

ENTRUST

Thematic Report

Mainstreaming and Anchoring (Draft, 17.11.2003)

Thematic Work Group: Hanka Wolter (Lisbon), Malcolm Borg, Susanne Gauci (Valletta), Peter Craig (Glasgow), Thomas Krueger (Hamburg), Simon Guentner, Knut Henkel (Berlin), Gediminas Rutkauskas (Vilnius), Niall o’Gorman (Dublin), Lykke Leonardsen (Copenhagen)

Thematic Group Coordination: Lykke Leonardsen, Simon Guentner

Structure of the report:

1. Introduction and Definitions
2. Findings
3. Recommendations

1. Introduction and Definitions

Integrated approaches to urban regeneration – also known as area-based policies - are still exceptions in urban policies in European countries. Whilst we can observe moves towards integrated cross-sectoral approaches and cooperative governance in all member states and at the EU level, these efforts do still have an exceptional character in three respects: They are limited in terms of time, space and scope.

Time limits: In many cases area-based policies are implemented in form of experimental pilot projects. For example, the EU Community Initiative Urban I and II had and have a timeframe of 6 years, the Danish Kvarterloft programme runs 7 years, the Integrated Castle project in Lisbon was planned for 8 years.

Spatial limits: Area-based policies are based special programmes for deprived neighbourhoods. They do not target cities as a whole but neighbourhoods – mainly inner city mixed function neighbourhoods and large scale housing estates – which show problems in various dimensions. These problems derive from market and state failure, which are sought to be solved or at least softened by the new forms of collaborative governance employed in area-based approaches.

Limits in scope: Area-based policies do not replace ongoing sectorally organised servicing of the areas in question. They add another additional layer, trying to integrate the sectoral interventions through various forms of negotiation. Decisions, however, are in most cases taken outside their influence/reach. In many cases, they still have a physical bias and target at improvement of the built environment.

Given these limits, area-based policies still represent a policy innovation as they see urban areas as multidimensional fabrics and seek for improvement in all dimensions. A second innovative element is that in addition to structural aims (improving the area) they also include the procedural aim to change mainstream policies. Turok (2003) identifies three ways, by which this change can occur:

- “‘Bending’ mainstream programmes towards poor communities by reallocating resources to reflect their greater need”,
- “‘Sensitizing’ core programmes to local circumstances”,
- “‘Cutting across the ‘silos’ through which services are delivered” (Turok 2003, 8).

A common feature of area-based policies is that they operate via projects. The project-based implementation eases the involvement of a broad range of actors and allows for innovations in a sense of the implementation of new ideas which wouldn't be possible for one actor alone. However, as the development approaches are limited themselves, so are projects. For the development of an area, the most critical issue here is the deadline. Whilst a clearly formulated end is essential to mobilize and organize resources, it might well be that the success of a project – be it a new training scheme or the joint construction of a playground – is dependent on its sustainability, its anchoring in the neighbourhood. So, an essential issue in area-based policies is to find or build long-term institutional structures which can take over responsibility for the innovative projects.

Thus, if we take area-based policies as time-limited - as “temporary systems” – they are facing two tasks in order to ensure a sustainable impact on the course of the area in question:

- They have to change mainstream policies which will continue to exist after the policy is terminated – this is what we refer to as “mainstreaming”.
- They have to find and create institutional arrangements which take over the responsibility for the projects which have been started after the policy is ended – this is what we refer to as “anchoring”.

All of these policies are based on some form of partnership between state, market and society. They recognize that all three sectors have a responsibility, a stake and a benefit of the development of an area.

In the ENTRUST network, we have looked at area-based policies in eight European cities. In this thematic paper we try to identify evidence for mainstreaming and anchoring from these cases. The empirical basis for this study is provided by a) case evidence for each city presented in the ENTRUST case studies, b) a set of questions answered by practitioners in each city, c) a joint cross-check of the findings by the work group “mainstreaming and anchoring”. The policies we have looked at are shown in the following table:

	policy/approach
Berlin	socially integrative city, URBAN II
Copenhagen	Kvarterloft
Dublin	Integrated Area Plan
Glasgow	Glasgow City Council /Gorbals SIP & Gorbals Initiative
Hamburg	national urban regeneration programme (urban regeneration, area management)

Lisbon	Integrated castle project
Valletta	Valletta Rehabilitation Project
Vilnius	Vilnius Old Town Regeneration Programme VOTRP, Community Capacity Building Program CCB

These policies are in different stages and have to be seen in the light of national traditions and legislative frameworks of urban regeneration. These preconditions are presented in the case studies as well as in the thematic paper on “Aims of regeneration”. For the task at hand here, it is important to note that some of these programmes have just started or are even just about to start, whilst other are just about to be terminated and the local actors are right in the middle of debates about future institutional designs and funding frameworks. For the latter - of which Copenhagen is a good example - the issue of mainstreaming is pressing at the moment, whilst for the comparatively young - of which we would like to highlight Valletta, where the Regeneration Agency is just being implemented - there is time left to provide for exit strategies at an early point. Altogether it has to be said that we are looking at ongoing policies and are not in position to pose an ex-post view on the cases.

2. Findings

2.1. Mainstreaming

In order to find evidence for mainstreaming, we present three aspects of the area-based policies in question. For each policy, give a short introduction focusing on its formal institutional set-up (1). Secondly, we describe, how the policy is embedded in the city-wide political and administrative system (2). On this basis, we can then try to trace examples for mainstreaming: Are there examples for the “bending” or “sensitizing” of mainstream programmes? Can we see cross-departmental institutions for the co-ordination of sectoral mainstream programmes?

The findings are presented comparatively. Evidence on a case-by-case level is given in the appendix.

2.1.1. Programmes and Institutional Set-Up

In all cities there is evidence for a partnership based approach to neighbourhood development. In all cases we can see core institutions as key players in the regeneration process:

- Berlin: Neighbourhood Management Team
- Copenhagen: Kvarterloft Local Secretariat
- Dublin: Integrated Area Plan Manager
- Glasgow: Gorbals Initiative and SIP Boards
- Hamburg: STEG
- Lisbon: Castelo Project Unit
- Valletta: Valletta Rehabilitation Committee
- Vilnius: Old Town Renewal Agency OTRA

In all these cases we find a local coordinator, who in most cases has a local office in the area. These coordinators are either staff members of or contracted by the Municipality or some sort of locally responsible public authority. They are closely connected to one department at municipal level (Finance Department in Copenhagen, Planning Department in Berlin, Hamburg, Urban Conservation and Rehabilitation and Lisbon).

These institutions are special purpose agencies, their sole task is the implementation of the regeneration process. All of these agencies or teams do implement national programmes or are put into place by state level public institutions. This shows that the issue of neighbourhood development is in all these countries a political issue at national level and goes beyond the local responsibility. The time-limit – under 10 years - and more or less rigid termination of some of the programmes (Berlin, Copenhagen, Lisbon) – as well as the physical bias in some cities - shows at the same time that neighbourhood regeneration is regarded as a temporary necessity to bring the area from crisis back to order: there is no case where the area-based approach seems to be a long-term, mainstream strategy so far. However, we can observe discussions about this at national levels (Germany, UK), and secondly some cases (Glasgow, Hamburg, Berlin, Lisbon, Dublin) show that in practice the invention continues for much longer periods. In Dublin, new structures have recently been established whereby the city is divided into five areas for local service delivery. Area offices and staff structure under an Area Manager have been established. The Project Teams for the IAP's now fit into this area structure and the links established with local communities during the life of the IAP's will continue into the future. In Lisbon the local multidisciplinary offices in charge of urban regeneration exist already since 1985 and will continue their work independently of several other integrated projects etc. Although they might lack in efficiency because of a lack of supportive legislation and of financial resources, they still do exist and people are aware that there is always somebody they can address their concerns and questions too.

