

CLLD at Open Days 2013

1. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND CLLD – LD-NET (09C19)

Chair: **Haris Martinos**

Though rural and coastal areas have made most use of CLLD so far, it has also been used in urban and social policy, as these cases show. The key message is that local actors should not wait for Managing Authorities to act. They should seize the opportunity, be creative, and prepare to use CLLD now.

1. Limerick – inclusive growth and social regeneration

Eileen Humphreys painted a picture of Limerick as a disadvantaged city of 100,000 people. The crisis has had a severe impact and 7,000 jobs have been lost – the biggest loss being 2,000 jobs at Dell computers in 2009. Unemployment is 29%, and youth unemployment (15-19) 68%. This has led educated young people to emigrate, leaving a concentration of those with problems. Disadvantage is concentrated in pockets comprising 6,250 people with high illiteracy and 80% welfare dependency.

CLLD has a long history in Limerick. The PAUL Partnership¹ was established in 1989 under the Poverty 3 programme. The Partnership is one of the network of companies throughout the state engaged in implementation of the Local and Community Development Programme. This was co-funded by EU Structural Funds in the past but is now wholly funded by the national exchequer. Because of the severity of problems affecting the disadvantaged neighbourhoods and problems of social disorder and crime in Limerick, a major regeneration programme was launched for the most disadvantaged estates in 2007. Two dedicated new agencies – the Northside and Southside Regeneration Agencies – were set up for a period of 5 years to lead the regeneration effort. Masterplans for regeneration were prepared by the Agencies involving planned investment of €3.1 billion in public and private financing. However, the launch of the Masterplans coincided with the economic and public debt crisis in the state and it didn't materialise as planned. By the time the agencies were disbanded in 2012, some €120 million in public funds were spent. The bulk of this (€90 million) was spent on physical works mainly involving buy-back of owner occupied housing on the estates, demolition and relocation of residents. €5 million per year was also invested on small community grants, which proved very successful. The programme also succeeded in solving major crime in the city, linked to the extra resources brought in for policing the city. Local Regeneration Committees (LRCs) were set up in each of the small areas (5 estates) and resident representation across the regeneration areas was brought together in a city-wide Community Consultative Forum.

In 2012 when the Northside and Southside Regeneration Areas were disbanded, the local authority took over the regeneration programme. It now runs a more modest regeneration programme with a budget of approximately €30 million per year. This includes a social programme of about €3 million per year and an additional €1 million for economic actions. The social programmes aims at both prevention and remediation. It is managed by the Limerick Regeneration Office² within the local authority and has significant engagement of

¹ <http://www.paulpartnership.ie/>

² <http://www.limerickregeneration.ie/>

the local community and voluntary organisations in the structures and also in delivery of action on the ground. The social programme is organised around 5 priority (vertical) themes: education and learning, health and well-being, ageing well, employability and work and families and youth at risk. What it aims to achieve across these themes is a stronger interconnectedness of actions. A key component underpinning the strategy is community participation, empowerment and citizen and engagement. Local community action or enterprise centres, built up in the regeneration communities over several years, are most important structures for the delivery of services into the local communities. These are the trust centres, where people meet, get information and participate in community activities. The Local Regeneration Committees, which involve resident and agency participation, are the key structures where community representatives engage in information exchange and input to decision making with representatives of the key agencies such as the police, health services, education services, etc.

The tools are in place to make use of the CLLD in the new programming period: for instance, a new body is being created as part of current reforms of local government, the Socio-Economic Committee, which will mobilise a cross-sectoral partnership at the level of local authority areas. The structure is being designed to comply with the rule in the new Structural Funds regulations, as they apply to CLLD partnerships, specifying that public partners should not hold more than 49% of the control or voting rights.

Initiatives presented from Limerick include: (1) the Learning Hub on the Northside (€288,000 total budget in 2012). This is centred on providing extended learning opportunities for children and young people at risk of early school leaving and educational underachievement. It also includes a social enterprise component operating a city orchard and a music studio; (2) Southill Development Cooperative, set up in 1984 with 300 shareholders. It operates a crèche, pre-school, estate management, training programmes, an insulation/energy-retrofitting enterprise and a workspace/business incubator. Southill Development Cooperative has an annual turnover of €1.5 million and employs 103 people. (3) Creative Limerick, set up in 2009 to retain design and fashion students in the city by making empty properties available to them on easy access terms (this initiative has been copied in other areas).

Proposals include a mix of new instruments: a national JESSICA scheme is proposed to fund the energy-efficient retrofitting of social housing as well as innovation and the knowledge economy.

