



University of the
West of England



Urban Matrix Second Demand Survey 2007

Rob Atkinson and Eileen Lepine

February 2008

Cities Research Centre
Faculty of the Built Environment
University of the West of England
Frenchay Campus
Coldharbour Lane
Bristol
BS16 1QY
United Kingdom

E-mail: Rob.Atkinson@uwe.ac.uk
E-mail: Eileen.Lepine@uwe.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

Urban Matrix (UM) aims to create a knowledge dissemination platform designed to support European local authorities in addressing Sustainable Urban Development (SUD) in all its complexity and many dimensions. Three demand surveys are being carried out during the course of the four year Urban Matrix project. These surveys are a key part of Work Package 2, the major objective of which is to:

develop a methodology to chart the demand of information and support on research results, products, guidelines and methodologies in the field of Sustainable Urban Development coming from European cities.

The first survey was in 2006. Here we provide an analysis of the second survey, carried out in 2007.

The 2007 survey

Full details of the survey are contained in Appendix 1

The questionnaire was divided into five levels (or sections) along the following lines.

Level 1, (as in the previous survey) asked for basic information about the respondent (name, organisation, country, etc) and included an open question about the key driver(s) stimulating local authorities' interest in sustainable urban development.

Level 2, (as in the previous survey) sought to identify the particular issues/themes on which knowledge was required, using a series of keywords.

Level 3 (as in the previous survey) aimed to identify the type of knowledge required (e.g. practice knowledge, research knowledge).

There were new questions at Levels 4 and 5.

Level 4 asked respondents how they preferred to access knowledge and whether their organisations had systems in place for knowledge exchange. It also asked whether they had used the Urban Matrix website and if they had about their experience of doing so. Suggestions were invited for other forms of dissemination through Urban Matrix.

Level 5 contained a number of more open questions which were included in the previous survey. Respondents were asked to identify issues/themes absent from level 2, whether they required knowledge on integrating policy areas and finally about subjects on which they would like to see the UM project host thematic workshops for knowledge dissemination. In addition, they were asked if they could contribute to Urban Matrix, with information about social cohesion (identified as a key issue in the previous survey) or by contributing good practice templates.

The survey, in English, was placed on the Urban Matrix web site and its presence primarily publicised by e-mail alerts.

SURVEY RESULTS

LEVEL ONE - CITIES (54) AND COUNTRIES (21)

For the 2007 survey there were 62 responses from 54 cities in 21 countries. In the previous survey, there were 126 responses, from 17 countries across Europe. In 2006, certain cities (Amsterdam and Belfast) and countries (The Netherlands and the United Kingdom) were over-represented by large numbers of responses – this was not the case in 2007. Only three countries that responded in the first survey did not respond in 2007 – these were Bulgaria, Croatia and France. Countries responding for the first time in 2007 were Greece, Lithuania, Romania, Serbia, Switzerland and Turkey and the USA. The survey therefore continues to give a good insight into thinking on these issues across Europe.

Most of those responding to the survey are employed by public authorities, in a variety of departments and posts – including planning, economic development, posts with an explicitly environmental focus, and a number of European or international departments.

Many cities and some individuals have now responded to both rounds of the survey. In a few cases, where there were multiple responses in the 2006 survey, this time there were fewer respondents and only one person who has responded to both rounds. This is the case for Amsterdam, Belfast and Sheffield and, since large numbers responded from these cities in 2006, as already noted, this partly explains the reduction in total responses.

Twenty two individuals have now responded to both surveys. Unsurprisingly, many made similar responses to similar questions, presumably reflecting their continuing core concerns and/or roles and responsibilities. However, responses were not identical but showed some changes in interests and concerns. In some cases, these seemed to be directly connected to matters of concern in a particular city – for example, shrinking population (Lodz) and population growth/ demand (Stockholm). In others changes perhaps reflected issues coming to the fore in the respondent's work – for example, new or increased concerns with monitoring/indicators or interdisciplinary working, or a greater emphasis on culture, transport and climate change.

In discussion of the 2006 survey, it was noted that Greece and Eastern Central Europe, including countries joining the EU in 2007, had not been represented, but could be expected to have knowledge needs to which the pan-European approach of Urban Matrix would be relevant. In the 2007 survey, numbers responding from these areas are small, but the information that is given by respondents suggests that, while these cities share many interests in common with other parts of Europe, there are also particular issues for them, which include interests in:

- best practice / learning
- EU policy / delivery - better understanding, transparency
- dealing with acute processes of change - rapid urbanisation, industrialisation and its impact, and in some cases, population decline

On the following pages, *TABLE 1, COUNTRIES AND CITIES*, shows which cities have responded in each round of the survey. (In the 2007 survey columns, numbers in brackets indicate the number of responses from a city.) *TABLE 2 – Responses from Eastern Europe, Greece and Turkey*, gives a further insight into the particular concerns of a number of cities.