In some cases the integration is in addition supported by “institutional interweaving”. This is particularly evident in Glasgow where at a local level this is evident in the relationships with Gorbals Initiative, Gorbals SIP and the New Gorbals HA and city wide we are seeing a fragmented local state with a division of work in particular between GCC (social issues), SEG (economic issues), GHA (housing issues) and some responsibility of the Scottish Executive as well:

“unlike other countries, the City Council is not responsible for the delivery of all services. Scotland operates a system of Government Agencies; the two most important ones that have a responsibility for regeneration are Communities Scotland and Scottish Enterprise” (Glasgow Case Study, p10).

However, in the other cases, the redevelopment agency is connected to other institutions by steering boards, see here especially Hamburg /STEG and Vilnius/OTRA. This aspect will be dealt with in the next chapter (city-wide embeddedness).

Areas and Programmes: An Overview

City	area: mixed function inner city neighbourhood	policy/approach	Specifics
------	---	-----------------	-----------

Berlin	south-east innercity	socially integrative city, URBAN II	temporary partnerships to initiated self governing processes
Copenhagen	Kongens Enghave	Kvarterloft	structured 7 year process with strong discursive elements and project-oriented forms of cooperation
Dublin	Kilmainham-Inchicore	Integrated Area Plan, tax incentives	
Glasgow	Gorbals	Glasgow CC – policy Gorbals SIP (Soon to be replaced by a Community Planning Partnership) & GI approach	arrangements to coordinate various responsibilities (Scottish Enterprise, Communities Scotland, Glasgow City Council, Glasgow Housing Association, Gorbals Initiative, Glasgow Health Board), direct involvement of residents (sit on boards)
Hamburg	Karolinenviertel	national regeneration programme (urban regeneration, area management)	specific double-role of STEG
Lisbon	Castelo de Sao Jorge	Integrated castle project	change of strategy after elections: from rehabilitation to revitalisation
Valletta	Valletta	Valletta rehabilitation Project	(Monument restoration approach and housing initiatives will be substituted by integrated and sustainable approach)
Vilnius	Uzupis, Paupis	Vilnius Old Town Regeneration Programme VOTRP, Community Capacity Building Program CCB	prime focus on upgrading of houses living environment

2.1.2. Integration of Programmes into the local and city-wide political and administrative system

In most cases the programmes are implemented by special purpose agencies. Such institutions are ambivalent. At the one hand they are efficient and show a high level of commitment and expertise, at the other hand they are kept off the routine of public service delivery – they are not mainstream but exceptional by design.

The integration of these institutions into the wider political and administrative system is in all cases brought about by steering boards. However, as we have seen above, in most of the cases neighbourhood regeneration is based on special legislation, and the governance approach in this field –as promoted in the respective laws and guidelines – differs from other policy areas. So, although the integration of various departments is – formally - guaranteed by representatives sitting at the boards, especially when it comes to setting priorities and putting the money where the mouth is, some departments have difficulties to follow. We can see a

particular line of division between Ministries who are traditionally used to invest in “hardware” and projects, like planning, environment and construction departments, and Ministries who have a “software”-based spending culture, like departments for education and culture.

In Vilnius, for instance, it was planned that OTRA was financed as a joint effort by the Municipality and the Ministry of Culture, but: “from the day of its establishment it has only been financed by the municipal budget” (OTRA 2003, 15).

A second crucial point is that the integrative approach is so far only applied for some areas in which there is a specific need, but it is not regarded (yet) as a mainstream approach to public administrative work, again with the exception of Glasgow, where, for example, based on the successful LDC model, partnerships have evolved in general as a need to ensure the integration of a fragmented local state system.

What we have not looked at in more detail is the integration of the approaches at national level. As basically all programmes are based on national legislation, this seems to be given. However, we can see contradictory policies at national level. For Portugal, for instance, the establishment and growth of the local economy (little and medium local anchored enterprises etc.) will be hindered by planned national tax policies: National policy emphasis is laid specially on new social housing that has normally be settled in the outskirts of cities. At this time nearly no city in Portugal could get into debt and lend any money to invest in urban renewal. Similar contradictions are known from Germany, which is still running a substantial subsidy for the construction of new single homes (hopefully to be dropped in 2004).

2.1.3. Evidence of institutional learning

Evidence for institutional innovation is rather weak. Apart from Glasgow, the integrated approach to neighbourhood regeneration is fairly new to the local actors.

However, looking for evidence of institutional innovation, the Glasgow experience is quite sobering: There seems very little evidence of this type of innovation being integrated into mainstream policies. Part of this could be due to it being resource intensive, requiring commitment and the right bottom up chemistry between community activists and executives. It is also seen as contentious in terms of accountability and in the current political structures could be seen to undermine the process of councillor representation. In general local authorities and national agencies are given a clear steer from the centre. The drive is to reduce the scale of delivery so there is very little enthusiasm to expand mainstream activity – even to the point of integrating successful local projects. At the same time, with regard to community associations, there are issues over participation fatigue and limited number of activists. The cyclical nature of funding and in many cases arbitrarily imposed conditions on funding lead to difficulties and may bring projects to an early end. There has also been a simplistic view on sustainability that community groups somehow can find ways to generate income and alternative sources of funding that are not viable.

For the other cases, we can see that the new rules of the game forced the actors involved to take a new look at the neighbourhood and at project implementation. Partnerships either emerged or were reinforced, especially for housing associations there is evidence of altered perceptions and an increasing sensitivity for the environment of their houses. Increased

awareness is connected to the local embeddedness and mobility of an actor. If he is dependent on the neighbourhood he will be more loyal and active than if he has the possibility to exit. Learning, however, is dependent on a supporting environment, and it is within partnerships where new approaches can emerge and routines be “bended”.

2.1.4. Mainstreaming – a summary

Looking at mainstreaming at approach level, we can conclude with the following findings:

- apart from Glasgow, where we have a very specific state system, there is not yet evidence of mainstreaming of an integrated approach to urban governance into the city-wide administrative system, but we can see tendencies in this direction (Germany, UK, Ireland)
- in all cases neighbourhood regeneration is supported by national legislation
- all approaches are based on time-limited plans and (still) a physical bias; they are non-repeatable and follow-up systems can/must built on the initiated networks
- in all cases the process is steered by special purpose institutions which are integrated into wider decision-making networks via steering boards; this model bears conflicts as it stands across to the still departmental organisation and financial logic of the public administration
- an additional model to networking is the “institutional interweaving”-approach, as it is seen in Glasgow
- in no case there is evidence of a city-wide integrated approach to policy delivery, all cities have special treatment for deprived neighbourhoods

2.2. Anchoring

In this next section we turn away from the overall perspective of the city and concentrate on the micro-level. In this we want to pick one single activity in each of the eight participating cities and look at it from a mainstreaming point of view. This discussion is structured around four dimensions:

- How projects start
- Institutional arrangements
- Exit strategies
- Incentives for private engagement

The examples from the cities are:

Berlin	Various projects started by the neighbourhood fund in Wrangelkiez
Copenhagen	Green job house in Kongens Enghave
Dublin	Digital Hub in Liberties-Coombe
Glasgow	Crown Street Development
Hamburg	Schanzenkieker project in St. Pauli
Lisbon	Municipality owned Public Facilities
Valletta	Timber Balcony Grant Scheme
Vilnius	Community capacity building programme

The reasons for choosing this way of doing it is to try and illustrate in a little more details the different kinds of consideration and efforts involved in securing the results of the regeneration work. None of the examples reflect the entire work of that city – and they are not chosen because they are particularly good or bad. Rather they show the multitude and wide range of activities that can take place within the regeneration process across Europe – and the varieties of solutions that have to be taken into consideration in answering the mainstreaming questions.

