

**INTERIM REPORT / FINAL REPORT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>FFG Project number</b>	870371	<b>eCall number</b>	4171989
<b>Short title</b>	InSight & EnLIGHT for a Public Decision Making ECOsystem  Digital citizen participation and transparent decisions	<b>Applicant</b>	Institute for Real Estate, Construction and Housing (IIBW)
<b>Consecutive number of the report</b>		<b>Reporting period</b>	01.10.2018-31.12.2019
<b>Author</b>	Dr. Nadejda Komendantova		

Please note: length approx. 10 - 20 pages, upload to eCall in PDF format

**1. Goals and results**

➤ Have the objectives defined in the funding agreement been achieved? Are these objectives still valid or realistic? (Please note: changes to objectives require the consent of the FFG)

Yes, the objectives defined in the funding agreement were achieved namely to write the background study and to organise the workshop with decision makers as well as the study tour to best practices among the Viennese participatory spatial projects.

The aim of our research was to understand patterns of participatory governance of the city planning of Vienna and of Stockholm and to provide new solutions for stakeholders’ engagement and public participation. We also focused our research on understanding of the existing possibilities for engagement of various stakeholders as well as citizen into decision-making processes.

Our research was guided by four major research questions:

1. Which methods of co-creation exist in the city planning of the municipality of Vienna?
2. How feedback from citizen on contested issues is integrated?

---

<sup>1</sup> Please delete as appropriate!

3. What are the differences in views about participation of various political parties?
4. What are perceptions on drivers and barriers for stakeholders' engagement into urban development?

Our data collection method included in-depth qualitative stakeholders' interviews with the representatives of the major political parties involved into the city planning processes.

During the period of summer-autumn 2019 we conducted interviews with the following stakeholders:

- Herbert Bork, „Stadtland“, Expert in participation in urban development
- Christoph Chorherr, Member of Parliament of Vienna (Green Party), former head of Municipal Council for Urban Development (until 2019)
- Thomas Madreiter, Planning Director of the Vienna Municipality,
- Wencke Hertzsch, Head of participatory division,
- Maria Vasilakou, until 2019 Deputy Mayor of Vienna (Green Party),
- Andreas Ottenschläger, Member of the National Assembly (ÖVP, People's Party),
- Christian Oxonitsch, Member of Parliament of Vienna (SPÖ, Social-democratic Party),
- Alexander Pawkowicz, Member of Parliament of Vienna (FPÖ, Freedom Party),
- Lorenz Potocnik, urban planner, Member of City Council of Linz (NEOS, Liberal Party),
- Erich Raith, Prof. at Technical University of Vienna, dept. of urban development

➤ [Compare the objectives with the results achieved.](#)

The aim of the background study is to understand:

- If such co-creation process already exists in the city planning of the municipality of Vienna and to describe the methods of co-creation, namely, how feedback from citizen on contested city planning issues is collected and how the decisions on further urban development are developed
- What are the different views on participation and co-creation from various political parties, what is the dominant discourse for each of the parties?
- What are the perceptions of drivers and barriers for implementation of participation and co-creation method in the city planning?
- What are the existing participation and co-creation best practices?

The key documents on participation in the Vienna's urban development were analysed. These included Urban Development Plan STEP 2025, Smart City Vienna – Framework Strategy 2050, Masterplan Participative Urban Development, Handbook on Participation.

Outstanding development projects were analysed as best practices. This included the restructuring of Mariahilfer Strasse, Development Area “Nordbahnhof”, Seestadt Aspern, Neu Leopoldau, Donauefeld / An der Schanze, Beresgasse, Collaborative Housing, Local coordination of Urban Development, Projects with mixed or negative outcome.

Interviews with major representatives on housing policy or spatial development of the various political parties were conducted. This allowed to develop results on the perceptions of benefits and limits of participation in spatial development, on the drivers of social opposition towards new infrastructure projects, on the needs of future residents and how to address and include these needs. The received information also allowed developing recommendations on how to avoid escalation and failure urban development, on key tools in participatory urban development. We were also able to collect information and to analyse political positions towards participation from various major parties including Social Democratic Party, Green Party, Freedom Party, People's Party and Liberal Party.

➤ Describe the “highlights” and problems that occurred in achieving the objectives.

A highlight for us was the understanding of the background on participatory processes in urban development in Vienna and similarities in this background understanding among all political parties. Namely, participatory processes are still shaped by the widespread paternalistic perception that administration has to handle all issues concerning spatial development. This perception was shaped since the times of Joseph II with his famous sentence “all for people but nothing through people”. Austria also has a long-lasting non-participatory history. Currently the focus is to change this perception and to create participatory tools. The role of administration is in implementation of participatory processes. The main driver of such development is the need to advance ethnical diversity of society. Representatives of all political parties agree that knowledge on the ground can improve decision making outcomes in such areas as connectivity, infrastructure, informal footpaths, places to meet, children playgrounds. Participatory processes help to create identification of residents in new neighborhoods. Positive impacts of creation of civil society, social inclusion, evolving cultural life, better health and prevention of devastation.

