



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/173388/>

Version: Published Version

Book Section:

Perry, B. and Russell, B. (2020) Participatory cities from the 'outside in' : the value of comparative learning. In: Simon, D., Palmer, H. and Riise, J., (eds.) Comparative Urban Research from Theory to Practice. Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 133-154. ISBN: 978144735312.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



POLICY PRESS

SHORTS

POLICY & PRACTICE

COMPARATIVE URBAN RESEARCH FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

Co-Production For Sustainability

EDITED BY
DAVID SIMON HENRIETTA PALMER
AND JAN RIISE

DAVID SIMON
HENRIETTA PALMER
JAN RIISE

COMPARATIVE URBAN RESEARCH FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

Co-Production For Sustainability

POLICY PRESS

SHORTS

POLICY & PRACTICE

First published in Great Britain in 2020 by

Policy Press
University of Bristol
1-9 Old Park Hill
Bristol
BS2 8BB
UK
t: +44 (0)117 954 5940
pp-info@bristol.ac.uk
www.policypress.co.uk

North America office:
Policy Press
c/o The University of Chicago Press
1427 East 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637, USA
t: +1 773 702 7700
f: +1 773-702-9756
sales@press.uchicago.edu
www.press.uchicago.edu

© Policy Press 2020

The digital PDF version of this title is available Open Access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits adaptation, alteration, reproduction and distribution for non-commercial use, without further permission provided the original work is attributed. The derivative works do not need to be licensed on the same terms.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN 978-1-4473-5312-6 (paperback)
ISBN 978-1-4473-5407-9 (ePub)
ISBN 978-1-4473-5409-3 (ePdf)

The right of David Simon, Henrietta Palmer and Jan Riise to be identified as editors of this work has been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved: no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of Policy Press.

The statements and opinions contained within this publication are solely those of the editors and contributors and not of the University of Bristol or Policy Press. The University of Bristol and Policy Press disclaim responsibility for any injury to persons or property resulting from any material published in this publication.

Policy Press works to counter discrimination on grounds of gender, race, disability, age and sexuality.

Cover design by Dave Worth
Front cover image: Jan Riise
Printed and bound in Great Britain by CMP, Poole
Policy Press uses environmentally responsible print partners



Contents

List of figures and tables		v
List of acronyms and abbreviations		vi
Notes on the editors		vii
Notes on contributors		ix
one	Introduction: from unilocal to comparative transdisciplinary urban co-production of knowledge <i>David Simon, Jan Riise and Henrietta Palmer</i>	1
two	From unilocal to comparative research: the Mistra Urban Futures journey <i>Henrietta Palmer and David Simon</i>	19
three	Local projects retrofitted <i>Michael Oloko and Barry Ness</i>	41
four	Replicating projects for comparative research: Mistra Urban Futures' experiences with comparative work on knowledge exchange, food and transport <i>Warren Smit, Elma Durakovic, Rike Sitas, Magnus Johansson, Gareth Haysom, Mirek Dymitrow, Karin Ingelhart and Shelley Kotze</i>	63
five	Clustering and assemblage building <i>Henrietta Palmer, Erica Righard and Nils Björling, with Eva Maria Jernsand, Helena Kraff and Lillian Omondi</i>	89
six	Internationally initiated projects with local co-production: Urban Sustainable Development Goal project <i>Sandra C. Valencia, David Simon, Sylvia Croese, Kristina Diprose, Joakim Nordqvist, Michael Oloko, Tarun Sharma and Ileana Versace</i>	113

COMPARATIVE URBAN RESEARCH FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

seven	Participatory cities from the 'outside in': the value of comparative learning <i>Beth Perry and Bert Russell</i>	133
eight	Assessment: learning between theory and practice <i>David Simon, Henrietta Palmer and Jan Riise</i>	155
Index		173

List of figures and tables

Figures

1.1	Research themes and core processes related to co-production of knowledge	11
4.1	Timeline of the Transport and Sustainable Urban Development comparative project	79

Tables

2.1	Mistra Urban Futures' comparative projects	33
4.1	Research foci in the respective cities in the Transport and Sustainable Urban Development comparative project	81

List of acronyms and abbreviations

CBO	community-based organisation
CTLIP	Cape Town Local Interaction Platform
GOLIP	Gothenburg Local Interaction Platform
KLIP	Kisumu Local Interaction Platform
LIP	Local Interaction Platform
MUF	Mistra Urban Futures
NUA	New Urban Agenda
QME	quality monitoring and evaluation
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SKLIP	Skåne Local Interaction Platform
SMLIP	Sheffield–Manchester Local Interaction Platform
SWM	solid waste management
TOD	transport-oriented development

