and culture aspects.

At the moment, the development and analysis of indicators is too much in the hand of specialists and experts –and this should change. Taking steps towards sustainability and more integrated urban policy is and should be a sign of political will. It needs the involvement of citizens, of the civil society of NGOs and the business community. This is the only way to find new balances, to bridge conflicting interests and to overcome the obstacles of silo thinking, isolated sectoral policies and lobbying of sectoral interests. To achieve that we should not focus on further development of criteria and indicators: we need to focus on procedures, ways of working together, cooperation, dialogue, finding a common language, struggle to find new balances, stimulate counter failing powers and increase the sense of urgency. This is highly political and that is as it should be. So, in the end, the conclusion is that we are not missing any indicators. However, we need to make better use of them and combine what is already existing and developed. There lies the real breakthrough. Further development of sustainability indicators is not only a dead end because important elements will be underdeveloped, but also because it will lack flexibility and it cannot solve the problem that many indicators are not available at city level. Developing more and better indicators will take too much time and will be too much an exercise of a specialist.

There are also methodological issues at stake in the selection of indicators. In his presentation, Koos van Dijken outlined good criteria and indicators, explaining they should be quantitative, qualitative, and focus on new forms of multi-level government operation,

---

[4] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NUTS-2

governance and democratic participation, adaptability and flexibility, and so on. These methodological conditions are often not fulfilled. This consequently results in vivid debates between experts, scientists, statisticians and policy makers. The heated discussions about indicators sometimes conceal the fact that sectoral interests are at stake rather than theoretical, methodological and empirical correctness.

To make the topic more concrete, some practical examples from Germany, Sweden, France and the Netherlands were outlined. This led to a lively discussion in a relatively small group. One drawback was that the group did not include a so-called end user (municipality). During the discussions, it was concluded that indicator tools that really help cities improving their performance on "sustainability" should be:
- practical
- stimulate integrative approaches
- comprehensible also for non-experts
- flexible regarding adaptation to change
- integrative (regarding 3 domains of sustainability)
- refer to easy-at-hand data

Indicator tools can be used for:
- measuring performance of cities over time
- stimulate political development
- integrating citizens in local development (policies)
- provide orientation for cities on effectiveness
- of their policy measures

Brainstorm, selection of activities and feedback to plenary session
Participants of the session on indicators made the following recommendations to the URBAN-NET consortium:

- URBAN-NET must not undertake activities that are covered elsewhere
- URBAN-NET could develop a mechanism for **competition** between municipalities in sustainability (mix of quantitative and qualitative indicators which would have to be applied)
  - Make use of the "award-effect" (i.e. Unesco World Heritage). Competition could prompt cities to become more sustainable.
  - Could be done in cooperation with EC.
- Develop a "**minimum set**" of comparable indicators for European Cities (Toolkit of best and bad practices)
  - If a complex indicator tool is not feasible a minimum standard could be helpful (smallest denominator)
  - Could be proposed to or done with EC
- Organise an **comparative evaluation process** of existing indicators and tools, draw conclusions and give recommendations
  - Could also be suggested to EC and tendered at European level.
  - Could be pooled with Leipzig Charter process

7c   Community of Practice

In this session on the setting up and developing of a community of practice, Ms Païvi Elmkvist from the Institute for Sustainable Urban Development (ISU) in Malmö, presented her experiences. ISU is a cooperation between the city of Malmö and Malmö University. There are three employees, attempting to bridge the gap between science and practice. The project or community of practice (COP) runs from 2007-2011 and receives approximately €200,000 funding per year.

Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly. ISU – Institute for Sustainable Urban Development in Malmö, is a link between researchers and practitioners. They make sure that the urban development process has solid scientific support when it comes to sustainability. This is primarily done by creating meeting points and by facilitating cooperation between researchers at the University of Malmö and practitioners from the city of Malmö. There is, of course also cooperation with other players in the field of sustainable development, such as researchers and experts from other parts of the academic world and the business world.

There are several local government departments involved in the project, ranging from the environmental department to the roads and streets department. ISU has identified some thematic fields in which it is operating: Malmö 2050, coordination of scientific evaluation, the green city, sustainable transports, processes for sustainable city development, evaluations, etc.