TABLE ONE – COUNTRIES AND CITIES

COUNTRIES SURVEY 2 - 2007	CITIES SURVEY 2 - 2007	SURVEY 1
Austria	Vienna	Vienna
Belgium (3)	Antwerp, Brussels, Namur	Antwerp, Brussels, Gent, Namur
Czech Republic (3)	Brno, Prague (2)	Brno, Prague
Denmark (2)	Aalborg, Aarhus	Aalborg, Copenhagen
Finland (6)	Espoon kaupunki, Helsinki (2) Oulu (2), Tampere	Espoon kaupunki, Helsinki Oulu, Tampere
Germany (3)	Berlin, Frankfurt, Leipzig	Berlin, Frankfurt, Leipzig Cologne, Munich
Greece	Amaroussion / Maroussi	
Italy (3)	Florence, Palermo, Rome	Palermo, Turin, Venice
Lithuania (2)	Klaipeda, Vilnius	Vilnius
Netherlands (8)	Amsterdam (3), Enschede, The Hague, Schiedam, Utrecht (2)	Amsterdam, The Hague Utrecht
Northern Ireland	Belfast	Belfast
Poland (2)	Gdansk, Lodz	Gdansk, Lodz, Bialystok Krakow, Warsaw
Portugal	Porto	Porto, Liboa
Romania	Bucharest	
Serbia	Novi Sad	
Spain (3)	Donostia –San Sebastian Gijon, Terrassa	Gijon, Getxo, Rubi, Sevilla Sitges, Terrassa, Zarautz
Sweden (5)	Gteborg, Helsingborg Sodertalje, Stockholm (2)	Gteborg, Helsingborg Malmo, Stockholm
Switzerland	Zurich	
Turkey (2)	Istanbul, Sanliurfa	
UK (12)	Birmingham, Bristol, Edinburgh Leeds, London Borough of Merton Newcastle upon Tyne (2) Nottingham (2), Sheffield (2) Southampton, Surrey	Birmingham, Bristol, Edinburgh Ely, Hayes, Hull, Leeds, Liverpool London, Manchester Newcastle upon Tyne Sheffield, Southampton
USA	Washington, DC	

TABLE 2 Responses from Eastern Europe, Greece, Turkey

CITY	KEYWORDS DRIVERS/ OTHER ISSUES OF INTEREST / ON WHICH KNOWLEDGE IS REQUIRED
Prague	Brownfield Sites , Energy Management, Public Spaces, Traffic management. Closing recycling loop; urban sprawl; air quality (PM) connected with the heavy freight; easily accessible public spaces and green areas
Prague 2	Benchmarking, Competitiveness, Public-Private Partnerships, The role of ICT. Role of Prague within wider European context; impact of globalisation; knowledge-based economy and innovations as the main source of city's future competitiveness; city development versus urban heritage protection etc.
Amaroussion	Citizen Participation, Finance, Regeneration, Traffic management, Urban Air quality. Deprivation of metropolitan areas due to rapid urbanization and attraction of large firms with positive and negative (mainly environmental) impacts. Innovative ways of financing large regeneration projects and guide to implementation. Urban regeneration and project planning/financing.
Klaipeda	Competitiveness, Energy Management, Public-Private Partnerships, Social Cohesion, Sustainable Procurement. Lisbon objectives, Leipzig Charter. Cohesion policy implementation in practice Energy efficiency and housing renovation. Waterfront transformation projects
Vilnius	Citizen Participation , Compact Cities, Competitiveness, EU, Globalisation , Integrated transport systems, Public-Private Partnerships, Spatial Planning, Sustainable Procurement Public participation in the planning proceses; Urban development management; Urbanization process in the territories around cities; Compact Cities;
Gdansk	Competitiveness, The role of ICT Increasing quantity of the investment in the city of Gdansk and generally in Poland. Environmental protection
Lodz	Public-Private Partnerships, Public Spaces, Spatial Planning, Urban Demographic change. 1.Implementation of urban sustainable development rules in the city which has to deal with intensive processes of changes in bases of economy 2.Adjustment of city functions and city space to the significant decrease of number of inhabitants
Bucharest	Eco-Friendly Transport, Public-Private Partnerships, Spatial Planning. Foreign investments. Protecting the environment
Novi Sad	Education/Awareness Raising , EU , Local Agenda 21 and similar activities,Enhancement of integration of EU urban policies; Easier flow of knowledge exchange; improved transparency of European funds targeted at sustainable development for potential candidate and candidate countries; education of administration staff. Brownfield sites, PPP, social cohesion and role of ICT
Istanbul	Benchmarking, Integrated transport systems, Regeneration, Traffic management. Our key areas of interest are here as follows: Benchmarking and best practices(European level), Alternative solutions to traffic problem and modernizing the transportation infrastructure (local level), Urban regeneration (national/local level)

LEVEL ONE - KEY DRIVERS

Level 1 of the survey includes an *open* question about the key driver(s) stimulating local authorities' interest in sustainable urban development.

Key drivers in the 2006 survey

In 2006 we reported that there were a very wide range of responses on the question of key drivers, from which it was difficult to identify clearly dominant themes. However, some themes could be identified. These were summarised as follows:

- Many respondents did not see there being a 'single driver' but referred to a number of interrelated issues and some were explicit about the desire to develop a holistic approach to sustainable urban development.
- A number of core issues, such as sustainable use of resources, energy and climate change, are driving interest in some cities.
- A range of related issues such as governance, partnership, collaboration and participation do appear to be identified as issues driving the agenda in a number of cities.
- Community cohesion appears to be a driver in a small number of cities.
- Economic development was identified as a driver particularly in relation to sustainable growth and how this is linked to other issues (e.g. how economic and traffic growth are related and the need to break this link, which of course can be related to wider issues such as sustainable use of resources and climate change).