2.2.1. How projects start

Looking across the cities we can say that the majority of projects are initiated by local administrations. Projects which were initiated by local residents are the neighbourhood fund projects in Berlin, the green Jobhouse in Copenhagen was developed in co-operation between professionals and residents. In the case of Berlin, the neighbourhood jury model secured that not only project definition but also decisions about project funding were taken by residents and local initiatives.

When we look at motivations for starting a project we see that projects have been started as a result of a process of consultation identifying problems in the neighbourhood. What all projects reveal, is that they would possibly not have been started or thought of without the local area managers. It is their consultation, assistance and funding possibilities which make neighbourhood-targeted projects possible. The assistance of the area management can have various forms:

- Create some kind of public realm in which ideas can be raised
- Individual assistance in project definition
- Project development.

These elements are an innovation to a neighbourhood. However, still projects are mainly brought forward by public authorities/administrations in the first place - this shows that the opportunities for individuals to get involved may not be sufficient yet (see thematic group public participation).

2.2.2. Institutional arrangements: who is running the projects ?

The diversity of projects is reflected in the multitude of institutional arrangements. There is not THE typical institutional design, but various types:

- Clear identifiable single ownership of private actor/NGO
- Public Administration as owner
- Partnership solution (existing partnership or specific collaboration for the project).

However, in the cases looked at here, there are only few examples of projects where the funding and the future institutional arrangements was clear at the beginning of the project – and this is the green job house in Copenhagen. In Berlin the applicants to the neighbourhood

fund have to show how this is going to continue – or who will look after it (if it is a physical project).

In the other cases there seems to be an ongoing discussion during the project phase – of how this will be dealt with. Again there seem to be 3 solutions of how to proceed:

- 1) Include it in the public sector: Copenhagen, Hamburg, Vilnius, Valetta and some of the Berlin neighbourhood fund projects, Lisbon: transfer to Municipal Agencies
- 2) transfer responsibility to NGOs or private sector (organisations or companies): Berlin, Lisbon, Valetta, Dublin and Glasgow.
- 3) end the project – either because it was a time-limited project (festival or the like in the neighbourhood fund projects from Berlin) or because it has failed to meet the expectations – or because of lack of funding.

2.2.3. Exit strategies: provisions for sustainability

We found that exit-strategies are in most cases considered quite carefully – or at least that the exit is recognised as a problem – although you perhaps can't do anything about it. However, the type of strategies vary; from our data we can identify four different groups:

- 1) There has to be a fixed exit strategy to even get started (neighbourhood fund projects).
- 2) The exit is part of the structure from the beginning (the green jobhouse and the Crown street project).
- 3) Temporary project where exit-strategies are only discussed after evaluation of project succes (Schanzenkieker in Hamburg).
- 4) Projects where you are discussing the exit-strategy and anchoring as an ongoing process but where this also depends on future finances (OTRA ??)

In all cases the exit strategies are a reaction to time-limited funding. In the cases where the products will stay and need maintenance after funding ends, the strategies are mandatory, in other cases which are taken on simply because they were successful, we are not talking about exit but anchoring/institutional change, and the debates here happen by free will.

Key people in the exit/anchoring discussion are of course the stakeholders in the project – and this also includes future stakeholders of the project even though they perhaps do not participate in the implementation. In most cases the area managers are involved as mediators or process facilitators.

A necessity for successful anchoring is a sensitive monitoring and evaluation system. In Hamburg it was only in the evaluation that the key actors saw the success and decided to continue the project city-wide. This is a key example for the mainstreaming of an innovation in public service delivery which had only been made possible in the extraordinary/experimental environment of an area-based programme.

2.2.4. Incentives

As there is little evidence for cases in which the ownership has changed, the issue of incentives is difficult to discuss here. We suggest that the incentives correspond with the character of the actor. A private/commercial actor needs financial incentives to act or the prospect of a new market/ a widening of an existing market. The incentive can also be the prospect to increase his efficiency. A public actor will be interested in increasing efficiency of his service delivery, higher acceptance in the neighbourhood and probably increased participation of residents. But this is a rather crude classification.

For some – like in Hamburg and Copenhagen it is seen as a chance to improve what they are already doing – and perhaps in the process improve their general image in the city. But in most cases it is said that there are no future incentives – or only the value of the produced good itself.

An outstanding example of effective tangible incentives can be seen in Dublin. Here we are not talking about incentives to take responsibility for a project but about an efficient system of transferring private capital to deprived neighbourhoods: the so-called “community gains”. This has achieved €12m in three years by deducting tax incentive gain from developers and creating a community gain fund. These monies have aided mainstreaming in Dublin as follows:

- Provision of a debt-free enterprise centre for community job schemes (Liberty Corner)
- Building of a community sports centre at St Catherine’s (Liberties Coombe) - also debt free allowing the community to run it as a non-profit operation.
- The payment of monies to committees to mainstream childcare centres by providing subvention for at least three years.

2.2.5. Anchoring – a summary

As we have shown, the projects which result out of an integrated regeneration process would probably not have been developed without a) additional funding and b) the discursive realm provided by the local offices in which projects can be discussed and defined. Projects like the ones discussed will not be developed in the future when this kind of space is not available.

The sustainability of the projects depends on their character (physical, consumptive) and on the funding possibilities. This is obvious. But the Schanzenkieker project and the training examples from Berlin show that it is possible to create new markets. This is the main element of the integrated approaches and the kind of innovation which should be supported in the future.

It might be interesting to look at single projects and their transferability, like e.g. the green job house, but none of them would exist without a supportive and creative environment - comparable in its structure to an innovation system - which allows for collaborative project development. It is essential that this system exists at the start, but it is as important that some sort of support system is available later on, so that positive evaluation results can lead to new arrangements and follow-up projects.

3. Recommendations

Having discussed evidence for mainstreaming and anchoring from the eight cities of the ENTRUST network, we can give the following recommendations. The recommendations are targeted at various levels of policy production: local, national and European.