ISU also mapped the existing cooperation in the region, thereby outlining the hindrances that were encountered. There was a lack of long-term commitment and planning, an unwillingness to commit financially, there were barriers between disciplines and there was a lack of resources. In addition, there was a big variation in activities. ISU battles these hindrances by building on knowledge and networks: an urban studies network, a network for a union of culture, including an agenda, and matchmaking. 'Individual' projects are also launched, focusing on sustainable renovation of post-war buildings, green tools for urban climate adaptation and ISU is also preparing the project creative urban reality.

Communication tools that are used to disseminate information and knowledge are a website, calendar and a newsletter. In short, ISU provides contact with researchers and practitioners in the field of urban development, knowledge overviews, reports and evaluations with a sustainable perspective, workshops and seminars, and lectures.

Brainstorm, selection of activities and feedback to plenary session
During the session, the discussion distilled key elements of a COP. First, a COP is practice-oriented, that is, it aims to be problem solving, aims to develop new knowledge and seeks the implementation of a new framework. To make sure a certain standard can be maintained, the focus of a COP should be on a limited number of relevant topics. Another necessity for a successful COP is that there is active involvement from people with a shared passion/concern. Therefore, all the wood must be behind one arrow, that is, it must be a coherent network community, having the same language.

On a more practical level, there should be no more than 15-20 participants, so as to keep the community manageable. The participants can be from different backgrounds, such as researchers, people from the public sector (policy makers, practioners), but also from the private sector and relevant NGOs. To keep the process alive it is recommended to have a

well-respected moderator, but to start with, a facilitator is invaluable to instigate the process of developing a COP.

The COP session made several recommendations to the URBAN-NET consortium:

1. Use the URBAN-NET research framework to create a marketplace to bring together brains, problems and money (alternative to rigid FP7 schemes);
2. Identify common topics relevant to a limited number of participants ("burning issues");
3. Create both regional (local) and European Communities of Practice.

7d   Joint applications for EU funds or programmes

The session on joint applications for EU funds or programmes kicked off with a presentation by Keela Shackell, project administrator from the SKEP ERA-NET. In her presentation, Ms Shackell briefly introduced the network and explained it is a partnership of 17 government ministries and agencies, from 13 European countries, responsible for funding environmental research. The project aims to improve the co-ordination of environmental research in Europe and runs from June 2005 until the end of May 2009. This, of course, means that SKEP is approaching its final stage and the question then of course is, how to move on?

As all other ERA-NETs, SKEP also works with several work packages, the latter two (number 5 and 6) focusing on joint activities and making recommendations for the future. After May 2009, there were several options for the network. However, in the end, 9 out of the original 17 partners, decided to continue their work in SKEP, thereby forming a self-funding consortium, i.e. they are paying for the continuation of SKEP out of their own pockets and are not using any EU funds at first. A cooperation agreement was been signed by co-funders of the third call (post-May 2009), including:
- Network agreement
- Schedule 1: SKEP network principles
- Schedule 2: framework for joint funding
- Schedule 3: amendment to the Funding Agreement for the second call
- Schedule 4: call arrangement for third call
- Schedule 5: financial summary

The network has also decided on network objectives for the new period:
- Objective 1: joint call management
- Objective 2: bidding for financial resources
- Objective 3: network communications
- Objective 4: information and staff exchange

In her presentation Ms Shackell also made some recommendations, should the URBAN-NET network decide to continue as a self-funding consortium. First of all, it is important that the network considers the ongoing work of URBAN-NET. In addition, partners need to be aware of the time it takes to negotiate an agreement everybody can agree on. This also goes for the funding priorities and ongoing objectives of the network. On a more practical level, there is a lot of work involved in the legal area. In the case of SKEP, the consortium had to be 'set up' under Belgian law for instance. Regarding finances, it was pointed out that it is of the utmost importance that there is a flexible budget, which can be amended each year according to the work that needs to be done.