Notes on the editors

David Simon is Professor of Development Geography at Royal Holloway, University of London and was on secondment from 2014 to 2019 as Director of Mistra Urban Futures, Gothenburg. He specialises in development–environment issues, with particular reference to cities, climate change and sustainability, and the relationships between theory, policy and practice, on all of which he has published extensively. He is author of *Holocaust Escapees and Development: Hidden histories* (Zed Books, 2019) editor of *Rethinking Sustainable Cities* (Policy Press, 2016) and *Key Thinkers on Development* (Routledge, 2019), and co-editor of *Urban Planet* (Cambridge University Press, 2018). His extensive research experience spans sub-Saharan Africa, tropical Asia, the UK, the USA and Sweden.

Henrietta Palmer is an architect and researcher. She was Artistic Professor of Urban Design at Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, and was Deputy Scientific Director at Mistra Urban Futures from 2015 to 2019, with a particular engagement in methodologies for transdisciplinary research, also developing a PhD course for transdisciplinary research. From 2005 to 2015, she was Professor of Architecture at the Royal Institute of Art, Stockholm, where she designed and conducted the transdisciplinary post-master's programme in resources, focusing on urban challenges with contextual studies across a number of cities globally. Her key research

focus concerns just urban transformation processes stemming from social-spatial practices.

Jan Riise was Engagement Manager at Mistra Urban Futures from 2016 to 2019. Jan has been working in the interface between science and society for almost three decades and is particularly interested in the participation of other actors, such as citizens and people from the public and private sectors. He was the Director of the European Science Engagement Association from 2013 to 2015 and a member of the Scientific Committee of the global network Public Communication of Science and Technology, and engaged in several other international organisations in the field.

Notes on contributors

Nils Björling is an architect and Senior Lecturer in Urban Design and Planning in Architecture and Civil Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg. Nils' teaching and research seek to develop theory and methods to increase the interplay between local, municipal and regional planning in order to support the design practice to manage challenges caused by uneven geographical development and to include a broader field of resources and actors in the planning process.

Sylvia Croese is an urban sociologist and researcher at the African Centre for Cities at the University of Cape Town, South Africa. From 2017 to 2019 she worked as an embedded researcher in the City of Cape Town as part of the Mistra Urban Futures research project entitled Implementing the New Urban Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals: Comparative Urban Perspectives.

Elma Durakovic has a background in economics, specifically environmental economics, from the University of Gothenburg. From 2019 she has been Acting Director at the Gothenburg Platform within Mistra Urban Futures. Since 2017, she has also been project lead for the comparative project Transport and Sustainable Urban Development, a collaboration between Gothenburg, Kisumu and Cape Town. Her interest is in

transdisciplinary research and knowledge co-production and how to organise these types of collaborations.

Kristina Diprose is a social researcher whose recent projects have focused on public perceptions of climate change, the intersection of arts and social research, and local implementation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Her work is published in various human geography journals and she is the lead author of *Climate Change, Consumption and Intergenerational Justice: Lived Experiences in China, Uganda and the UK* (Bristol University Press, 2019).

Mirek Dymitrow holds a PhD in human geography from the University of Gothenburg, where he was a research fellow until December 2019. He is now a postdoctoral fellow at Lund University. He also works as research co-ordinator at Chalmers University of Technology. His research interests include social psychology and sociology of science with a focus on conceptual change and inertia, as well as problems and causes of social deprivation in the face of overarching sustainability goals.

Gareth Haysom is a researcher at the African Centre for Cities at the University of Cape Town, working in the African Centre for Cities' urban food systems research cluster. His work focuses on urbanisation in the global South with a specific interest in African cities. Gareth's contribution to this volume emerged from a comparative urban food system engagement between Mistra Urban Futures researchers in four very different cities, drawing on different contextual experiences and food system challenges and needs.

Karin Ingelhart is a project manager within business development, and a former educator. Karin's current engagements include running the European Union project Urban Rural Gothenburg as well as co-ordinating research in collaboration between the City of Gothenburg and Chalmers University of

Technology. Karin's academic background in psychology and behavioural sciences recurs in her ongoing work with sustainability transitions.