3.1. Mainstreaming

"Mainstreaming" means taking innovative steps from experimental programmes and projects and generalising and rationalising them within longterm mainstream programmes.¹

Local Level

The comparative analysis shows that in some circumstances it may be necessary to set up a special initiative or task force of some kind to lead and co-ordinate urban regeneration efforts, while in others there is a need for more far-reaching institutional change and flexibility to deal with the multi-faceted nature of local problems. In order to secure efficient support for areas in decline, both institutional models are needed: special initiatives and more sensitive mainstream policies. So we come to two recommendations for decision-makers at a local level:

- The recognition of the “special need” of deprived neighbourhoods should be shown in the set-up of a special task-force with a direct connection to the mayor. In all examples, where the main responsibility lies with one department we see inefficiencies in the work of the responsible steering boards. A clear and visible commitment from the top is needed to overcome this. Such a task force should involve broad representation of public and private key players in its decision-making structure, have a long term perspective and a specifically allocated budget.
- It has to be accepted that part of an area’s problems are rooted in state failure. So, mainstream policies should be made more sensitive and responsive for local needs – city-wide and not only for some areas. By changing the institutional routines city-wide, the exceptionality problem which is inherent to special initiatives – e.g. special projects for deprived areas are detached from ongoing service delivery; high attention only for a short period - would be overcome. In parallel, a – transparent - city-wide monitoring system is helpful in order to identify areas in need of special attention.

When it comes to private sector involvement in the regeneration process, there is little empirical evidence in the cases we have looked at at this level. However, it is evident that if

¹ Compare the definition given in the minutes of session, chaired by Mr Michel Barnier, which brought together representatives of regional and city associations as well as experts on urban policies and the Structural Funds, Brussels, 17.07.03.

the private sector is to take over a responsibility it has to be brought into the game already in the design phase rather than at a later point in the process (see also below).

National Level

All national evidence from the case-studies shows that intervention in the neighbourhoods in question is based on some sort of national incentive be it through legislation or otherwise. So the approach chosen will often be the result of a national strategy.

At national level it has to be seen as well that the promotion of special local initiatives – like Kverterloft in Denmark, SIP in Scotland or the “Socially Inclusive City” projects in Germany – are needed **COMPLEMENTARY** to mainstream programmes but not as a replacement for them. Mainstream solutions will not be possible until there is a recognition that some of the structural problems in regeneration areas – poverty, educational attainment, health, etc. are not going to be resolved solely by special needs intervention. Especially national legislation and funding programmes on housing still tend to have an anti-urban bias. Departmental policies – housing, employment, education - have to be made more responsive to the needs of deprived urban areas.

European Level

A core contradiction of EU programmes supporting urban areas (in particular within ERDF), is the underlying additionality principle. The EU is supporting innovative measures in areas where it is difficult even to manage basic service delivery due to dramatic budgetary situations. It is difficult to see any possibility for local administrative learning here when the local administrations don't have the resources and management capacities needed. There are two recommendations to overcome this core problem.

- The EU could help to breakdown the unhelpful dichotomy between special, separate initiatives and ‘routine’ mainstream policies by explicitly encouraging and facilitating arrangements for a knowledge transfer to local mainstream policies.
- The EU could widen the scope of their programmes and be more responsive to local priorities. Topics like traffic and housing should be included in the schemes.

3.2. Anchoring

Anchoring means finding or building sustainable institutional arrangements for the running and maintenance of innovative projects.

Probably obligatory, innovative projects have to emerge first before they can get anchored. We have observed that a specific experimental environment is necessary to let new ideas develop. So, the main recommendation here is to provide the basis for such “local innovation systems” - the Berlin neighbourhood funds system can be a model here. In this model, a residents’ jury was given the responsibility for a certain budget. It could be shown that the selection was careful and sensitive and secured high acceptance in the neighbourhood, even

more: in this environment ideas could emerge which wouldn't have had a chance of implementation in a departmentally organized mainstream funding system.

For such innovative projects, the question of anchoring is important: how is their maintenance secured in the future? We have shown that possible institutional arrangements include public ownership, private ownership and partnerships. However, if a private partner is sought to take over or step in, he has to be attracted by incentives or "gains". Across our cases we have identified four potential "gains", which can be offered from the public sector to private partners:

1. a planning gain in terms of more flexible handling of regulations in certain areas,
2. a monetary gain like grant schemes or shared responsibility; but also: income through the creation and establishment of new markets. For example, there is evidence that newly developed training schemes, which were designed within neighbourhood management projects, carried on self-financed by the fees of attendants;
3. a critical mass gain and
4. a public domain as the project will be known and positively connotated.

In other words, the resources which can be offered in exchange for responsibility and finances taken over by non-public actors are land, labour force, a market for products, PR value and not least a stable operating environment.

Local Level

For decision-makers at local level we recommend that every project decision should include an exit strategy. Whilst it can be sensitive to carry out a project as an experimental one-off activity in its own right – like e.g. a festival -, other projects can show market-based, network-based, public sector based or third sector based exit strategies. These have to be developed at a single case level, but they should be elaborated right from the start. On basis of such a strategy, appropriate incentives can be sought timely.

National and European level

European funding and national funding and legislation - as the framework for action - should allow projects to generate income, which is a necessity for any market-oriented exit strategy.



APPENDIX 1

Case Evidence Mainstreaming (Draft, 10.10.2003)

1. Programmes and Institutional Set-Up

Berlin

In the Berlin case, we are looking at the south-eastern part of the inner-city. Here, we see the implementation of three programmes:

- the “Socially Inclusive City” a joint programme of the national government and the Bundesländer,
- the European Union Community Initiative URBAN II, and
- the Neighbourhood fund model, a programme initiated by the Berlin Senate.

All programmes are time-limited, though with different time-frames. Organisationally, they are based in a special unit within the Senate Department for Urban Development. At the heart of all programmes is the neighbourhood management team in a local office with the main tasks to coordinate and support area-focused activities of other organisations. This team is a contracted agency, the three core tasks of the neighbourhood managers are:

- *Mobilising* inhabitants and businesses to actively participate in the development process of their neighbourhood,
- *Coordinating* the neighbourhood, i.e. link different interest groups and local actors, establish cooperation between institutions, initiatives, businesses, housing societies, etc.;
- *Assisting* with the development of social, cultural and economic projects or those who deal with physical renewal (project initiation) (see Berlin case study).

Copenhagen

In the Kongens Enghave area of Copenhagen we are looking at the implementation the national programme Kvarterløft, which is carried out by the Finance Department of the Municipality of Copenhagen (see case study). It has a clear time-frame of seven years and a clear sequence of agenda-setting (“neighbourhood planning”), implementation and anchoring. At the heart of the programme is a local secretariat, based in the neighbourhood and managing the process. The staff of the local secretariat holds a mix of employees of the Municipality and hired staff, paid for by other institutions like housing associations (see case study). Its main task is to involve local residents into the development process.

Dublin

In Dublin, urban regeneration is based on an Integrated Area Plan. The IAP is a non statutory framework plan, initiated by the Urban Renewal Act 1998. It is implemented by a project manager who is supported by a multi-disciplinary project-team. It is overseen by a monitoring

committee, chaired by a Dublin City Council member (see Dublin Case Study). Within the framework of the IAP, targeted strategies and partnerships evolve:

“The IAPs are envisioned as dynamic and fluid, providing a basis for the configuration and re-configuration of partnership arrangements focused around specific themes or targets of activities” (Dublin Case Study, p14).

In Kilmainham Inchicore, the IAP has the aim “to allow for partnership” and “to allow designation for tax incentives to take place in those areas that are in particular need”.

In planning terms the implementation of the IAP’s is a stated inner city policy of Dublin City Council in its 1999 Dublin City Development Plan and Section 18 (3) (b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 states that when planning applications are being considered regard shall be had to any integrated area plan for the area. Furthermore funding for public capital projects such as social housing, childcare, roads and traffic projects comes from Central Government Departments.