To further build on the foundations of URBAN-NET and explore activities that could be undertaken after the initial URBAN-NET period ends, Gert Nijsink and Gé Huismans of SenterNovem presented their views and findings on the question 'How could (the) URBAN-NET (philosophy) live on?' In essence, they denoted three options: lobbying for a new ERA-NET call, applying for funding through other EU funds and/or programmes, and of course the option which was explained in detail at the beginning of the session, it is also possible to start a self-funding consortium.

The presentation on future options for URBAN-NET then outlined the several options for funding that are known and available at the moment.

- **European Research Area**[5]

- **Civitas**; The CIVITAS Initiative[6] helps cities to achieve a more sustainable, clean and energy efficient urban transport system by implementing and evaluating an ambitious, integrated set of technology and policy based measures.

- **Concerto**; The CONCERTO initiative[7], launched by the European Commission , is a Europe wide initiative proactively addressing the challenges of creating a more sustainable future for Europe's energy needs. Today, there are a total of 45 communities in 18 projects, each working to deliver the highest possible level of self-supply of energy. CONCERTO is part of the framework research programme supervised by the DG Energy and Transport of the European Commission.

- **Cost**; COST[8] is an intergovernmental framework for European Cooperation in Science and Technology, allowing the coordination of nationally-funded research on a European level. COST contributes to reducing the fragmentation in European research investments and opening the European Research Area to cooperation worldwide.

- **Regions of Knowledge**; The 'Regions of knowledge' initiative[9] aims to strengthen the research potential of European regions, in particular by encouraging and supporting the development, across Europe, of regional 'research-driven clusters', associating universities, research centres, enterprises and regional authorities.

- **FP7**; The Seventh Framework Programme for research and technological development (FP7) is the European Union's chief instrument for funding research over the period 2007 to 2013. CORDIS is the official portal for participating in FP7 and following related developments in European science and technology.

- **Cohesion policy - INTERREG IVC**; The INTERREG IVC Programme[10] is part of the European Territorial Cooperation Objective. It is a EU programme that helps regions of Europe work together to share their knowledge and experience. Launched in 2007, the programme will run until 2013. Two main priorities are targeted: 'Innovation and Knowledge economy' and 'Environment and Risk prevention'.

- **EQUAL**; The EQUAL Initiative[11] brings fresh ideas to the European Employment Strategy and the Social inclusion process. Its mission is to promote a better model for working life by fighting discrimination and exclusion on the basis of gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. Funded through the European Social Fund (ESF), EQUAL is being implemented in, and between, the Member States up until 2008.

- **JEREMIE**; the Joint European Resources for Micro to Medium Enterprises initiative[12]. JEREMIE provides the framework for a series of coherent financial actions to improve the financial environment for small businesses (medium, small

[5] http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/era_gp_final_en.pdf
[6] http://www.civitas-initiative.org
[7] http://concertoplus.eu
[8] http://www.cost.esf.org
[9] http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/capacities/regions-knowledge_en.html
[10] http://www.interreg4c.eu/
[11] http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/equal/index_en.cfm
[12] http://www.eif.org/jeremie/

SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

and micro enterprises, known as SMEs) at national, regional and local level. Increasing small businesses' access to finance and risk capital enables economic growth and competitiveness.

- **JESSICA**; Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas[13]. Under new procedures, Member States are being given the option of using some of their EU grant funding, their so-called Structural Funds, to make repayable investments in projects forming part of an integrated plan for sustainable urban development. These investments, which may take the form of equity, loans and/or guarantees, are delivered to projects via Urban Development Funds and, if required, Holding Funds.

- **URBACT**; a European Programme, URBACT[14] is funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), which aims to foster the exchange of experience among European cities and the capitalisation-dissemination of knowledge on all issues related to sustainable urban development.

- **ESPON**; set up to support policy development, ESPON[15] aspires to build a European scientific community in the field of territorial development. The main aim is to increase the general body of knowledge about territorial structures, trends and policy impacts in an enlarged European Union.

- **LIFE**; LIFE[16] is the EU's financial instrument supporting environmental and nature conservation projects throughout the EU, as well as in some candidate, acceding and neighbouring countries. Since 1992, LIFE has co-financed some 2,750 projects, contributing approximately €1.35 billion to the protection of the environment.

- **CIP - Intelligent Energy**; the Intelligent Energy - Europe programme[17] is the EU's tool for funding action to improve these conditions and move us towards a more energy intelligent Europe.