Key drivers in the 2007 survey

Generally the themes identified remain significant in the 2007 survey, as the following analysis will show, but some newer issues and changes in emphasis also emerge.

Integrated approaches to sustainable development

As in 2006, many respondents did not see there being a 'single driver' but referred to a number of interrelated issues and some were explicit about the desire to develop a holistic approach to sustainable urban development. In many cases, respondents were explicit about the links between drivers and the need for a holistic approach. Cities are clearly interested in sustainable development at European, national and local levels and have broad concerns for sustainability – "humanity's intellectual and emotional duty to maintain and develop the planet Gaia for future generations" (Sodertalje). Several cities emphasised the importance of integrated approaches to city planning for sustainable development (Berlin, Amsterdam, Scheidam, Donastia, Stockholm).

Climate change

Given these broad concerns for sustainability, it is not surprising to find that climate change was mentioned directly by at least a dozen cities – and of course concern with this issue may underpin other drivers, even when it is not explicitly mentioned. On this issue too, the need for action beyond the city level is emphasised by some cities – for example, in references to the need the need to address regional contributors to climate change (Belfast) and for action on climate change at all levels of governance at which it can be addressed (Newcastle).

Most of those raising this issue, also express a wide range of other concerns. Some of these might be described as 'green' or environmental issues. For example, there are references to air quality, nature protection, and greening the urban environment (for example, Frankfurt). For others however, climate change is an issue being tackled alongside concerns about growth, the local economy, disadvantage and poverty (Nottingham) or about liveability in cities in general, (Utretcht).

In addition a number of cities raised the related issue of **energy consumption** (Vienna, Brussels, Stockholm, Zurich, Bristol)

Transport and traffic.

In 2006 we reported that there was strong interest in traffic and transport issues and this remains the case.

This is the issue that is mentioned most often, by at least 15 cities. Five of these are in the UK, but this is clearly an issue of concern across Europe, as Table 3, indicates. What this table also shows, however, is that this is not an issue seen in isolation. For some, the impact of traffic and transport issues in their city it is the main concern mentioned. For others, it is one of a number of key drivers and is clearly seen to be related to a range of other problems – from its global environmental impact, to its more immediate and local impact on the quality of city life.

TABLE 3 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ISSUES AS KEY DRIVERS

Berlin	Integrated urban transport , environmental planning and policy for sustainable development
Brussels	Environmental and Energy issues : air quality; reduction of energy consumption; road traffic management
Istanbul	Our key areas of interest are here as follows: Benchmarking and best practices(European level), Alternative solutions to traffic problem and modernizing the transportation infrastructure (local level), Urban regeneration (national/local level)
Namur	Transport
Oulu	Development of the city centre and public transport. Enhancing bicycle and pedestrian traffic.
Prague	Closing recycling loop; urban sprawl; air quality (PM) connected with the heavy freight ; easily accessible public spaces and green areas
Roma	Urban regeneration, eco friendly transport , urban planning
Stockholm	Locally: - integrated city planning – innovative solutions for waste, water & energy, - energy and transports
Tampere	Key issues driving our interest in sustainable urban development in Tampere are climate change, energy saving and traffic/mobility . In addition, responsible consumption is a new issue of interest for us.
The Hague	- sustainable transport planning - integrated planning (spatial and transport) - environmental issues (climate, air quality) - reduction of transport demand (mobility management, road pricing) - use of ICT in transport (ITS, innovations)
Birmingham	Links between transport and spatial planning so that the roads lobby does not have such a dominant role in shaping cities and large urban areas. We need a much more balanced appraisal process to take account of the impact of movement.
Edinburgh	European/national: Climate change Regional/local: Traffic congestion
Leeds	Climate change, Waste management, Transport , Contaminated land, Urban design Social deprivation, Biodiversity
Nottingham	Sustainable transport
Southampton	Climate Change and energy management, Water efficiency, Air Quality, Sustainable design & construction (input into planning process), sustainable transport , Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal

The urban environment

The complexity and interconnected nature of sustainable development issues is clearly demonstrated in responses which are concerned with many aspects of the urban environment – for example:

- greening the environment (Frankfurt); easily accessible public spaces and green areas (Prague); biodiversity of natural areas - wildlife corridors, habitat (Bristol); ecosystem approach, biodiversity (Helsinki)
- air quality (Frankfurt, Prague, Utrecht)
- urban sprawl (Prague).
- urban village approach to work, life and play, minimising need to travel (Bristol)

Urban change

Alongside such common concerns about the environment of the city are particular issues arising from urban change – and here, while cities do have issues in common, there are also some distinct differences which centre on how cities are to respond to issues of growth and decline. For some a key concern is the impact of rapid urbanisation, or population growth and associated pressures on housing and/or the urban environment. For example:

‘more and more people want to live in Stockholm and the shortage of available amount of land is a fact. In order to host all these people [it] is [necessary] to build in a sustainable way in means of energy, transport etc’.