Glasgow

In Glasgow, neighbourhood regeneration is carried out by five key agencies:

- Glasgow City Council GCC
- Communities Scotland (implementing the Scottish Executive’s Community Renewal Statement)
- Scottish Enterprise Glasgow SE
- Glasgow Alliance GA (representing the SIPs throughout the city)
- Glasgow Housing Association GHA (see Glasgow Case Study).

In the Gorbals, these agencies cooperate in three partnerships:

- Gorbals Initiative GI (core funding from GCC and SE)
- New Gorbals Housing Association NGHA (acting as a LHO for GHA)
- Gorbals Social Inclusion Partnership SIP (core funding from Scottish Executive/Communities Scotland).

There is no overall coordinator mediating between these institutions. Instead, the coordination of their work is based on “cross-sitting on each others boards”:

“There is no one overall body co-ordinating the various activities – overall co-ordination happens through more informal processes that include key personnel from each organisation (mainly senior staff) sitting on each other’s boards” (Glasgow case Study, p13).

Right in the middle of this broad range of institutions sits the SIP. It was put into place in 1999 and was planned to run until 2005. However, all the SIPs in Scotland soon will be replaced by Community Planning Partnerships and the outlook in Glasgow is unclear. The SIPs’ functions may be absorbed into Glasgow City Council’s structures.

Hamburg

In the Hamburg case we are looking at the implementation of the national legislation on urban regeneration (Städtebauförderung) based on the national urban regeneration Act. At the same time we are looking at the local area management, which is a time-limited pilot-programme initiated by the local government (Hamburg Senate). The key actor here is the STEG Company:

“STEG was founded in 1990 by the City of Hamburg as a regeneration and redevelopment agency and district manager for the Karolinenviertel (and other areas)...” (Hamburg Case Study, p6).

The work of STEG is regulated in a redevelopment-frame-contract between the Municipality of Hamburg, Ministry for Construction and Traffic (BBV) and STEG.

STEG has an important double-function: It is an important landlord and area-manager at the same time. Whilst it owns / manages a large part of the housing stock (in a “trustee fund”), it is also employed by the local authority as regeneration agency and area manager:

“STEG has two important functions in the neighbourhood: On the one hand STEG administers one third of all housing and commercial areas in the district and on the other hand STEG acts as redevelopment agency engaged by the city of Hamburg” (Hamburg Case Study, p6).

The main elements of STEG’s approach to regeneration are:

- area management
- integrated regeneration concept
- redevelopment advisory board
- cross-sectoral cooperation
- area-based neighbourhood office
- neighbourhood disposal fund
- ongoing reporting (Hamburg Case Study, p8f).

STEG was privatized in 2003, the consequences of this move for the regeneration process have not been looked at so far.

Lisbon

In Lisbon we are looking at the Integrated Castle Project. In 1985 the area was declared as a “critical Area of Recovery and Urban Conversion” (by the Municipality, as part of the General City Development Plan). In 1995, the City Hall set up the Castle Work group, which included at its beginning 3 architects and then grew to a multidisciplinary group. The approach includes restoration work (and to complete essential equipment of dwellings) as well as socio-cultural and economic development. The implementation is based on five governmental financing programmes:

- PROCOM (for commercial development)

- PROCOM/URBCOM (upgrading of public space)
- FUNDO DE TURISMO (for refurbishments of facades and roofs)
- REVRIA/REHABITA (renovation of dwellings)
- LEI DO MECENATO (allowing private sponsorship).

The approach was structured in 5 phases and was planned to be completed by 2005 (initially 1998). A change in the Lisbon Municipal Council led to a strategic change in the Integrated Castle Project. The “Castelo Project Unit” was created to complete the project. The new aim is to lay more emphasis on modernisation of housing types in order to adjust the housing stock to the demand – in contrast to a reconstruction of old types as it had been before.

Valletta

The Regeneration proposals have been developing from the 1980s with the institutionalization of the Rehabilitation Committee (Public works and Infrastructure) for Valletta. It was established by the central government under the Ministry for Works and Infrastructure) to initialize rehabilitation and restoration works in Valletta to address the degradation and depopulation. The Planning Authority supported these regeneration initiatives in the 1990s through the compilation of the Structure Plan Policy and other funding initiatives. This caters for a ten-year span and is currently under review.

Vilnius

Urban regeneration in Uzupis is carried out by the Vilnius Old Town Renewal Agency OTRA. OTRA was established in 1998 by the City of Vilnius and the national Ministry of Culture and works in close cooperation with the City Development Department. It is “a non-profit organization encouraging and coordinating interinstitutional cooperation of private, national and municipal sectors”. To date, it is completely financed by the Municipality (see: Municipality of Vilnius 2003, 15). Its activities are supervised by a Supervision Council, which is a public commission including representatives of non-governmental organizations and state institutions.

The Vilnius Old Town Regeneration Strategy scheme was approved in 1997 and forms the basis of OTRAs work. The first year (1998-99) focused on physical upgrading of facades and public space. In 2000 the Community Capacity Building programme started to financially stimulate and support initiatives of the residents to renovate and upgrade the exteriors of their houses and their environment. Also more attention was given to preservation and maintenance of cultural heritage properties. Community awareness rising activities were started (seminars, open discussions, special publications) to ensure better and long term understanding of the historic urban environment and proper ways of its care. The strategy for the Uzupis area is based on developing a cooperative networks amongst active organizations. OTRA cooperates with the House Owner’s Association (HOA), with the Uzupis Fund and the Angel Club (local NGOs). Social issues such as creation of community center in the area are started to be debated between OTRA and local NGO.

2. Integration of Programmes into the local and city-wide political and administrative system

Berlin

The “socially integrative city” is a vision of the Senate and has been expressed in the government declarations 1999 and 2002. The approach is institutionalised via a specific unit within the Senate Department of Urban Development. This unit “Socially Integrative City” is responsible for connecting the project level with city-wide policy. The Senator of this department is responsible for raising important issues with the other departments (Senators). There is an accompanying steering committee meeting at the level of the State Secretaries approximately two to three times a year. It gathers those Senate Departments involved in questions of the “Social Urban Development”. These are the Senate Departments of Urban Development; of Education, Youth and Sports; of Health, Welfare and Consumer Protection, and of Economics, Labour and Women. In this round, fundamental issues concerning the “Socially Integrative City” and the local neighbourhood development are discussed, especially reflecting on the complexity of underlying trends and the city-wide implications and looking for the solution of possible conflicts of aims.

The local authorities at district level are integrated via an administrative agreement for the personal and financial support of the programme (contract). The districts have an area coordinator, and each neighbourhood management team is supervised by a steering committee.

Copenhagen

In Copenhagen, the Kvarterloft programme is placed in the Department of Finances – the main steering committee being the financial committee (Case Study p 10). At city-level there is a cross-departmental administrative reference group, in which members from all 7 departments follow the work: “The function of the Reference Group is to ensure that each department gives higher priority to the Kvarterloft neighbourhoods and also to ensure interdisciplinary coordination between the departments’ activities in the Kvarterloft neighbourhoods” (Case Study p 9).