Also, all representatives named participation at various levels namely:

1. At the urban level: about general targets or values of urban development but direction has to be provided by authority

2. At the neighborhood level: about organization of open space and traffic
3. At the level of individual buildings: about architecture or apartments

However, there are also several limits to participation in spatial development. For instance, it is difficult to say which planning decision should be qualified for participatory practices. A clear political will and innovating planning should be a starting point, which is frequently missing. Participatory processes are also frequently limited in creation of new content, but they are very valuable in providing preferences between existing alternatives. Currently participatory processes are marked by unequal representation of social groups. Namely, those who have time or who are more critical are more often participating.

A lot was mentioned about various formats of participation. Currently the most frequent format is workshops and info-boxes. There are also such formats of participation as:

- Urban development (existing neighborhoods): establishment and empowerment of citizen parliament with elected representatives to communicate results
- Early zoning – before publication of planning documents for comments
- Individual buildings - participatory processes can easily be implemented and financed, if connected to new construction and first-time use (financed as part of construction costs)
- Social attendance for new residents - orientation of the new residents, creation of neighborhood, prevention of social conflicts, but also participatory configuration of common space
- Digital tools are gaining importance: PocketHouse app for common activities

While speaking about discourses about participation among various political parties our research shows that elements of delegated power were identified in the discourse of the representatives of Social Democratic Party, while Neos and Green party spoke about partnerships. Two other parties such as People's Party and Freedom Party recognize much lower level of participation, mostly, at the level of consultation and informing, which are both part of tokenism but not of citizen power (figure 1).

## Discourses about participation among various political parties



Figure 1: discourses about participation among major Austrian parties

Source : adapted from Arnstein, 1969, Luttringhaus, 2003, Rau et al., 2012

While speaking about discourses on participation among major Austrian parties, our research shows that these discourses are marked by the following key words.

Social Democratic Party:

- Participation in urban projects leads to better decision-making outcomes and better projects
- Existing models of participation work for some cases and don't work for other cases (no guarantee for success)
- Right moment for engagement is crucial (participatory paradox)
- Good media coverage is essential and can facilitate participatory processes as well as to reach all social groups

Green Party:

- Participatory process should start as early as possible
- This is a challenge how to integrate interests of conflicting neighbors
- Representative democracy facilitates participation, but elected politicians take decision however all voices should be heard

Freedom Party:

- Participation may create additional value on the level of neighborhood planning, but in less extent on a small-scale level.

- People should not get the impression to be entitled to decide, but to be part of a process.
- Decisions have to be taken by political representatives.
- Participation is formally an open process, but in practice only closed groups are involved.

NEOS:

- Participation exists already for 15 years but there is no single efficient model
- Participation should be real when feedback is implemented. When it is done for alibi only, it brings only frustration and loss of trust
- Participation is necessary to win trust and to receive knowledge on the ground
- But participation is often expensive
- Participation helps in situation when there are conflicts, to bring transparency and to understand positions of each other better

**2. Work packages and milestones**

**2.1 Synoptic tables**

➤ Explanatory notes:

The tables are structured according to the funding application.

Scheduled date: date according to the funding application or according to the contractual project plan.

Current date: date according to the plan valid at the time of reporting.

**Table 1: Work packages**

WP No.	Work package Title	Stage of completion	Scheduled date		Current date		Results achieved / Deviations
			Start	End	Start	End	
1	Co-creation of survey to analysis feedback loop	Ongoing	M1	M20	M1	M20	T1.1 Stakeholder analysis and stratified selection of co-creation participants: This task will identify representatives of end-users participants in the succeeding co-creation workshops. The stakeholder analysis will be updated during the project to take into account new developments and emerging stakeholder groups. T1.2 User-centred co-design of market survey layer: This task is devoted to plan, implement and document the first co-creation workshop focussing on the market survey layer tool. T1.3 User-centred co-design of decision analysis layer: This task is

							devoted to plan, implement and document the first co-creation workshop focusing on the analysis layer tool.
2	Pilot case studies	Ongoing	M2	M20	M2	M20	Task 2.1 Pilots identification and definition: Formation of two smaller project groups with relevant 3-4 members at the city of Stockholm for which the proposed approach is to be piloted. The task is concerned with at least one initial workshop per pilot. The outcome of the workshop will be a description of the two issues to be investigated and analysed in the pilots, the requirements of citizen and stakeholder involvement in each pilot, and a plan for its pilot implementation. Task is led by IIBW, who are responsible for defining the pilots. Preference and Allies support in identification of pilots. Each pilot case serves as a proof-of-concept for the approach.