There are references to tensions between urban/ economic growth and the protection of the urban heritage (Prague) or between growth and its environmental impact – for example, the ‘deprivation of metropolitan areas due to rapid urbanization and attraction of large firms with positive and negative (mainly environmental) impacts’ (Amarousson). For others, however, the concern is not with growth, but with

‘adjustment of city functions and city space to the significant **decrease** of [the] number of inhabitants’ (Lodz)

Disadvantage, migration and social cohesion

In the previous survey we noted that social cohesion appeared as a cause for concern in a relatively small number of cities. While, again, the numbers referring to this issue are not large, it is our overall impression that this may be a growing issue for a number of cities. Respondents refer to overall concerns with disadvantage, crime and poverty, but also explicitly to social cohesion (for example, Zurich, Klaipeda, Nottingham) and there are also references to inward migration and integration of migrants (for example, Vienna). (See also the responses at Level 6 to requests for information on the issue of social cohesion)

Finance and funding issues

For at least 6 cities, funding is an issue. There are references to

- private/public partnership (Florence, Newcastle, Utrecht)
- eligibility for EU funding (Florence) and transparency of European funds targeted at sustainable development for potential candidate and candidate countries (Novi Sad)
- inward / foreign investment (Bucharest,
- City Development Companies / Local Asset Based Vehicles (Newcastle)

Other drivers

Other drivers mentioned by at least one city are

- cultural issues – the way arts and culture can contribute to sustainable urban development (Utrecht); culture and education (Espoon kaupunki).
- Citizen participation (LB Merton, Aarhus)
- Monitoring of sustainable development, local level indicators (Oulu)
- Benchmarking and best practice, at European level (Istanbul)
- Waterfront transformation projects (Klaipeda)

LEVEL TWO – KEYWORD RESPONSES

At Level 2 of the survey, respondents are asked to identify particular issues/themes *on which knowledge is required*, using a series of keywords.

In 2007, an expanded list of keywords was offered (40, previously 33). The new key words were: Spatial planning, Sustainable procurement, Urban demographic change, Noise reduction, Anti-discrimination, Mainstreaming, Urban health / healthy cities. These are indicated in bold type in Table 3, which summarises the responses. Three of these - Spatial planning, Sustainable procurement and Urban demographic change - were in the top ten key words chosen.

One of the new keywords - Urban health / healthy cities – was among several of the keywords at the end of the list which do not appear to have been chosen by any respondent. The others were Urban Heritage and Conservation, Urban safety / security, Urban sprawl, Waste Management and Water use. Responses in 2006 and in other parts of the 2007 survey suggest these are issues of interest for at least some respondents.

Most respondents complied with the request to choose just five key words. (Only eight respondents chose more than five key words and of the 54 choosing five or fewer, 25 chose five and 20 selected only four.) Together with questions about key drivers and workshop interests, the responses therefore give a good indication of those issues which are important to respondents.

Both differences and similarities can be expected between the responses on key drivers and keywords. Key drivers may be issues of great interest or concern, but this does not necessarily mean they will be identified as the issues on which greater knowledge is needed. So, while the choice of key words in at least some cases is consistent with responses on drivers – for example, many select eco friendly transport, integrated transport systems and traffic management, reflecting the strong interest in these issues – other things emerge more strongly in the keyword responses. For example, drivers indicate that there is some interest in public private partnerships but the keyword responses makes this clearer – it is top of the list and selected by 24 respondents. Citizen participation is also given a high priority among the keywords.

These results are summarised in Table 4. For comparisons with the 2006 survey, the table shows the rankings for each keyword – the number in brackets () in each column. While there are variations between the surveys, interest in many issues appears to be consistent and, as we noted in relation to the previous survey, many of these these are issues which are by no means new to the policy debate; the previous survey report discussed the implications for dissemination.

TABLE 4 KEYWORDS

	Numbers selecting each keyword, 2007 (ranking)	Numbers* selecting each keyword, 2006 (ranking)
Public-Private Partnerships	24 (1)	34 (4)
Citizen participation	20 (2)	42 (3)
Eco-friendly transport	18 (3)	22 (10)
Social Cohesion.	15 (4)	44 (1)
Energy management	14 (5)	24 (8)
Integrated transport systems	14	26 (6)
Environmental Impact Plans/Assess	13 (6)	21 (11)
Competitiveness	13	25 (7)
Regeneration.	13	43 (2)
Traffic management	13	13 (16)
Benchmarking	12 (7)	42 (3)
Education/Awareness raising	10 (8)	19 (12)
Evaluation	10	19 (12)
Spatial planning	10	
Sustainable procurement	10	
Compact cities	9 (9)	26 (6)
Road pricing/congestion charging	9	11 (18)
Urban demographic change	9	
EU	8 (10)	16 (14)
Finance	8	18 (13)
Globalisation	8	14 (15)
Public Spaces	8	27 (5)
Brownfield sites	7 (11)	13 (16)
Role of ICT	7	8 (19)
Urban Biodiversity	7	11 (18)
Noise reduction	6 (12)	
Urban Air quality	6	23 (9)
Anti-discrimination	4 (13)	
Shrinking Cities	4	11 (18)
Building materials	3 (14)	7 (20)
Local Agenda 21 and similar initiatives	3	13 (16)
New build	2 (15)	11 (18)
Eco-labelling	1 (16)	2 (22)
Mainstreaming	1	
Urban health / healthy cities		
Urban Heritage and Conservation		12 (17)
Urban safety / security		16 (14)
Urban sprawl		11 (18)
Waste Management		19 (12)
Water use		6 (21)

Those selecting 'other' referred to:

- Global migratory movements caused by environmental, economic, demographic and war tensions- its impact on national states, regions, cities and communities.
- Urban Culture, Urban Economy
- Arts and Culture
- Sustainable development (economic) in region
- Employment Policies Innovation

LEVEL 3 – TYPES OF KNOWLEDGE

At Level 3 respondents were again asked to identify the type of knowledge they required. The table below shows the results and gives a comparison with the 2006 survey.

