

































Work Package 2: Existing experiences and barriers on finances/ resources and cooperation






| European Union Funds | Leipzig | Gothenburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) | 😊 Leipzig East ERDF (2002-2006) Leipzig West and Leipzig East (2007-2013) | 😊 | 😊 Constructing of the North Ring Road of Bytom City (Link) | 😊 Metro, ICT... | 😊 Objective 2 European Funding in Kirkless (Support business support, provide capital development and regenerate communities) | 😊 ERDF (2000-2006): Cleavage of pipelines for water supply EC-ERDF Fund for 2007-2013: City dump and water treatment plant broadening |
| European Social Fund (ESF) | | 😊 | 😊 | 😊 Local program for insertion and employment | 😊 Equal Programme: local employment and labour market. | 😊 Empresa Local 10: Economical growth and labour market |
| Cohesion funds | N/A | N/A | 😊 Improvement of water-waste management in the City of Bytom (Link) | | | *For the period 2007-2013, CF and ERDF funds have merged in Spain. |
| Urbact II (Except LC-Facil Project) | | 😊 My Generation: Youth social inclusion | 😊 <i>Land Use Management in Sustainable European Cities (LUMASEC),</i> (Link) | 😊 | 😊 | 😊 |
| Urban II: Cities and Programmes (Initiative 2000-2006) | 😊 Leipzig West (2000-2006) | 😊 | | | | |
| Life + | | | | 😊 | 😞 Waiting for information | |
| Intelligent Energy-Europe | | | | | 😞 Waiting for information | 😊 Polis Project: Solar Energy in the city planning. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INTERREG III and IV • URBACT-ECO-FIN-NET | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leonardo da Vinci (Co-financed by ESF): Education and schools | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Pilot • Urbact I | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban: Integrated revitalization of the medieval quarter |

| Instrument | Leipzig | Gothenburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| JEREMY , JASMINE , JASPERS , |  Know them all, but never applied to them. |  Know them all, but never applied to them. |  Don't know them. |  Know them all, but never applied to them. |  Know them all, but never applied to them. |  Know them all, but never applied to them. |
| JESSICA : |  State and Funding Bank (SAB) regulations made no possible to use Jessica. |  Swedish law a barrier for Jessica. |  Jessica uses the same allocation for programming period 2007-2013, So using Jessica makes Bytom lose the allocation in RPO for revitalisation. |  The regional authority was not willing to implement Jessica. |  Never applied to it. |  Never applied, because it needs to be negotiated with the Regional authority and need tough administrative procedures to get Jessica (and only if regional Authority decides so) |







| | Leipzig | Gothenburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Barriers when implementing actions by the structural funds?</p> | <p> 50% of ERDF funds for environmental investments. Need of more funds for social actions, economic growth and labour market promotion.</p> <p> Only 15% of National funds for economic and labour market growth.</p> | <p> Jessica could not be implemented due to incompatibilities with Swedish Law.</p> | <p> Regional OP: Schedule changes of competitions and too much effort on document preparation.</p> <p> National OP: Lack of criteria and long term view on project rating</p> <p> Urbact: Lack of cohesion requirement between lead partner and national first level controller</p> <p>In general:</p> <p> Too long administrative procedures till contract signing</p> | <p> No funding for housing (?), for energy demand management and for integrated and sustainable diagnostic and planning</p> | <p> Coordination with other cities slows project implementation time.</p> | <p> Local objectives not well represented at national or regional decision on OP.</p> <p> Difficulties to coordinate and find city cooperation</p> |

| | Leipzig | Gothenburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Adequate structural funding?</p> | <p> Funds for infrastructures, but not for integrated urban development (only 6% of ERDF)</p> | <p> Although more funding is welcome, kind of adequate.</p> | <p> Funds are not well allocated. Many times few funds available for many projects. (Ex. Bytom can consume whole region fund allocation)</p> | <p> Yes, for metropolitan cities.</p> | <p> Difficult access to funds for major capital works as deprived communities.</p> <p> Match funding getting more difficult.</p> <p> Even with funding at different levels, is difficult to achieve a meaningful integrated and sustainable urban development.</p> | <p> Funds not enough for integrated urban development which needs meaningful budget.</p> <p> New Member States of convergence regions will make it very difficult to get funds for next years.</p> |
| <p>Is sustainable urban development a separate priority in your regions Operational Programme for 2007-2013?</p> | <p>YES. Under Priority axis 5: “Expansion and improvement of the infrastructure to permit durable economic growth”. Subject matter: Deprived cities and neighbourhoods.</p> | <p>YES.</p> | <p>YES. Under Priority VI: Sustainable urban development. Priority in fostering regional growth and devastated areas.</p> | <p>YES. At second level of the Operational programme.</p> | <p>NOT in Kirkless sub-region (West Yorkshire).</p> | <p>YES. Under priority axis 2 and 3 “Environment” : Water treatment, waste treatment,...</p> |