**Table 2: Milestones**

Milesto	Milestone	Scheduled	Current	Milestone	Results achieved /
1	Background report for the Austrian pilot	M12	M12	Completed	Background report including results of interviews with major representatives of housing policy from various parties is finalised
2	Workshop with Austrian stakeholders from policy-making process on housing policy	M12	M12	Completed	Workshop is organised at the premises of the city of Vienna. Several participants from the Austrian housing policy making process took part. Austrian and Swedish best practices were presented
3	Study tour to two participatory spatial projects	M12	M12	Completed	Study tour for the delegation of the Swedish decision makers including representatives of the municipality of Stockholm was organised. Further work was inspired by presented best practices from the Viennese participatory spatial development projects.

**2.2 Description of the work carried out during the reporting period**

➤ Describe the work carried out during the reporting period broken down into the work packages.

WP1: We have a delay in the Pilot Case studies in Stockholm due to difficulties in finding suitable real test cases. The city is afraid to stir up expectations if the scope is too wide and as this is just a

test case and may not affect the outcome at this stage. Therefore, WP1 is not completed yet. A field study is ongoing at present.

WP2: Is on time. Deliverable 2.1 has been completed by IIBW. It includes the background report on spatial projects which involved participation and were realized in various communities of Austria. It also includes review of existing legal and regulatory framework as well as evaluation of strengths and weaknesses. The deliverable includes materials collected through qualitative in- depth interviews with key stakeholders in the Austrian policy process.

WP3: Is on time. Prototype methodology for integration of Association Wheel and Preference's methods has been designed. Deliverable 3.1 has been completed by Preference.

WP4: Is on time (it starts later than other work packages).

WP5: Is on time.

➤ Have the work steps and packages been completed according to plan? Have there been relevant deviations?

City of Stockholm has been able to get new insights and a good awareness into means for stakeholder participation and there is an exchange of knowledge and experience between Stockholm and Vienna. Based on learnings from interaction with Stockholm and Vienna, Preference AB has been able to create mock-ups of its next generation software having a different approach to user adoption compared to its existing software. During the design of the first survey, the project members have gained experience and know-how into the essential problematics formulating survey questions for the urban planning domain, and we expect that these learnings will enable for quicker launches of upcoming surveys leading to more swift launches.

➤ The description must also include any changes to the methodology applied (please note: changes to the methodology and relevant changes to the work plan require the consent of the FFG).

What has been in focus:

To formalize the connection between Association Wheel and the methods of Preference. For the initial pilots, Preference will use its software DecideIT 3.0 and a quantitative interpretation of survey respondents reported in Deliverable 3.1. Further, work has been carried out towards the design of a new and more user friendly user interface for utilizing the Preference DMC. Substantial



effort has also been put on establishing working relations between the City of Stockholm and Vienna with a focus on participatory approaches in urban development.

What has been done:

- Working with the City of Stockholm to find pilot cases, this has proven to be more difficult than anticipated and the pilots are therefore delayed. However, it has been decided that the first Stockholm pilot will focus on the development of Nytorps gårde.
- Analysis of how to use data from the Association Wheel to build a transparent decision model in DecideIT. See Deliverable D3.1
- Contacts have been established between the City of Stockholm and Vienna. A joint workshop will be held in Vienna on the 16<sup>th</sup> of December. The workshop will bring together over 50 experts and decision-makers dealing with questions of participating in decision-making processes from various Austrian institutions.
- The study tour to spatial development projects with innovative participation techniques was organised and will be conducted on the side of the workshop.
- We added resources on communication, a new website, new PPT templates and initiated a communication strategy to be able to communicate progress to a broader audience.
- The Preference methodology and the researchers behind it was selected for the IVA 100-list.

### 2.3 Changes in the further course of the project

➤ Are there any changes? What effects do they have? How does the plan need to be adjusted?

We don't anticipate changes in the further course of the project however the experience gained during the study tour to two participatory spatial development projects in Vienna is currently under consideration. Further work is inspired by the following meetings and projects visits:

- Meeting with Kurt Puchinger, representative of the Mayor Dr. Ludwig, at Rathaus
- Visit to the Seestadt Aspern project, guided by Jakob Kastner, project manager in 3420 Aspern Development AG
- Excursion to Urban Renewal Neighborhood „Smarter Together“ Simmering, guided by Ms. Julia Girardi-Hoog (former project leader “Smarter Together”, today Wiener Wohnen) und Ms. Tamara Brajovic (neighborhood management)

## 3. Project team and cooperation

➤ Have there been major changes to the project team (internal key personnel and third party service providers)?