At neighbourhood level, the local steering groups also have representatives from various departments (local institutions as real members, central departments as observers) (*Case study p. 24-25*). However,

Kvarterløft is seen as a project of the lord mayor rather than for all the departments. There is relatively little political interest – except when there is direct involvement from other political levels (*Case study p. 22-23*).

The participative and integrative character is problematic:

“The experiences from Copenhagen show that regeneration projects such as kvarterloft may be difficult to link with the ordinary procedures and routines. The local residents’ wishes may (...) deviate from the municipality’s internal planning and priorities, and the 1-year budgeting may be difficult to combine with resident-managed projects” (Copenhagen Case Study, 10)... The municipality of Copenhagen is an old municipality and the new methods of working (...) have not always been easy to tackle” (Copenhagen Case Study, 21).“

Dublin

All over Ireland, the Integrated Area Plans form the basis for the implementation of the national 1999 Urban Renewal Scheme:

“The scheme is based on the concept of Integrated Area Plans (IAPs) prepared by local authorities on the basis of guidelines drawn up by an Expert Advisory Panel on Urban Renewal. All IAPs were prepared by the relevant local authority, following widespread consultation with local partners and participation by local communities. The IAPs submitted by the local authorities were considered by the Expert Advisory Panel and their recommendations were made to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government” (www.environ.ie, consulted 15-08-03).

For each of the 49 IAP there is a Monitoring Committee in place to monitor progress on the implementation of the IAP objectives. Comprising local elected, trade union, business and community representatives, the Monitoring Committee provides guidance on how delays or barriers to implementation can be eliminated and adopts an ongoing, pro-active role (www.environ.ie, www.dublincity.ie, consulted 15-08-03).

Respectively, the IAP is a specific instrument for certain areas and is NOT a city-wide approach. Besides the implementation of the IAPs in five areas, Dublin City Council has expressed its commitment to neighbourhood development in the strategy “Dublin – A City of Possibilities 2002-2012”:

“It is intended that Dublin will be a ‘City of Neighbourhoods’ by 2012. This goal is at the heart of the Dublin City Development Board 10-year Strategy to make Dublin an overall better city. Through the development, maintenance, and protection of neighbourhoods in Dublin City centre, the environmental, social, cultural and economic needs of the city will subsequently be fulfilled” (www.dublin.ie, consulted 15-08-03).

Glasgow

In Glasgow, the local initiatives are integrated into city-wide institutions and the local partnerships are embedded in a city-wide system of partnerships, each of which have some relationship with the Scottish Executive (Glasgow Case Study p9). The city council and local elected representatives are embedded in local initiatives, either as partners or key players by design. The council at a city level has the largest budget and in terms of democratic processes is the only agency answerable to local people – all the others have members/directors in place through patronage or invitation. The council sees itself in that context as the legitimate lead player in any integrated work. This tends also to be replicated at a local level. In practice an example of this can be seen where Scottish Enterprise Glasgow and Gorbals Initiative work closely to tailor national programmes (Training for Work) to suit local labour market conditions and skills gaps. The LDC develops the programme, holds the contract and delivers outputs that contribute to SEG’s targets.

Hamburg

STEG is contracted and controlled by the by the Municipality of Hamburg, Ministry for Construction and Traffic (BBV). There is a cross-departmental steering group of 5-7

Departments. The integrated approach is applied in some deprived neighbourhoods but not city-wide. However, there are obstacles to the integrated approach, as sectoral aims and higher level targets might prevent area-based approaches. The Departments are not obliged to prioritise the deprived areas in their work.

Lisbon

The Castle project has been named “integrated” because of the jointed intervention in public space, houses and (underground) infrastructure, having in mind at the same time a socio-cultural revitalization, economic growth and improvement of the social ambience (expected to be induced by physical renewal and new commercial promises to be established and addressed to tourism). All those interventions were planned and carried out including the involvement (even if in a very patriarchal and protective way) of the population and other mentioned stakeholders. So the focus here is still very much on physical renewal.

Urban physical renewal (not an integrated approach! Local concepts vary completely) has recently been (once more) declared as a priority of municipal policy in order to stimulate tourism and to protect cultural and architectural heritage, intending to comply at the same time with a declared national policy to stop excessive land use and to bring people back into the city centres. However there is some kind of inconsistency as it is not considering very important stratum of population (e.g. decrease in rent allowance for young people, abolition of especial bank loan conditions for young people).

In general there has been some kind of an attempt to come to an integrated way of urban renewal in Lisbon by establishing local offices made up by multi-disciplinary teams in charge of daily assistance and general development within different fields (see above).

However, recently things are changing and staff has been reduced. There are no clear orientations and intentions regarding neither an integrated policy approach on citywide level nor on local neighbourhood level.

Valletta

N.A.

Vilnius

The regeneration of Uzupis is part of the Old Town Revitalisation Strategy, which is carried out by OTRA. OTRA is a special purpose institution, which prepares and manages implementation of annual Old Town Renewal Programs (it covers Uzupis area) in co-operation with municipal departments and co-ordination with Ministries of Culture and Environment. Through the annual programs OTRA supports both public investments and financially stimulates private ones. indicates the importance of the issue, but at the same time it means that city-wide institutions are involved to a smaller extent.

3. Evidence of institutional learning

Berlin

At federal level, a new federal-state programme “Urban Redevelopment East” (Stadtumbau Ost) has been developed. In its implementation in Berlin, the integrated approach as experienced in the Socially Integrative City policy, is taken on.

Installation of district partnerships for economic development and job creation: These boards discuss strategies and grant funding for activities of business networks and marketing for specific neighbourhoods.

Area Management: The district of Lichtenberg is re-organising its service-delivery based on a spatially based distribution. As a first step, it introduced five area managers who guarantee a good access for the citizens to district affairs and have the responsibility to pursue neighbourhood related concerns within the administration. These (5) managers don't have much capacity (compared to the departments) and no own funding sources, their job is solely to secure information across departments and to and from the local community.

Copenhagen

Kvarterløft strategies have entered several places:

- Local democracy
- The development of new projects (kvarterløft light)
- New procedures for resident involvement
- Local approach to tackling unemployment

Housing associations and development companies, which have been involved have slightly altered their view as they are more sensitive to the environment/neighbourhood of their houses now.

Dublin

Area Management: New structures have recently been established whereby the city is divided into five areas for local service delivery. Area offices and staff structure under an Area Manager have been established. The Project Teams for the IAP's now fit into this area structure and the links established with local communities during the life of the IAP's will continue into the future.

Glasgow

The first Local Development Company (Govan Initiative) was formed in 1986, and subsequently based on its success seven others have been set up in the other regeneration areas, the last in 2000. Gorbals Initiative is a key player in economic regeneration in the Gorbals. The LDCs also work collaboratively on city wide issues, particularly in the field of employability and training and delivery of contracted services such as business start up and SME growth. The SIP model was a Scotland wide solution and in some ways the creation of these additional agencies in Glasgow was a missed opportunity. Their functionality could have been provided in a broader LDC remit by integrating economic and social development at a local level. The overhaul of the SIP structure is unresolved at this time, but the future role of Glasgow Alliance in this respect is most uncertain. Glasgow is unique across Scotland with the mature LDC model. Community development trusts are becoming more common, but are unlikely to approach the scale of LDC operations.