CLLD has a high value but this is difficult to measure, and it reaches areas other approaches do not reach. It is needed to effectively address problems such early school leaving and social exclusion in extremely disadvantaged neighbourhoods. It will be a missed opportunity if the state does not implement it.

2. Turin – Smart City

Enzo Lavotta, councillor and president of Turin Smart City Foundation.

The Smart City Foundation is managed by a committee includes the city, businesses and academic institutions. Its mission is to plan the smart city strategy and ensure an appropriate governance strategy.

Turin has lost a lot of businesses in the crisis. It is no longer 'Fiat City' and wants to diversify. Its five-year strategy has the acronym SMILE: Smart Mobility, Inclusion, Life and health, Energy. Its Key Performance Indicators cover issues such as mobility information, clean goods transport, cultural heritage, waste, security and the community management of buildings.

Turin has taken a participative planning initiative. It organised six workshops, involving 10,000 hours of work by 350 participants from businesses, associations, research institutions and citizen groups, to create the plan. They resulted in 45 actions, including nine

in inclusion. Their total budget is €11 bn, which is to be financed from EC and local authority budgets.

Rosalba La Grotteria, CODEX: the local development dimension of Turin Smart City is that the strategy was developed from the bottom up, through a community process that ensured continuous feedback. One tool was the Smart City Days, which were held over three days and involved 200,000 people across the ten city wards (*circonscrizioni*).

One initiative is to make disused industrial space available to projects for three years.

3. Málaga – Iniciativa Urbana

Fernando Barreiro, external adviser to the city of Málaga.

The Iniciativa Urbana is a good example of participation in cities.

The *Plan Especial de Protección y Reforma Interior* (PEPRI) area covers 23,000 of Málaga's 570,000 people. Its aim is to regenerate the city centre, which had been neglected. It started under URBAN I in 1996 and has been continued using ERDF funding under a home-grown 'Urban Initiative'. Since 2007 it has been funded from both ERDF and ESF.

The population of the city centre had been reduced to poor and unskilled people, and the objective was to bring back a variety of urban uses while retaining its residential function and avoiding gentrification. It achieved an integrated approach, which relied on the mayor's co-ordinating the contributions of different municipal departments. The plan intervenes in social inclusion, welfare and employment as well as physical regeneration.

Citizen participation was ensured by setting up:

- 'Urban Initiative Assemblies' to allow dialogue between the council and associations and citizens. This idea worked because the mayor attended all the meetings, which were held every four months.
- The 'Citizenship school' with a steering group of 30 associations to promote civic culture
- mechanisms such as a time bank and an informal network of voluntary carers to build social bonds, urban solidarity and reciprocal self-help

Five success factors are:

- Multiple strands: physical renovation, social inclusion, welfare, attractiveness to visitors. The 'new urban complexity' requires new ways of mediation and balance
- Commitment to sustainability: limits to growth in favour of the environment, e.g. expanding café terraces causes noise for residents, so there is a trade-off between jobs and quality of life
- People at risk of social inclusion (e.g. Roma) should be integrated into the urban context
- Partnership with municipality
- Involvement of associations and co-operatives to create social capital

Local authorities should avoid the temptation to simply identify the problems and launch service programmes.

Jean-Pierre Pellegrin asked why Málaga did not address the problem by working through up a service agency like Rév8 in Budapest. This was because Málaga wanted to stay flexible and learn through trial and error. In the end they did not succeed in achieving a totally integrated approach. The challenge is to make two different tempos coincide – physical development can be done quickly while social development is much slower.

4. Liverpool

Andy Churchill, Merseyside Network for Europe

Prior to 2007, the Structural Funds had changed the context of Merseyside regeneration policy by implementing 7-year planning and the partnership principle. CLLD was practiced in 38 areas, of between 500 and 30,000 people. However the 2007-13 programme was the worst in memory, being implemented through a 'big is beautiful' system of prime contractors. It was process-driven and risk-averse, and is likely to end with an underspend. JESSICA and JEREMIE were used but had long delays in lending, and the lessons have been learnt.

2004/20 brings simplification and localism. There are no regional programmes: one single programme covers the whole of England and includes EDF, ERDF and some EAFRD. 95% of it is devolved to 39 Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). These are business-led and do not involve the third sector. LEPs have been instructed to work on social inclusion and to involve NGOs, and the guidance includes a description of CLLD. But the private sector does not understand it and is not sure who is in charge.

It is not clear how many LEPs plan to introduce CLLD. Cheshire commissioned a report on how to do CLLD and social innovation. LEPs are looking at using financial instruments to support social enterprise, However the JEREMIE mechanism is unfriendly towards social enterprise as they are seen as high risk and cannot accept equity investment.