TABLE 5 KNOWLEDGE TYPE

KNOWLEDGE TYPE	2007 SURVEY	2006 SURVEY
PRACTICE	53	100
RESEARCH	33	64
POLICY	27	59
NETWORK	24	44

Only two people chose 'other' in response to this question in the 2007 survey and no more detailed comment is recorded for either in the data base.

As in the previous survey, these results suggest that there is particularly strong support for the dissemination of knowledge on good practice, which was prioritised by 53 out of 62 respondents in the current survey. As before, the issue is how to effectively and efficiently disseminate this knowledge and, in this survey, some additional questions were added on preferred methods of dissemination of knowledge / learning – see Level Four analysis, which follows.

NOTE: - re classes of knowledge. The question on classes of knowledge – i.e. Sustainable Urban Governance, Urban Infrastructure, Spatial Planning, Built Environment, Urban Diversity/Ecology – included at Level 3 in the 2006 survey was not repeated in 2007.

LEVEL 4 – ACCESSING KNOWLEDGE

Level 4 of the 2006 survey asked respondents a series of questions intended to give further insights into dissemination issues. This series of questions asked about the preferred means of accessing knowledge. It asked about

- preferences re use of the web, personal interaction through workshops, conferences and paper based forms
- whether their organisations had systems in place for knowledge exchange
- whether they had used the Urban Matrix website and if they had about their experience of doing so.

Suggestions were invited for other forms of dissemination through Urban Matrix.

LEVEL 4 - PREFERRED MEANS OF ACCESSING KNOWLEDGE

The **web** was selected by 58 respondents. The four respondents not selecting the web were from Amaroussion, Enschede, Firenze and Lodz. In each case, personal interaction was their preference – the respondent from Lodz also referred to paper based forms.

Generally, **paper based forms** did not appear popular. They were selected by only 14 respondents.

However, while these results no doubt reflect the growing importance of the web and of IT based sources of knowledge, it should be noted that **personal interaction** was also preferred by a great majority of respondents – 47. So, it cannot be assumed that web based forms will always be preferred, or suitable. Although the survey information cannot confirm this, it may well be that further enquiry would indicate that people's preferences vary, depending on the type of knowledge, information or learning they seek.

(Only two respondents chose 'other' and completed the relevant text box. Reflecting the typical interests in computer based and more personal forms they referred to email and to common projects)

LEVEL 4 - SYSTEMS FOR INTER-DEPARTMENTAL KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE

The survey went on to ask about knowledge exchange systems used by respondents, within their departments / organisations. There were 24 responses to this question, with a number of respondents also commenting on systems for sharing information across departments / in their city. Again, reflecting the use of both IT based and more personal forms of interaction, the responses here show that intranets are commonly used and that there are also more personal forms of interaction in use. There were 9 references to intranets and three to e-mail. Other respondents described a variety of more or less ad hoc systems for sharing information, consultation and coordination. These included

- annual planning exercises (e.g. Aalborg),
- inter-departmental cooperation
- verbal and written briefings
- salons' and 'jam sessions' (Amsterdam)
- temporary project teams.

For a full list of responses, see Table 5.

It is also of interest to note that as well as those simply not answering this question (11), there were 22 respondents who said a definite no. This perhaps has implications for forms of dissemination which rely on cascading or other methods of sharing (and disseminating) information. It may imply that there is a lack of coordination within local authorities, or between partners, or that coordination is confined to certain levels, such as senior officers, chief executives, and/or mayors. It is also of note that only one respondent clearly highlighted problems with the methods being used (referring to a system of file exchange to monitor progress that they thought was not very efficient or intelligible). However, it cannot be assumed that because a method is mentioned the respondent thinks it is working well, or is the best method that might be used. It may be that this is an area in which those who are positive about the methods they use could usefully share information, via Matrix.

TABLE 6 - SYSTEMS FOR INTER-DEPARTMENTAL KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE

The planning of the coming year's activities is carried out in an involving process where all departments are involved.
We just set up an alliance between all the spatial departments... This to support each other in the big projects, and not have conflicting interests.
We use Salons to open up different disciplines and cultures for each other. We do learning trips. We organize Jam Sessions each month. And we organize a week of method learning each year.
Via departmental intranets and via verbal and written briefings
Email exchange on key issues; internal network meetings
Intranet
We make use of temporary project teams and ad hoc seminars
The intranet of our city works as a means to exchange knowledge.
The Local Agency for Economic Promotion and Employment uses a Balanced Socorecard System and quarterly we collect data and elaborate reports.
Through the internal web and through meetings.
Intranet-system for general information and projects
Department of Strategic Planning gathers up the work done and future projections from the Municipal Departments to compile and disseminate within the Municipality.
During making the specific decisions we organise meetings with other Directors (from other Department) and we discuss. During this process we look for & find common goals and solutions that make all participants exchange their experience and knowledge
Special information system for offices for economic development ...
Intranet, internal newsletter
e-mails and e-learning
Not based on a common web oriented platform, that could be the best in my opinion. Only a system of file exchange that is not very efficient to monitor progress and gaps and that is not very intelligible
In part only: Intranet (esp. reports from conferences and journeys, media monitoring etc.)
We have an intranet platform where we can put all the information of common interest to share with other departments
Intranet
Generally via email but also through newsletters, bulletins, and our web site
Monthly meetings where EU coordinators from different administrations in the city meet and exchange info.
Non formal and formal co-operation between departments ...on the subject of air quality/ noise and mobility, urban planning (all environmental subjects)and social and environmental issues.
Interdepartmental working groups on different topics (e.g. neighbourhood development, development areas)

LEVEL FOUR - USE OF THE URBAN MATRIX WEBSITE

It is clear from responses in this part of the survey that people are open to web-based forms of knowledge exchange and, for the first time, the 2007 survey was able to look at the use of the Urban Matrix website.