Although this seems quite an extensive list, there are hardly any programmes that fit the issue of urban sustainability. URBAN-NET therefore needs to focus on sectors with DGs of the European Commission, i.e. within these DGs, the sectoral aspects of the urban sustainability dimension can be found (e.g. DG Transport, DG Environment, DG Education and Culture).

During the session a lot of attention was paid to the objectives for URBAN-NET in the future. The participants agreed that a further integration of the network should be organisational, i.e. focusing on knowledge transfer. In addition, there was an appeal for a stronger consortium, meaning more partners, different partners, essential partners that cannot be left out, and regional partners. The second objective that was identified was that URBAN-NET is a unique initiative for the development and dissemination of research in the urban field in Europe. This, according to the participants, implies that URBAN-NET needs strong products so as to increase the visibility of the network. Related to this is the third objective, which focuses on the lobbying for urban research issues on the European and national level. The network should try and influence EU agendas and policies, lobbying for research priorities and funding schemes.

---

[13] http://www.eib.org/jessica/
[14] http://urbact.eu
[15] http://www.espon.eu/
[16] http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/index.htm
[17] http://ec.europa.eu/energy/intelligent/index_en.html

SIXTH FRAMEWORK
PROGRAMME

Unfortunately, most people in the group were non-URBAN-NET partners, meaning that there was not always a clear understanding of what has already been produced by the network (e.g. research database, research framework, etc.). This means, most poignantly, that the network needs to focus more on dissemination activities. In addition, the issue of private funding was raised: would it be possible to attract funding from businesses/industry?

On a more practical level, the above means that the partners of URBAN-NET and other interested parties should set up a monitoring group for lobbying and funding opportunities in Europe. On top of that, they can search for other ways of attracting funding, such as funding from the private sector.

8   Conclusions

On the second day of the workshop, all sessions reported back to the plenary session by giving a presentation and explaining what activities were chosen. This way, all participants could get a fair idea of what had been discussed in the sub sessions they did not attend. In addition, this extra information gave them a clear idea of what the activity entailed, should they decide to participate in it.

Looking at the suggestions that were brought forward during this plenary session, the moderator, Wim Hafkamp, decided to list all activities on a flip over chart and asked participants to think about the proposed activities and, most importantly, think about which activity participants would want to sign up to (in what activity do you want to be active and what do you want to do?).

Wim Hafkamp then directly enquired, per activity, who wanted to participate. The aim was to make sure that all participants were involved in at least one of the selected activities. Towards the end of the session, indeed most attending participants did sign up to one or more activities.

It was decided that the lead partner of each activity would take the initiative for a first document, outlining the activity, and asking for ideas, suggestions, and other relevant input. After that, some more poignant questions will be asked, going into more depth and exploring the issue fully.

With regard to URBAN-NET's dissemination activities, it was concluded that the network needs to be more visible and promote its products more. This was an important element that came to the fore during the Stakeholder Workshop. Indeed, promotional and dissemination activities will form a significant part of the network's undertakings towards the end of the project.

9   Next steps

To guarantee progress within the activities and a quick kick off, activity leaders were nominated. They start the process with an activity overview, which gives a general idea of the activity and asks participants to give their input on the activity, the aims and expected outcomes, as well as deadlines. These overviews are disseminated by the activity's lead partner (see also annex on joint activities and participants).

After the initial input phase, the lead partner drafts a position paper, outlining the activity, its goals and expected outcomes and what, in concrete, will be undertaken to achieve such and such goals. This will then be extended to the participants for a last chance for comments. Participants themselves can add any desired endeavours within the activity, as well as new participants to broaden the view and gain more expertise.

Nicis Institute, as leader of work package 4b, will then write an implementation plan, based on the 7 activity overviews, which will indicate the steps that need to be taken so as to develop these activities into something more permanent (Deliverable 4.2). The deadline for this implementation plan is summer 2009.

For an overview of the selected activities and their participants, please refer to Annex 1, appendix 3. Interested parties can still apply to join one of the activities. For more information, or to apply, please contact Marije Breukelman at breukelman@nicis.nl or at +31 70 344 0953.