It is likely that between 5 and 15 LEPs will set up Local Impact Funds³ matched by Big Society Capital. Liverpool has piloted this tool using ERDF.

CLLD is more effective and has longer-lasting results, and creates more jobs. It is our best chance for many years. Success factors are:

- use local understanding and intelligence
- start early
- fund capacity building and allow enough time
- build trust
- learn and share with other areas

Questions concerned whether medium-sized cities could use CLLD and where cofinance comes from.

A representative of West Cork LEADER group said that they have been delivering CLLD for years, but the Irish government seems to have forgotten about territoriality and subsidiarity. The voluntary sector should not be used as window-dressing. Eileen said that the challenge is to make the instruments work together: for instance in Ireland the JESSICA fund will probably be national, as that way it can be more efficient and strategic. But it doesn't have to be top-down. As in Limerick, CLLD can be co-ordinated by the local authority, targeted at disadvantaged areas, and NGOs can provide the content. It would be a huge mistake to refuse it for political reasons.

To a questioner from Oslo on how children can be involved, Peter Ramsden mentioned the 'My Generation' URBACT network, and Rosalba mentioned a number of schools projects in Turin.

5. How does the LEADER approach have to be adapted?

Urszula Budzich-Szukala (FARNET) pointed out that CLLD is not yet a recognised methodology, and has no track record in urban areas, unlike LEADER which goes unquestioned. How might the LEADER principles have to change in urban areas?

- territoriality: areas are less identifiable: residents identify less with areas, and boundaries are less clear

³ <http://www.slideshare.net/NCVO/local-impact-funds>

- integrated strategic approach: there are diverse themes around which to organise (rather than say the common interest in fisheries that FARNET projects share)
- strategies: cities probably have more experience
- partnership: it is harder to find groups with a shared experience and harder to identify key partners because there are so many possible partners

So far, much action involves consultation rather than devolution of real power to communities. But in spite of this, CLLD can be applied, should we abandon some of the principles? The devil is in the detail. The barrier of it seeming too complicated can be overcome by showing examples that it works. Good urban development does involve CLLD - but it is not the same as an urban strategy. CLLD can be part of an ITI but not the reverse.

Peter Ramsden commented that managing authorities have been willing to invest in the complexity of JESSICA, and CLLD is a good deal less complicated. The key issue is not its supposed 'complication' but an unwillingness to empower citizens.

Paul Soto commented that community means different things, but the EC definition is:

- the people experiencing an issue are in the partnership
- no one group dominates
- The partnership takes decisions on projects – it is more than consultation

Thus there is a lot of scope for adaptation.

6. EC guidance for local actors

Jean-Pierre Vercruysse (MARE) outlined the practical manual for local actors which is in preparation, and targeted at the 2,600 existing partnerships. It contains seven chapters, on:

1. Why do CLLD?
2. How to launch CLLD
3. CLLD in cities
4. CLLD and social inclusion
5. Meeting new challenges for citizens
6. Co-ordination between funds
7. Faster, quicker and easier for everyone

The chapter on cities covers:

- how to identify needs and challenges and develop a strategy
- partnership – how to build alliances
- how to define boundaries (areas housing 10-150,000 people)
- How to take advantage of urban-rural links (the hinterland)

The chapter on social inclusion includes:

- capacity-building
- beneficiary participation
- integrated approaches, e.g. Roma, housing, education, employment
- awareness-raising using preparatory support: it is important to know that funding is available to prepare integrated approaches from January 2014

It is a challenge to apply CLLD in new fields, and there is a risk of low take-up because of a lack of demand from Managing Authorities. The manual will help to break the vicious circle of actors waiting for the MA to take action, and will also help to broaden the scope of ERDF and ESF action to areas such as climate change. It may also help to refresh CLLD in areas that already use it. CLLD is a good tool for addressing the diverse needs of EU citizens.

It is important that Partnership Agreements should remain open to CLLD, even if it is not adopted straight away in 2014.

2. STRENGTHENING EU URBAN POLICY INTO THE NEXT PROGRAMMING PERIOD: HOW TO MANAGE CHANGE IN A SHARP ECONOMIC DOWNTURN (09A03)

Chair: **Joost van Iersel**, EESC

Even without a coherent government policy, well-organised local authorities can proactively set up metropolitan authorities, which can develop integrated urban programmes incorporating ITI and CLLD. But if central government holds onto the power, cities suffer.

1. Athens

Athens is developing an integrated urban programme including ITI/CLLD, but is hampered by the lack of clear content, rules and guidance for users.