Only 10 respondents said they had used the site and some had made limited use of it and therefore did not have detailed comments to offer. Use of the site seemed to be spread across Europe – respondents were from Amsterdam, Belfast, Birmingham, Brno, Donostia, Palermo, Porto, Novi Sad, Sheffield, Stockholm. (This list includes some but not all partner cities.) The comments from those who had used the website were generally positive. Several people said that they found the website easy to use and that the information they find there is useful and relevant.

Respondents said:

- I think it is a basic and simple to use website where there is plenty of knowledge to find.
- ... up-to-date information on the important urban research issues
- A very useful page because is very easy to find the information
- I found in this website a very interesting experience that gave us very important ideas to develop our own project concerning quality of life measurement

One comment was that more case studies were needed to keep building positive use of the site.

- ...in many of the key thematic areas, there are relatively few case studies. I accept that it is up to project partners to populate the site however, greater numbers of case studies would be likely to create a critical mass of site users thereby generating a more significant and widespread knowledge repository.

If this is correct – and it seems a reasonable comment - it suggests that continued efforts are needed to get good information on to the website, from workshops and from partners, so that a virtuous circle is created in which more people are willing, not only to use information available on and via the site, but also to contribute to it.

LEVEL 4 – OTHER IDEAS FOR DISSEMINATION METHODS

An additional question invited respondents to suggest other means by which Urban Matrix might disseminate information. Eight respondents offered the following comments and suggestions

- a project conference
- continuing partnership
- trans-European partnerships, networks
- E-library development
- wider dissemination of the survey
- dissemination within organisations
- more frequent calls for uploading of good practice
- partnership with universities and other cities
- networking

LEVEL 5

KNOWLEDGE REQUIRED ON THEMES NOT COVERED BY KEYWORDS

The first question at Level 5 – about issues on which knowledge was required, but which had not been included in the key word list - was also included in the previous survey. In 2006, there were some 28 responses to this question and they were too specific and diverse to pick out common themes. Some key words added for the 2007 survey do cover areas respondents had referred to in 2006 (anti-discrimination, noise and mainstreaming, for example).

Perhaps because the key word list had been extended, or perhaps simply because there were fewer individual responses this time, there were fewer responses to this question (9) – and one of these simply identified additional priorities on the key word list. Again, the list was specific and diverse and included references to:

- Climate change. Low emissions strategies. Low carbon strategies
- Migratory movements and processes on the global as well as on the European level
- Mutual research, trans-national and trans-European information, cooperation and responsibilities.
- How to persuade individuals and politicians to take a long term view
- Institutional learning
- Cities and culture
- Life cycle assessments to inform procurements etc
- Exchanging best practices related to employment policies and fostering innovation in the SMEs.
- Self creation of community organizations
- Interdisciplinary working

There is clearly some interest in learning expressed here and some confirmation of themes which appear elsewhere in the survey – re cultural issues, climate change and migration, for example.

LEVEL 5 – INTEGRATING POLICY AREAS

The second question at Level 5 was also included in the 2006 survey. It asked whether respondents required knowledge/information on integrating policy areas. There were 35 varied responses. In 2007, respondents were asked to respond using key words, but didn't confine themselves to this. There were fewer responses – 16 rather than 35, but given the lower number of respondents overall, this again confirms that the issue of integration is a key one for respondents.

Again, responses are diverse but it is possible to pick out some themes and issues - for example. For example

- Demographic change. This is an issue referred to elsewhere in the survey and by respondents from several cities, in this part of the survey (Aarhus, Berlin and Sodertalje). The respondent from Sodertalje comments on the need for 'research, practices and policies on the demographically and rapidly changing social contexts of national states, regions, cities and communities - its impact and consequences upon environment, social behaviour, mentalities and diversities'.

- Traffic/transport issues and the need to understand these in terms of their wider impact / connections. For example, a respondent from Utrecht refers to 'mobility & air quality & noise & energy efficiency and sustainable development (economic) in the region' and another' from Istanbul, speaks of putting integrated transport systems and traffic management under the same header, Urban Mobility because ... the two fields are vastly interrelated and performance in one field is highly correlated with the other.

Respondents to this question also referred to

- The need for 'a new planning' where [the] private sector [is] called [on] to work [with] the public and there is active citizen participation
- Urban health and spatial planning / general sustainable development issues
- Finance issues - innovative ways of financing large regeneration projects, venture capital and public-private partnership
- The need for easily available info on EU legislation within the UM fields of interest.
- Integrating policy areas for new member states focussed on the period 2007-2013

LEVEL 5 – ISSUES FOR THEMATIC WORKSHOPS

In both the 2006 and 2007 surveys respondents have been asked to identify themes and issues for Urban Matrix workshops. (Overall survey findings are also taken into account in planning these workshops).)