There were no major changes to the project team, including internal key personnel and third party service providers.

➤ For consortium projects: describe the cooperation within the consortium.

Cooperation works very well within the consortium. Our working language is English. Every week on Wednesday we have teleconferences to keep track on the work of each other and to raise questions and to exchange information. Everybody is very motivated.

➤ Please describe changes in the work allocation. Do they have an effect on the cost/financing structure and objectives?

Until now there were no changes in the work allocation.

#### 4. Final Report only: Dissemination and exploitation

➤ Describe the exploitation and/or dissemination activities carried out so far. Is it possible to exploit the project results?

The dissemination took place during the workshop with stakeholders from the spatial urban planning of various organisations of the municipality of Vienna. The workshop was organised by IIBW. The following members from partner organisations within the project participated during the workshop:

- Preference AB, Kjell Borking
- Preference AB, Love Ekenberg
- Invest Stockholm Business Region AB, Birgitta Holmström
- The City of Stockholm Building Office, Torkel Kjellman
- University of Stockholm, EgovLab, Andreas Paulsson
- Allies, Anders Lundkvist
- University of Stockholm, EgovLab, Maria Petritsopoulou
- Allies, Daniel Steinholtz

The Workshop took place at the Vienna Planungswerkstatt, 1010 Vienna, Friedrich-Schmidt-Platz 9 on Monday, 16 December 2019. The welcome address was provided by Thomas Madreiter, Planning Director of the City of Vienna, and Birgitta Holmström, Invest Stockholm Business

Region AB.

The workshop included following sessions:

***Session 1: Participation in Urban Development in Vienna***

Wencke Hertzsch (City Planning of Vienna): Introduction

Nadya Komendantova (IIBW): Main results from the project report “Participatory Approaches in Urban Development in Vienna and Austria”

Birgitta Holmström (City Planning Administration of Stockholm): Participatory Approaches in Urban Development in Stockholm)

Discussion moderated by Wolfgang Amann (IIBW)

***Session 2: New tools for Participation in Urban Development***

Kjell Borking (Preference AB): The EU-project „InSight & EnLIGHT for a Public Decision Making ECOsystem“ (JPI Urban Europe)

Daniel Steinholtz (Allies): New digital tool for cost efficient stakeholder inclusion in decision making

Love Ekenberg (Preference AB): Multi-Stakeholder-Multi-Criteria analysis (MSMC) in urban development

Discussion moderated by Wolfgang Amann (IIBW)

The following stakeholders registered for the workshop:

- Stadtland, Herbert Bork
- Magistratsdirektion-Baudirektion, Wencke Hertzsch
- Magistratsdirektion-Baudirektion, Thomas Madreiter
- NEOS, Lorenz Potocnik
- Grüne, Maria Vassilakou
- Wohnbund Consult, Raimund Gutmann
- Klaus Wolfinger Entwicklung-Machbarkeit-Realität/en, Klaus Wolfinger
- Stadtland, Sibylla Zech
- IBA, Rainer Zeitlinger
- ÖROK - Österreichische Raumordnungskonferenz, Paul Himmelbauer
- Die Grünen, Jennifer Kickert

- MA 21A, Bernhard Steger
- Gebietsbetreuung Stadterneuerung GB\*, Jan Draxler
- nonconform zt gmbh, Caren Ohrhallinger
- Magistrat der Stadt Wien, Susanne Bauer
- MA 20 Energieplanung, Susanna Erker
- Wohnbund Consult, Ernst Gruber
- Immobilienverwaltung Rustler, Michael Hudelist
- Wiener Wohnen, Isabella Jandl
- Stora Enso, Johanna Kairi
- TU Wien , Arthur Kanonier
- IIBW GmbH, Sabina Reiß

➤ List all publications, PhD theses, diploma theses and patent applications that have resulted from the project.

The paper for submission to a peer-reviewed journal on discourses about participation in spatial development among various political parties in Austria is currently in preparation.

➤ What further R&D activities are planned?

The experience received during the workshop in Vienna as well as during the meetings with stakeholders and study tour is currently under discussion by members of the project team for further implementation in Stockholm. Implementation of the tools developed during the project is also currently under consideration.

➤ How will the prototypes created during the project be used further?

The work is ongoing on further development of the participatory governance tools such as Citizen Wheel and DecideIT as well as further modification of the tools and linking of their interfaces.

## 5. Reportable incident

Have there been special events or incidents concerning the project that must be reported to the FFG, e.g.

➤ changes in legal or economic influences on the funding recipient

- bankruptcy proceedings
- incidents that delay or prevent the performance of the funded work
- additional funding for this project

No incidents occurred during the reporting period.