Dimitris Oiknomou of Athens, Professor of Urban Planning at the University of Thessaly, set out the context that Athens is suffering in the crisis more than the rest of Greece – in particular, tourism has collapsed. He also outlined governance issues: there is no one authority for the city: neither Attica nor the metropolitan authority cover the whole ‘functional urban area’ (FUA) of 4 million people (40% of the national population) and the municipality of Athens only covers the city core with 650,000 inhabitants. Furthermore, most planning responsibility is national: most power lies with the Decentralised Administration of Athens, whose head is appointed by the national government.

The socio-economic partners and civil society is weak, and when given the opportunity to participate, they do not take it up.

The solution is twofold:

- expand the municipality to cover the FUA and give responsibility for growth and urban planning (as in most countries)
- use EU funds to promote CLLD, including permitting aid to small and microenterprises (40% of shops and 255 of hotels have shut)

Prior to the crisis, Athens was the second-most developed area in Greece, and ITI & CLLD are promising tools as they are area-based and multisectoral. The municipality is developing a €150m integrated urban programme.⁴ However the lack of clear content, rules, and guidance for users are barriers to their being taken up.

Yannis Evmolpidis, special Adviser to the Mayor, added that the city does have good co-operation with the EC, and, in a unique pilot, has set up its own MA.

I asked whether capacity-building was envisaged for civil society to enable CLLD to get off the ground. It seems that actors are deterred as they do not see any results from their attempts to participate. It is hoped that they will be more willing once the investment is in place. I was backed up by a Greek from Manchester, who said that successful CLLD requires credible partners, a clear vision and accountability.

Conclusion: support to civil society is very important in making CLLD work.

⁴ http://www.biciklirajbeogradom.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/09-SUTP2013_Evmolpidis_Yannis_FINAL.pdf

2. Katowice

14 counties in Silesia have not let the absence of a legal framework stop them from forming their own metropolitan authority.

Tadeusz Donocik, President of Katowice Chamber of Commerce; Poland has no law on metropolitan authorities. The Śląsk (Silesia) Voivodship (5m people) is divided into 36 counties; 19 urban and 17 rural, and 167 communes. Of these, the Upper Silesian 'metroplex' of 2.2m people comprises 14 counties.

The metropolitan association of Upper Silesia was set up in 2007 with elected officers (it is currently chaired by the mayor of Świętochłowice). It runs transport and waste. Coalmining has declined from 480,000 to 100,000 jobs, while industry, which was in a state of ruin in 1989, has made up ground. It has EU permission till 2026 to operate a Special Economic Zone⁵ which gives investment tax relief to 200 companies and has created 400,000 jobs. Civil society is well structured.

Development priorities are: status (create a metropolis), economy, science & culture (including social economy), transport & communications, environment and living conditions.

3. Manchester

Neil Swanwick, member of Manchester City Council (responsible for waste and energy) & CoR

Even given the abolition of regional authorities, strong solidarity among Manchester's 10 district councils has helped the city region to continue to grow throughout the crisis, and to plan ahead.

Central government has removed a whole layer of regional authorities: the Greater Manchester Council (GMC) was abolished in 1986, and the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) and the long-standing Government Offices (GOs) were also abolished in 1010-11. There are now 10 districts, with emergency services dealt with regionally.

Luckily, Manchester has benefited from a high level of political continuity and stability – the city council has been Labour-controlled for 40 years, and the other councils for 15 years. The Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) includes 10 districts and a population of 2.7m. Unemployment runs at 9.4% against the national level of 7.7%. The extension of the tram network has continued through the crisis, and the city is one of the few in the UK that is still growing.

In 2009 AGMA commissioned the Manchester Independent Economic Review⁶ which provides a vital evidence base. In 2011 it created the model of the "combined authority" and is currently the only one in the UK. It has important powers in economic development, regeneration and transport. Using European funding effectively, the town aims to stimulate a 'new industrial revolution' by setting up a National Graphene Institute (€27m ERDF) based on the local discovery of this new material, and is also building the National Football Museum (€400m ERDF). The URBACT 'City Sustainable Investment'⁷ network is looking at how to make financial instruments work better for cities.

The NW England region also planned ahead when it came to setting up Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), and has achieved full coverage without overlapping boundaries.

⁵ http://www.slaskie.pl/strona_n.php?jezyk=en&grupa=9&dzi=1293525128&art=1293528570&id_menu=386

⁶ <http://www.manchester-review.org.uk/>

⁷ http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/CSI_Europe/outputs_media/CSI_Europe_Leaflet_FINAL.pdf

In 2012 AGMA agreed a 'City Deal'⁸ with the government, whereby the 10 districts invest their own money in the tram network, and via an 'earn back' system⁹ can recoup their investment through a share of the business rates (local taxes) generated by the advent of the tram.