In the boxes which follow, responses are grouped around a number of key areas – transport, social cohesion, participation and partnership, climate change and energy use, heritage/culture, economic development, finance, noise - and a final, miscellaneous, category.

	TRANSPORT
B'ham	How to actually achieve integrated transport in cities when the appraisal systems for walking, cycle, road, rail, bus and metro are so different!
E'burgh	Transport
Bristol	Is transport sustainable? Will compulsion be necessary to force people to behave sustainably?
The Hague	Integrated planning (urban development + integrated transport) Use of ICT in transport (ITS) Financing of transport, particular public transport
Palermo	Sustainable mobility
Utrecht	Mobility

	SOCIAL COHESION
Nottingham Palermo Novi Sad	Social cohesion
Vienna	How the growing metropolises in Europe could deal with the challenges due to the migration? And which policies and strategies will be used to explain it to the citizens and provide an "open-minded" society? Positive reactions toward migration, etc.
Berlin	Demographic and economic [<i>change and?</i>] effects for public services
Aarhus	Anti-discrimination, equal opportunities (<i>see also participation response from Aarhus which may be related to this point</i>)

	PARTICIPATION and PARTNERSHIP
Palermo	Citizen participation
Aarhus	Involvement from citizens and external partner f.i. educational institutions, unions, ppp and particular focus on citizens participation as an additional partner.
Vilnius	Public participation in the planning process

	CLIMATE CHANGE / ENERGY USE
Sheffield	Climate change. Low emissions strategies. Low carbon strategies
Surrey	Community based energy schemes and the retroactive refitting of housing to a higher environmental specification
Palermo Utrecht	Energy efficiency
Prague	Energy efficiency of cities.

	HERITAGE /CULTURE
Washington DC!	Role of heritage buildings in sustainable development
Amsterdam	Cities and Culture. The way they mutually influence each other. And inspiring projects that take place in this field. See also www.erasmuspc.com
Palermo	Urban cultural life
Novi Sad	Urban heritage and conservation

	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Nottingham	Sustainable economic growth
Donostia	Integrated plans of urban development including economic urban and social policies based on sustainability
Lodz	Lodz is the city which develops very fast and runs lots of investments at the same time we also have to cope with problem of decreasing number of inhabitants. It would be very helpful to discuss the solutions and tools for cities to deal with such problems
Vilnius	Urban development management
Stockholm	Competitiveness

	FINANCE
Amaroussion	Urban regeneration and project planning/financing.
Roma	Identification of target areas for local development, procedures of negotiation for PPP
Aarhus	PPP (<i>mentioned in longer response – see participation</i>)
Gijon	Finance: Venture Capital Public-private partnership: Innovation

	NOISE
Stockholm	Noise reduction
Utrecht	noise

	MISCELLANEOUS
Zuerich	Millenium Development Goals
Istanbul	Benchmarking and city performance measurement
Stockholm	Compact cities
Amsterdam	Sustainable building
Newcastle	Our priorities :- (<i>need to review whole response to understand this one</i>)
Utretcht	air quality
Helsingborg	safe and healthy urban planning
Prague	urban (spatial) planning from the brownfields and urban sprawl angle;
Novi Sad	Education and training, EU enlargement policies and funds
Sodertalje	1.The impact of free flowing capital and the migratory movements in the world. 2. Medias power and impact on change, development and mentalities. 3.The transformation of the human being into a commodity and its relation to sustainability ideology

LEVEL 6 – COMMENTS INVITED ON SOCIAL COHESION

At Level 6, requests were made for input from respondents – on the issues of social cohesion in particular and on other areas in which partners were willing to share information via the web site. There were a number of positive responses to both requests, with some respondents replying positively to both requests. An initial check suggests that little of the information is simply available via websites or documents to which links have been provided and that further contact will therefore need to be made with respondents. Contact details have however, been omitted from this summary

CITY	RESPONSE	SUMMARY
Nottingham	Social inclusion through transport: Accessibility is a key component to secure improvements to the accessibility, punctuality and reliability of local public transport (bus and light rail). Improving accessibility makes a valuable contribution to national objectives and targets in other sectors, including: To improve health and social care outcomes.	Re contribution of transport to wider outcomes.
Sodertalje	The City of Sodertalje, Sweden, has been engaged since 1996 in the National Urban Development Initiative with national and local development strategies for four certain housing areas with 25 % of the Sodertalje citizens - among them between 60-85% of other national and ethnic origin. Strategies include financial growth, labour market development, youngsters education, adult education, public health, crime prevention, culture, leisure and NGO support, citizens participation and democracy.	Re initiatives for specific areas in the city, with a high BME population
Amaroussion	The municipality of Amaroussion has invested in social care policies, trying to provide innovative social care services to third age and special social groups, like unmarried women, drug addicted people, immigrants etc.	Re social care
Berlin	The project Pro.Mode analysed the demographic, economic and social development in European metropolitan areas and the consequences for transport planning and policy http://www.promode.biz/	Re transport issues
Aarhus	The integration policy of Aarhus. Developed in 2006 and adopted in 2007. Strategy for developing deprived areas in Aarhus.	City integration policy
Utrecht	The department of Cultural Affairs is engaged in developing policies to address social cohesion. For example: in cooperation with the national government we execute a cultural program that focuses on themes like cultural diversity and social cohesion. Also we support some community art-programmes, like the Community Art Lab (www.community-art.nl).	Culture and arts related