Hamburg

In Hamburg we can observe that municipality owned housing companies are today more aware of the neighbourhood of their houses than some years ago. The Municipality has renewed its commitment to an integrated approach for deprived neighbourhoods and public participation, but one has to take into account, that for all German cities, the integrated approach itself is still quite new and needs time to develop..

Lisbon

If we consider the whole Castle Project as some kind of a special procedure due to the included issues and the complete renewal of built up area and public space, we could name it “experimental” within the Lisbon context. As political changes occurred there were only few and partly reflections on that experience, not concerning the whole process and the different matters involved as well as initially defined goals and priorities.

Valletta

N.A.

Vilnius

The formation of associations like the House Owners’ Association and the Angel Club is a positive sign of empowerment of the local initiatives and collective action. Also regular attempts of OTRA to involve wider circles of residential/ other social groups seeking to consolidate their interests and on the higher extent support their initiatives.

Appendix 2 Case Evidence Anchoring (Draft 10.10.2003)

	Berlin – neighbourhood fund	Copenhagen green jobhouse	Hamburg Schanzekieker	Lisbon Public facility	Glasgow Crown Street	Dublin Digital hub	Vilnius The Community Capacity Building programme	Valletta Timber Balcony Grant Scheme
How was that particular project/activity started, by whom and with what motivation?	<p>The neighbourhood fund and the new funding possibilities were publicly announced (poster: “the Kiez becomes a Millionaire”). Applications could be handed in at the Neighbourhood Management office in a non-formal style, some were only brought forward verbally. 114 applications were handed in, 37 projects were chosen and implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 53,1% initiated by residents, • 33,3% by local initiatives • 8,3%: local businesses • 3,2% Schools and kindergardens • 2,1%: churches; <p>main motivation was improvement of living environment and quality of lifespecially for kids. Most of the applicants</p>	<p>The green jobhouse in Kongens Enghave was started through the work in a Kvarterløft working group consisting of residents and professionals from the local administration. Motivation was the high unemployment in the neighbourhood. The project was developed in close co-operation with the local administration working with employment issues. The local political council had authority to change the service according to the wishes of the project. It has been one of</p>	<p>The city was motivated to improve the street-cleaning in the neighbourhoods. The city cleaning company had a similar motivation to improve its reputation through an effectivisation of the services</p> <p>The project was initiated by STEG – as step in improving the quality of life in the neighbourhood. It was carried out as part as STEGs work in Karolinen and Schanzenviertel. Through this work the theme of Garbage and dirt was brought up. STEG developed</p>	<p>The project was started by the Municipality to provide lacking facilities for the neighbourhood as well as a tourist attraction point as some kind as a “welcome centre” leading to the monumental Castle area, reusing, and restoring an old palace.</p>	<p>Instigated by the local enterprise company (formally Glasgow Development Agency, now Scottish Enterprise Glasgow), working with the City Council and Scottish Homes (now Communities Scotland). GDA committed a significant resource to the masterplan approach to neighbourhood development - a new one for Scotland. A major factor to the success of this approach was that the Project Director was based locally and the local community was involved</p> <p>Crown Street</p>	<p>The Digital Hub is an imitative by the Irish Government to create an international digital enterprise area in Dublin City. Dublin City Council, enterprise Ireland, IDA (Industrial Development authority), Ireland are key partners in developing The Digital Hub. The vision of the digital Hub is to create a global centre of excellence for innovation, creativity, research and learning. Upon completion the Digital Hub will offer companies a managed and secure environment in one of the most attractive and sought after areas to work and live in Dublin.</p>	<p>The Community Capacity Building programme was started by OTRA as a part of Vilnius Old Town Renewal Programme in a year 2000. Motivation: Strategy of Vilnius Old Town Revitalisation (1996-1997) where support and PPP development was stressed as one of the priority goals.</p>	<p>The scheme was initiated by the Malta Environment and Planning Authority in 1996 to regenerate and upgrade the Three Cities and Valletta. Wooden balconies are believed to have been introduced locally in the 18th century. Gradually they gained popularly to become a standard feature in town houses. Unfortunately the introduction of alternative material like aluminium has had a deleterious effect on the traditional townscape. The grant scheme aims to help alleviate the</p>

	were active in the neighbourhood before and familiar with writing applications (in particular, the education sector used to realistic calculations).	the most highly prioritated projects in Kvarterløft in Kongens Enghave	the concept and found the necessary partners in professional, ministries, cleaning company and the private house-owners.		represents the first newly built owner-occupation in Gorbals	The government invested Eur130 million in the project which includes funding for media Lab Europe, the Anchor Tenant.		financial cost of maintaining timber balconies in order to encourage their continued use. Since 1996 MEPA has already contributed up to Lm86,000 through the scheme to help 155 owners of timber balconies in Valletta, Floriana, Senglea, Cospicua, Vittoriosa and Kalkara.
What are the institutional arrangements for that particular project/activity after the initial funding has ended? Who is running it and how will it be funded?	In general, the applicants who receive funding are responsible for carrying out the project. As a project it might well end after the funding ends, which is never later than 1 year. Responsibility for the maintenance of the projects lies with the applicants. So, in most cases no new institutional arrangements are needed. This is the case for some physical improvements as well as festivals. Overall, there were two funding models: financial support to kick-off / carry out a new project or money to buy some additional goods/instruments to improve an existing project. After funding	The project has never had any initial funding. It has from the start been financed through the ordinary revenue for unemployment measures in Kongens Enghave as part of the local administration until the end of 2001. From 2002 onwards (with the closing down of local councils) the project is run as a part of the city-wide unemployment service on a contract with the department for	During pilot phase STEG dealt with concept and co-ordination. The sanitation company were the producers. After the end of pilot phase (end of 2002) the city has included the project in its normal financing. With city sanitation company the model was taken on as a standard in 3 inner city districts because of the positive experiences with pilot project and because it fitted the new political goals of the new Senate – safety and	The facility has been administrated by the Lisbon Municipal Agency of State-owned Dwelling Resources and Public Facilities, as an organisation that should work within the possibility of making profit and to reinvest financial resources, having in mind a specific dynamism of some kind of an independent enterprise and a reduction of municipal financial support using at the same time some privileges within contracting	There are two organisations - the local housing association who own a number of houses in Crown St and supply management services to owner-occupiers. There is also a Crown St Trust that will be responsible for looking after the public spaces.	The Government has committed to funding the project through the initial stages. In July this year the digital Hub Development Agency was established. It is established to implement the development of the Digital Hub Project. The Board is appointed by the Minister of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources and includes enterprise, education, business, arts social and urban regeneration interests. The sponsoring partners	OTRA is still the only institution authorised/ financed by Vilnius Municipality to develop the programme. The funding is being allotted annually and this particularly part is being though/ recognised by politicians as one of the most prospective and needed.	The public funds for this sector is increasing on three levels; (1) Housing Authority has a series of supporting funds (20-30) depending on income brackets, first-home buyers, old houses etc. (2) MEPA - Planning Authority incentives like timber balcony grant schemes have been extended in the past two years and diverse initiatives are being proposed on other aspects.