Success factors for regional development:

- a direct link to Brussels, over London's head
- recognition that Manchester can deliver
- always being willing to innovate and try new things
- an attitude of "what we can do for you" rather than the reverse

3. URBACT INNOVATION BROKERS DELIVERING EUROPE 2020: How CITIES GENERATE CHANGE TO MEET COMPLEX URBAN CHALLENGES (10A01)

Chairs: **Sally Kneeshaw & Eddy Adams**

URBACT II, along with INTERREG IV C, ESPON and INTERACT II, is one of four interregional co-operation programmes within the European Territorial Co-operation objective of the Cohesion Funds, and has a budget of €68m.

It promotes integrates sustainable urban development. There have been three calls for proposals resulting in support for 46 thematic networks and 14 working groups. The current call focuses on transferring good practice.

Its tools are learning, capitalisation, communication and capacity building, the latter comprising national training schemes, a summer university every other year, and this year training for elected representatives was piloted.

1. Sustainable Food Network

Stephanie Mantel, Brussels Environment

Food uses 30% of the world's energy and produces 20% of its greenhouse gases.

The network has three themes: growing food, delivering food and enjoying food. It has three cross-cutting issues:

- CO₂ and resource efficiency
- inclusion, jobs and economics
- governance, synergies and local systems

Some experiences are:

- Göteborg uses only organic meat in its schools and old people's homes. It costs an additional €1 per meal but its carbon footprint is lower than non-organic meat, even though they have to import it.
- Brussels supports 'Veggie Thursdays'
- Lyon has social and inclusive groceries (*épiceries solidaires*), which operate a dual price system, such as La Passerelle d'Eau de Robec¹⁰
- Citizen purchasing groups such as GAS (Belgium), AMAP (France) and Community Supported Agriculture (UK)
- An indoor food market and 3,000 m² rooftop farm
- The 2011 *Who Feeds Bristol?* Report, based on which the city set up the Bristol Food Policy Council which priced a *Good Food Charter*

⁸ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/221014/Greater-Manchester-City-Deal-final_0.pdf

⁹ <http://www.lgcplus.com/budget-2012-manchester-earn-back-details-emerge/5043169.article>

¹⁰ <http://www.eauderobec.org/>

2. Rethinking mobility

András Ekés, Metropolitan Research Institute, Budapest

Mobility needs to be rethought, based not only on hardware and software (know-how), but also 'mindware' (intelligence). Many cities have similar infrastructure, but they do not start from the same place. Many East European cities have had the luck not to have had the money to build large infrastructure in their city centres. Some actions:

- rescale hard investments
- reinvent soft modes of transport
- place mobility mindsets at the heart of planning
- have political courage, don't go for a lowest common denominator which tries to balance all stakeholders' needs.
- create places where people feel wellbeing, e.g. the 'A vous de jouer' pianos in stations

Examples:

- Ljubljana: car-free city centre, reallocation of space. Existing residents objected, but now it has become chic
- Budapest: cycling is growing by 40-50% over the last three years in the centre. Cyclists are now visible and unavoidable
- Reggio Emilia: targeted the mobility message at children

Lessons:

- It's never too late to innovate
- Benefits will appear very quickly on the street, in terms of living space, pollution and access to jobs
- Cities can learn from each other

3. Growing in Health Education Network

Angels Chacón, Deputy Mayor for Economic Development, Igualada

The network looks at the issues of excellence in knowledge and professional training; the competitiveness of companies: funds optimisation in the health system; and aging, unemployment and new demands of citizens.

4. The city of tomorrow

Corinne Hermant-de Callatay, Unit for Urban Development and Territorial Cohesion, DG REGIO. In charge of the Interservice Group on Urban Development and *Cities of Tomorrow*

The city of tomorrow needs to be built in a humanistic rather than a technological way. It needs a social mix, different functional uses, and strong social and cultural values. The principal challenge is segregation, gentrification, demography. But you cannot address these issues individually.

She is keen on Local Action Groups and Local Action Plans – everybody learns from these and they can be exported to other programmes. She would like to see mobility among civil servants. There is a need to rebuild trust with citizens and CLLD and it is can help to do this.

Tips from the panel:

- cross-sectoriality underlies everything
- be open to future challenges and new roles for city councils
- think long-term and future-proof your solutions
- Create bridges between silos and levels
- Implant practices from the streets in policy

Toby Johnson, 22 Nov 2013