| Funding and cooperation | Leipzig | Gothenburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|-------------------------|---|---|------------|---|---|--|
| <p>National</p> | <p>Socially Integrative City (For under developed districts)</p> <p>Research Programme (Housing and urban Development)</p> <p>National Urban Development Policy (Network to exchange practices on sustainable projects)</p> <p>Urban renewal programme (Also with national funds, supports investments in buildings and infrastructure)</p> <p>Urban regeneration programme East Germany “Stadtumbau Ost”</p> <p>In general:</p> <p> Different funding mix, but none permits a whole and complete integrated approach. Need to combine with ERDF.</p> <p> Funding programmes and tax laws have permit Leipzig to refurbish 85% of the buildings.</p> | <p>National urban development policy</p> <p> Platform for cooperation between local/national level</p> <p> No longer include funding</p> <p>National strategy for regional competitiveness, entrepreneurship and employment</p> | <p>No.</p> | <p> No national funds for integrated, sustainable urban development. Only for specific and isolated projects:</p> <p>Politique de la ville: For neighbourhoods, strong social and urban approach, but not enough economic and environmental.</p> <p>Grenelle de l’environnement:</p> | <p>Total Place: For greater efficiency on public spending. (Link)</p> <p>National Lottery Fund (Including Heritage Fund): Renovation of historic buildings.</p> | <p>Plan E: Financial and budget measures to promote economical growth and unemployment (Link)</p> |

| Funding and cooperation | Leipzig | Gothenburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regional/Local | None. | <p>Sustainable Growth, Göteborg Region Association of Local Authorities</p> <p>K2020 – The Future Public Transport in the Göteborg area</p> <p>😊 Good regional cooperation policies. www.grkom.se</p> | None | Local strategy shared with regional partners in common strategies | <p>Yorkshire Forward RDA:</p> <p>😊 It is funding the Dewsbury Renaissance programme, for social regeneration. (Link)</p> <p>😞 Also funded the Geographical Programme for regeneration of an area, was not successful due to not having an integrated approach from national government and for the complex management arrangements that Yorkshire Forward put in place.</p> | <p>Euskadi INNOVA: Promotion of innovation and excellence in Basque Institutions. (Link)</p> <p>Plan Alhondiga: At local level, to revitalize commercial routes to promote city economical growth, new technologies and public participation.</p> |
| Private sector | <p>😊 Selbstnutzer.de : To foster private property building, www.selbstnutzer.de</p> <p>“Gestattungsvereinbarung”: Use of private space as temporal public space.</p> <p>“Guardians house – “Wächterhäuser”: Bring new users into abandon houses.</p> | <p>😐 Local agreements with landlords to refurbish squares of buildings</p> | <p>😐 Very few cases. One would be the cooperation of a coal mine owner to restore the land use in the area.</p> | <p>😐 Funding of the high-speed train line</p> | <p>😊 Deighton and Brackenhall Initiative (Link): District regeneration</p> <p>😊 Private Financed Initiatives (PFI) in the development of schools, public housing, street lighting. (Link)</p> | <p>😐 Not too much experience. A case would be the development of the New City Council. Private sector builds it, and after renting it for 30 years, the property will fall on the City Council.</p> |

