Appendix 2. Summary of the empirical results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy**  **instrument** | **Questions posed to the case studies** | **MIP/MIA** | **FbL** | **CHVL** | **Open Lab Ebbinge** |
| Nodality | Q1: How is the municipality creating and participating in networks? | Through both ULLs municipalities of Malmö and Lund bring public and private actors together by creating a meeting arena to share challenges and discuss innovations. Both municipalities are lead partners in ULLs and therefore directly participate in these networks. | | During the initial design phase of CHVL the municipality participated as a consortium partner in the tender for ERDF funding for the lab activities. Overall, the municipality of Rotterdam is strongly embedded in diverse PPP networks on urban transformation. | In the case of OLE the municipality of Groningen teamed up with the initiating local retailers’ association and citizen initiatives in a later phase of the project to acquire EU funding in a collaborative effort. Today, the municipality of Groningen is actively participating in diverse networks on urban transformation. The municipality e.g. committed to participate with OLE in the Creative City challenge network. |
|  | Q2: How has the municipality expanded participation of different actors? | Both municipalities created multi-actor “steering groups” that manage ULLs and in this way expand the participation. At the platform level, the ambition to co-create knowledge with users is not among the primary ambitions of municipalities while the participation of citizens is rather expanded at the project level. | | Both ULLs were originally designed and set up with support from the municipality however, not (yet) with an actively enabling function in the initial phase, which was driven by other urban actors. With a more mature state of these ULL, the municipality then took a more pro-active role as a partner and network node. Through the municipal engagement in the lab activities the municipality also expanded cross-departmental collaboration within the municipality. | |
|  | Q3: What type of information is being disseminated and how? | Malmö municipality aligns its communication about MIP with local visions and priorities on social sustainability. | Lund municipality aligns its communication about FbL with local visions on smart city development and promotion of sustainable innovations. | Over time, the strategic relevance of CHVL increased for the municipality and was taken up in their information and dissemination strategy as a reference case for housing retrofitting and energy efficient buildings, which was explicitly referred to in local visions and strategic programs. | At a later stage of the lab activities, the municipality of Groningen supported the ULL communication and dissemination e.g. through its municipal websites about events in the lab and publications around the creative city challenge and the flexible city concept, as well as international nominations for OLE. |
| Authority | Q4: What kind of regulative tools are being used (if any)? | Swedish Building and Planning Act is a conservative legal document that restricts innovation. Through both ULLs Malmö and Lund municipalities open urban spaces for innovation and experimentation with sustainability solutions. | | CHVL illustrates how the municipality makes use of its authority to create (or end) flexible, temporary conditions that enable experimentation in the urban fabric with. | Likewise, in the OLE case, the municipality of Groningen as one of the land owners, used its authority to provided part of the land to experiment with the new form of urban re-development. |
|  | Q5: how does municipal authority manifest in enabling legal conditions and decisions? | Both ULLs favour a transition from traditional top down governance approaches in which Malmö and Lund municipalities exercise their power of authority towards more collaborative and inclusive governance processes. These provide flexibility for urban actors in the ways to achieve local sustainability goals. | | These two ULLs on the one hand benefitted from municipal authority, when the municipality authorized the temporary (in between) use of land parcels within the city for ULL operations. On the other hand this authority was also used in the case of CHVL to “kick-out” the ULL after operations for 5 years, when the municipality as land owner considered re-developing the area. | |
| Treasury | Q6: What kind of economic support is the municipality providing? | Malmö municipality received basic funding for MIP from VINNOVA and ERDF and coordinates these budgets. | Lund municipality received basic funding for FbL from VINNOVA. It also co-finances some projects. | Both Dutch ULL’s were not the main applicants for the initial funding from ERDF or other funding within a larger consortium of European partners. The municipalities did not provide direct financial support during the first year(s), yet, additional resources were provided in both cases. | |
|  | Q7: Which additional resources does the municipality provide? | Employees of Malmö and Lund municipalities provide in-kind contribution by dedicating their time to work on the ULLs. | | The municipalities did not provide direct financial support during the initial phases.The ULL in Rotterdam was partly enabled by the municipality providing the right to use vacant land parcels, When the initial funding period ended, the municipality’s urban development section in Rotterdam provided resources for additional two years to cover the costs of a team of 4 people working to keep the lab running | |
| Organizing | Q8: treatment of individuals/citizens in ULL | At the platform level, the ambition to engage individuals is not among the primary ambitions of both municipalities while the participation of citizens is rather expanded at the project level. | | The two Dutch ULLs both did involve citizens, however, OLE organized more explicit opportunities for individual citizens, while CHVL rather focused on organizing the co-creation among institutional actors e.g. from the building sector, academia, and others, rather than primarily focusing on individuals’ engagements. | |
|  | Q9: Treatment of groups in ULL | Through both ULLs Malmö and Lund municipalities open space for collaboration between various urban actors towards a common goal. Practically this is operationalized through, for example, steering groups. | | In both Dutch ULLs, the municipality was not in a leading, enabling role in the initial phase, however, later, supported and co-provided the space for co-creation and learning between various urban stakeholder groups. | |
|  | Q10: How are resources such as premises or staff being organized, if provided? | At the local level, MIP is part of the Environment Department of Malmö municipality, and its employees dedicate their time to the ULL work. At the county level, MIP is part of the Region Skåne innovation agenda and structure. | Lund municipality located meeting place for FbL in the innovation district outside of the municipal organization to create a favorable working climate for idea-driven employees and facilitate their interaction with business partners and university groups. | The municipality of Rotterdam initially kept a low profile reduced to co-financing within a European funding scheme. The municipality’s interest in organizing new partnerships to regenerate the Heijplaat area grew in the second year, temporary free land use for the Lab activities was granted in response to the external pressure to adapt local policies to the growing demand for knowledge about housing retrofitting | OLE illustrates how organizing emerges less formally and how the municipality can be an enabler over time, even when not directly involved in the initial phases. It was a local retailer’s association that initiated OLE together with engaged citizens, yet, the municipality supported acquisition of additional public funding and locally organized meetings became included in municipal (co-) organizing. |