	<p>has ended, there are three types of follow-up arrangements:</p> <p>1.The running costs are taken over by the responsible group/association and the participants. This is for instance the case in some training schemes.</p> <p>2.Maintenance costs are taken over by public authorities. For example projects with no specific target group (eg public toilet).</p> <p>3.The project ended. In all cases, the so-called appropriation of revenues is mandatory. So, e.g. instruments which were bought for projects have to be listed in an inventory. The handing back of instruments is organised on a single case level and depends on whether the recipient can secure the appropriation of revenues. Examples for arrangements after funding ended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Problem solution training for kids: carried on by local initiative on a honorary basis (kids pay small fee) •Mediation training: carried on by an association with public 	<p>social affairs and labour market in the Municipality of Copenhagen.</p> <p>The project has been successful in additional fundraising for the development of new methods – such as national foundations and the EU-social Fund.</p>	<p>cleanliness</p> <p>Responsible for the continuation is the city sanitation company – financing according to the standard fees for owners and tenants and extra financing from the city.</p> <p>Very few means for special action after end of pilot phase</p>	<p>procedures of external partners and service delivering (changed recently again, having now the same legislation as normal public sector complying with European legislation).</p> <p>Despite of this intention, the Municipality has been financing the bigger part of all activities of this agency.</p>		<p>are Department of the Marine and Natural Resources, IDA Ireland and Dublin City Council.</p> <p>The functions of the agency include:</p> <p>(a)procure, secure the provision of and to promote and facilitate the development, including the carrying out of construction or maintenance works, of the digital hub as a location for digital enterprises and related activities;</p> <p>(b)formulate strategies to encourage individuals and enterprises engaged in digital content and related activities to locate in the digital hub;</p> <p>(c)promote and facilitate the procurement of technical and communications infrastructure to attract digital enterprises to the digital hub;</p> <p>(d)prepare a development plan.</p> <p>(e)prepare estimates</p>		<p>(3)Finance - Government. The Government has launched tax relief in the past two years directed at new home owners and these were further directed to those home buyers (on works commission) in the Cottonera/Valetta etc.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	---

	<p>funding (Socially Integrative City budget)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Learning support project: local association, project now financed by fees •Renovation of fountain: carried out and finished, financed by urban renewal program •Installation of public toilet: maintenance is taken care of by district authority (for 1 year) 					<p>of the costs of implementation of the development plan and propose possible funding options;</p> <p>(f)oversee and manage implementation of the development plan;</p>		
<p>Has there been an exit strategy? When and how did stakeholders involved discuss the future ownership? Describe how you came to these solutions and of problems of getting there.</p>	<p>The future of the project and the problem of maintenance costs was part of the negotiations with the neighbourhood jury. A guiding principle of the neighbourhood fund was that the projects should not create additional costs which are not covered within the allocated budget. So, the maintenance costs of the projects had to be covered by the budget. The proposals had to take this into account. E.g., the construction of a new public toilet was difficult because the department asked for a 10 years maintenance plan.</p>	<p>Because the project from the beginning has been a part of the normal routines of service in the neighbourhood it has not been necessary to have an actual exit strategy – the exit strategy so to speak embedded in the project. This was part of the argument for starting the project in the first place – because the long term effect on the neighbourhood would be greater than if you set up at temporary organisation.. When the local council closed it was decided to keep these special local activities</p>	<p>The pilote project was set to 2 years and was ended at 31.12.2002. The goal was during this period to gather experience with the new cleaning model and the co-operation between different partners. Only at the end of this period would it be decided if it was going to be continued. The important stakeholders were the city of Hamburg and the city sanitation company. They started discussing the future in Feb. 2002, but the decision to continue wasn't taken until January 2003. The process</p>	<p>The transferring from municipal administration to the Municipal Agency has been planned since the very start of this project. The intervention of the Local Council has always been restricted. At this Moment Library and Local Council have been moved into another municipally owned building by leaving specifically designed space out of specific use.</p>	<p>Yes & No - yes in that the original organisations that set it up are pulling out and leaving it to the owners (incl the HA); no in that there was not a special strategy - it was typical house development.</p> <p>The stakeholders discussed the future ownership in the beginning of the project.</p> <p>We have learnt from experience that the public sector cannot do it all itself, so this time it is a mixture of community ownership (the HA) and private ownership (owner-occupiers)</p>	<p>Currently in phase one of the project and moving to phase 2. A developer competition is underway which will develop the nine-acre site</p>	<p>Not yet, as the programme is experiencing intensive development stage. The growing PPP between OTRA/ municipal and P sector (also Church) is regularly meeting and discussing ways and methods of co-operation and common actions directed to improve living environment and protect the architectural/ urban heritage properties. We recognise the process of community involvement is a very slow one and</p>	<p>There is no exit strategy for this scheme, since this is a one off grant scheme.</p>

		because of their successful methods.	involved problem-analysis, discussions with stakeholders and internal STEG workshops.		This is the third regeneration of the Gorbals in 50 years - previous attempts were public sector.		depends on change of mentality (recent turn from the non-private/ state managed to free market economy) and economic situation. As the economics is still transiting and radical social changes are still in place, development of the programme remains both challenging and prospective from the point innovations development. The program also is starting gradually to shift from being focused on an upgrade of physical environment towards putting more attempts to built parallel new instruments for seeking social cohesion.	
What incentives are there for the future owners (tax reliefs, reputation, income)?	The incentive is the produced good itself. The good has been produced out of a demand so it is more than likely that it will be used. In some cases where private funding was sought for	The incentives for the future owner – the City of Copenhagen - lies in the satisfaction (and good reputation) for successful and cost	The city sanitation company hopes to improve services and reputation through the continuation of the projects. They have realized this in the	We could name it the possibility to gain reputation and to get profit and opportunity of reinvestment.		The core development is a nine-acre site located just 10 minutes from the city centre within the historic Liberties area of Dublin.	No incentives still. (conditioned financial support instead)	Besides the Balcony Grant Scheme which is issued on a regular basis, there are other incentives, offered by the Housing Authority

	<p>public goods, the company which was asked looked for advertising possibilities. This was the case for instance ion debates over a public toilet in the Wrangelkiez. It would have been possible to find private funding for maintenance if in return the company would have been allowed to use public space for advertising. The neighbourhood jury opted against such a model.</p>	<p>effective problem solution. The incentives for the employees have been the freedom of developing new methods and being a part of groundbreaking new procedures – which also strengthens future job opportunities.</p>	<p>framework of the model-project.</p>			<p>In 2002 the Irish Government adopted a strategy for the development of the Digital media sector in Ireland. Its aim is to develop a world-class Digital content Industry based on the targeted development of a number of clusters at the intellectual property end of the market, namely enabling technology and high value content and applications specifically The Digital Hub should be developed as a showcase for digital content in order to market the capabilities and benefits of Digital Media/Content to the corporate sector in Ireland and internationally. The establishment of a Digital Media Cluster in Dublin is the focal point for the development of the Digital Media Sector nationally and internationally. Clustering like minded companies is a proven concept internationally Specific incentives</p>		<p>to upgrade habitable and vacant dwellings. These incentives include subsidies on adaptation work in owner occupied dwellings; Subsidies on adaptation works in leased private dwellings and financial aid for adaptation work in residences occupied by persons with disability.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	---

						<p>include: Clustering a Mix of Irish and International Digital Media Companies High Speed Broadband network Access to a Network Operations Centre State of the Art Accommodation for Digital Media Companies Fostering of new collaborations between Enterprise, Media Lab Europe and Third level Institutions Access to specialised courses for Digital media in new technologies Increased access to technology for local and wider communities Innovative pilot project to address the digital divide.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--