| | Leipzig | Gothemburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Economical crisis programmes |  National programme (Konjunkturprogramm II): Energy-efficient refurbishments. Although no real verification of the actions taken. |  Only education for adults and internships for unemployed |  None |  National Plan, promoting economic investments, employment, housing and solidarity. |  * Urbact questionnaire on economic crisis |  Plan E: Loans to SMEs and City Councils to boost employment and economical growth |
| Coordination/ cooperation between different level |  National and European programmes work independently, but can be combined for local implementation, but this integration of programmes is a complicated task.  National and Regional funds aims at environmental investments. Need of more integrated approaches and even more when ERDF funding will cease because Leipzig's situation of a "phasing out" region. |  Good regional and social funds combination |  National and Regional Operation Programmes combine to support different projects.  National and Regional Operation Programmes allow ERDF and ESF funds combination in some cases  Participation: Many suggestions on the elaboration of ROP 2007-2013 not taken into account. |  National and Regional Operation Programmes have been established at the same time to be coherent and even Rennes could take part in the negotiations.  Some aspects as „Energy demand "mastery" (Control/limitation) not covered by the OP.  Rennes not enough involved in programme creation (? Above you say contrary) |  Programmes don't fulfil sustainable development and integrated regeneration as a whole. Tend to be individual projects and with no long term view  Local priorities not well addressed with national/regional decisions.  City participation on programmes is difficult, due to limited time to contribute and discuss local priorities.  There are some mid term evaluation programmes. |  Most programmes touches a specific pillar of sustainable urban development, but has no integrated approach.  European objectives and local ones mismatch.  Funds can be combined but with some restrictions (no more than 100% funds and no coming from different lines).  Not enough involved in OP creation. |
| City management according to sustainability criteria |  A system to link municipal budget planning to the objectives of the integrated urban development is under development and being tested.  Interdepartmental cooperation has started to optimise the budget for a more efficient use of public money, |  Main budget document based on the 3 pillars of sustainability  Also governance  Need to improve city participation |  Activity based budget. No obligatory criteria to choose tasks compatible with sustainable principles.  ISO 9001:2008  Aim to develop methods to qualify projects within sustainable criteria. |  A pluriannual program for investment (not linked with ISUD)  Annual activity balance is based on our ISUD strategy  A specific department is dedicated to lead the ISUD strategy |  New Council Structures (Matrix management)  "Total Place" initiative |  City has a Sustainability Observatory, where indicators are being developed to evaluate city sustainability.  Budget control by an independent first level auditor. |

| Status quo of integrated, sustainable urban development | Leipzig | Gothenburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|--|----------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Developed a strategy for / implemented an integrated approach at district/ neighbourhood level? | YES | YES | NO | YES | YES (Draft) | YES |
| Developed a strategy for/ implemented a city-wide integrated urban development concept? | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES (Draft) | YES |
| Developed a system for follow-up and evaluation for the implementation of the integrated approach? | YES/O | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Developed a system that relates the idea of sustainability / the integrated strategy to the municipal budget? | YES/O | YES | YES | NO | No (but close) | YES |
| Used funding programmes that were multi layered and/or supported integrated regeneration programs linked to substantial EU funding (period 2007-2013)? | YES | YES | YES | - | NO | YES |

| Challenges for integrated, sustainable urban development | Leipzig | Gothemburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|---|----------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| (remaining) sectoral structure/thinking of the city-administration? | YES | YES | YES | NO | YES | YES |
| short-term view of political operating? | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES | YES |
| a lack of continuity between an (integrated) strategy and the actions taken? | YES/O | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO |
| lack of awareness for the benefits of integrated / sustainable urban development? | YES/O | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| creating the evidence of the benefits of integrated / sustainable urban development? (lack of monitoring/evaluation and visualization tool) | NO/O | NO | YES | YES | YES | NO |
| lack of flexible budget, due to sectoral or overlapping funding opportunities? (e.g. national and European funding programmes) | YES | NO | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| lack of skills within the administration for: integrated planning processes, the participation with local stakeholders or providing the evidence for the benefits of the integrated approach | YES | NO | YES | NO | NO | YES |
| lack of exchange opportunities with other (national/European) professionals | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES | YES |

| | Leipzig | Gothemburg | Bytom | Rennes | Kirkless | Vitoria-Gasteiz |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Statement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The URBAN Dimension needs an earmarking within ERDF. - The main goals of ERDF funding towards cities must be part of national programming - Don't minimise funding. The URBAN criteria, size of area and investment per inhabitant are fundamental for success of investment. - Intensive city hearings by the European commission. Critical evaluations of practise by professionals. Carry necessary changes through. - Without this a European commission driven URBAN+ is better than a Urban Dimension within ERDF following subsidiarity (and relying on programming at regional level) | <p>Programme users should be involved in the planning and creation of the programme.</p> | <p>Support is needed from NOP and ROP to promote funding on deprived neighbourhoods, housing and infrastructures as road or waste.</p> | <p>We do not wish a global funding, but rather for a funding aiming at important projects which are leant back on an ISUD strategy.</p> <p>To maintain the regional policy</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible budget for mixed social economic and physical regeneration • Capital programmes • Long term funding programmes (10 years plus) • More local flexibilities (a geographic programme approach) • Less red tape / restriction eligibilities etc. • A solution to the problem of securing match funding | <p>To include the integrated urban dimension to the ERDF programme,</p> |