Newcastle upon Tyne	Intercultural dialogue conference happening next month in partnership with other European cities	Intercultural dialogue - European conference
Donostia	We are working in guarantee employment of people at risk of being outside of the labour market like immigrants, women with children, disabled people... We are also working on promoting the creation of corporative social responsibility enterprises which employ people with difficulties in finding a job	Employment and enterprise
Gijon	Social cohesion is always taken into account in our employment policies. We have Labour Insertion Plans that combine training and work experience for those who have more difficulties to find a job. Other related programmes are the Second Chance School and Employment Workshops. Under this link you can find more information about our labour policies: http://www.gijon.es/Contenido.aspx?id=24451&zona=2&leng=es	Employment
Newcastle upon Tyne	Social Inclusion Strategy Community Cohesion Strategy Everyone's Tommorrow - Older People's Strategy	Related strategies
Lodz	The City of Lodz is a member of 2 Platforms that are created by Committee of Region - Subsidiarity and Lisbon Monitoring. The Mayor of the City of Lodz Office is also of a member of Commission for Territorial Cohesion Policy	
Vilnius	Urbanization process in the territories around cities; Compact Cities	
Helsingborg	see our document Plan for sustainable development in Helsingborg 2007 http://www.helsingborg.se/upload/Hallbar%20utveckling/Plan%20for%20sustainable%20Development%202007.pdf	City Plan

LEVEL 6 – TEMPLATE OFFERS

Many responded positively to the request for information which could be shared via templates for the web site. As with the offers of information on social cohesion, follow up work will be needed; contact details have been left out of this summary, which is included to give an idea of the range of input available. (There is some overlap with offers in relation to social cohesion).

TOPICS

- Energy management, energy efficiency, urban green spaces. (Frankfurt)
- Linking sustainable urban development to existing environmental management systems. (Leeds)
- Transport. (Edinburgh)
- The triple Helix Area of Norra Station-Stockholm (working, living and companies in the same area).; the environmental car trail (all cars for the work in Stockholm are environmental cars); bio-fuel. (Stockholm)
- Climate change and energy management. (Southampton)
- Policies and practices as concern the adult educational system; the "crossover" cooperation between local, regional and national authorities in the adult labour market development and immigration, between private sector and authorities, between NGO sector and authorities. Sodertalje]
- Urban regeneration through Mega-events projects: the case of the Olympics Urban renewal in Maroussi, Greece. (Amourission)
- Requiring developers to incorporate renewable energy in new developments. (London Borough of Merton)
- Sustainable planning, building and transforming. (Amsterdam)
- Urban transport policy. (Berlin)
- The relation between sustainability, flexibility, beauty / love for the city and temporary use. Strategies to apply these in innovative processes. (Amsterdam)
- Sustainable energy and transports integrated planning technologies for future infrastructure environmental reviews. (Stockholm)
- Integrated programmes private/public Integrated urban projects. (Florence)
- Agenda 21, Aalborg commitments, Green procurement. (Aalborg)
- The integration policy, citizen participation, strategy for developing deprived areas in Aarhus. (Aarhus)
- Sustainable action plan for environmental policy; sustainable transport. (Brno)
- Participation, public space, urban regeneration. (Rome)
- Sustainable economic development integrated in the urban planning. (San Sebastian)
- Development of Local Employment Agreements. (Gijon)
- Complex waste management; renaturalisation of rivers (Sokolowka example) Lodz
- Decentralized concentrated development. (Vilnius)
- Bicycle and pedestrian traffic. (Oulu)
- Town and mobility planning. (Terrassa)
- Energie Guidelines - Services of General Interest - Integrated policies in the fields of Urban Development & sustainability - Holistic approach of Gender Mainstreaming - Participation in planning. (Vienna)
- Social Integration and Environment Protection. (Novi Sad)

Conclusion

Once again there has been a good response to the 2007 survey, while the absolute number of responses has declined, because of a fall in multiple responses from certain cities, the overall number of cities responding has increased. The additional and up-to-date information it provides will continue to direct the work of Urban Matrix and has wider relevance. It gives a clear indication of those issues that are currently of concern to European cities, in the field of sustainable urban development. It highlights those issues on which knowledge is sought, but also those on which cities are able to offer information, evidence and good practice examples. Broadly speaking these concerns reflect those at the EU level and suggest a complementarity of interest/concern

Traffic and transport, the urban environment, urban change, and in particular issues of disadvantage, migration and social cohesion are all significant issues for respondents; as are funding and financial issues. Within these broad areas, respondents may seek knowledge because an area of work or an issue is new for them or for their city. However, given the nature of the issues identified, it appears more probable that they seek information because persistent problems are complex and present challenges in implementation and/or because of past limitations in the dissemination of available information that might assist them. This would suggest the important need for continued dissemination of knowledge on 'good practice' at a pan-European level. The key issue is how to most effectively match knowledge offer with knowledge demand. This would also imply a continued need for the European Commission to continue to support and aid the development of knowledge dissemination platforms that support sustainable urban development.

Finally this survey has now given helpful information about how dissemination works within organisations and cities. This can also inform the approach Urban Matrix takes to its workshops and its website.