Eva Maria Jernsand holds a PhD in Business Administration from the School of Business, Economics and Law, which is part of the University of Gothenburg, and is a researcher in marketing at the School of Business, Economics and Law at the University of Gothenburg, and affiliated with the Centre for Tourism at the same university. Her research interests include place branding, participation, transdisciplinary research, innovation, design and sustainable tourism development. Eva Maria's work is published in journals such as *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *Action Research* and *Tourism Recreation Research*.

Magnus Johansson has a PhD in pedagogy from Lund University. He divides his time between the Department of Urban Studies, Malmö University, where he works as Assistant Professor in Environmental Studies, and the Research Institutes of Sweden, where he works as a senior researcher, affiliated to the unit of sustainable communities.

Shelley Kotze holds a PhD in human geography from the University of Gothenburg. She previously held the post of project assistant at Urban Rural Gothenburg's Research Forum. Her research interests include place keeping, immigrant integration and public green space interactions, and the polarisation of gender.

Helena Kraff has a PhD in design, and is a researcher in design at the Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts at the University of Gothenburg. Her main research interests include participatory design and transdisciplinary research methodology. Her thesis identifies and critically explores a number of challenges related to participatory research practices

in Kisumu. She has published in international journals and edited books, and written reports in the areas of participatory design, tourism, place branding and transdisciplinary research.

Barry Ness was, until December 2019, the Director of the Skåne Local Interaction Platform (SKLIP) for Mistra Urban Futures. He is also a project researcher on the Mistra Urban Futures solid waste management comparative project. Barry is Associate Professor in Sustainability Science at the Centre for Sustainability Science at Lund University, where his current research interests focus on promoting and understanding sustainability in the craft beer sector through bottom-up, participatory approaches. Past research themes have included sustainability assessment, the diffusion of simple, more sustainable innovations in Africa, and large land acquisitions in Africa.

Joakim Nordqvist holds a PhD in environmental and energy systems studies and is affiliated to the Institute for Sustainable Urban Development at Malmö University. He also holds a position as climate strategist at the Environment Department of the City of Malmö, focusing on partnerships for sustainability action and on transdisciplinary learning. His research interests home in on challenges of sustainability in built environments.

Michael Oloko is a senior lecturer, researcher and Dean of the School of Engineering and Technology at Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology. He is also the Deputy Director for research at Kisumu Local Interaction Platform. He holds a PhD in agricultural engineering from Egerton University. His current research interests include environmental engineering, integrated water resources management, renewable energy technology, urban agriculture and waste management.

Lillian Omondi is a sociologist with a PhD in sociology and lectures at Maseno University's Department of Sociology and

Anthropology, Kenya. Her research interests include social capital and its influence on community action, migration and migrant networks, engendering research and community action, and community-led climate change adaptation. Her recent publications include, with Merritt Polk and Mary Aswan Ochieng, 'Social Capital and Climate Change Perception in the Mara River Basin, Kenya' (*Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 5(12), 2015).

Beth Perry is Professorial Fellow at the Urban Institute at the University of Sheffield. Her research focuses on processes and practices of urban transformation, co-productive urban governance, citizen participation and the just city. Beth oversees a collaborative programme of work between academics, individuals and organisations supporting progressive social, spatial and environmental change in the North of England. Recent books include *Reflexivity: The Essential Guide* (Sage Publications, 2017), *Cities and the Knowledge Economy* (Routledge, 2018) and *Cultural Intermediaries Connecting Communities: Revisiting Approaches to Cultural Engagement* (Policy Press, 2019).

Erica Righard is Associate Professor at the Department of Social Work and the Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare, Malmö University. From 2018 to 2019, she co-ordinated the International Migration and Urban Development Panel at SKLIP. She also co-co-ordinated the Mistra Urban Futures comparative project on Migration and Urban Development. Her research is multidisciplinary and mainly focused on the intersection of international migration and social protection. She is a member of the International Migration, Integration and Social Cohesion network's Standing Committee on Transnationalism, and chaired Nordic Migration Research from 2015 to 2018.

Bert Russell is an action researcher with a focus on municipalist politics, economic democracy and the commons,

with publications in journals such as *Antipode*, *City* and *Area*. He is also co-founder of the UK's Municipal Action, Research and Advocacy Network and a committed public intellectual, with articles published on websites such as openDemocracy, Red Pepper, Novara Media, CityMetric and ROAR Magazine, and in *New Internationalist*.

Tarun Sharma is co-founder of Nagrika (Sanskrit for 'citizen'), a social enterprise addressing the issues of small cities and their citizens. Nagrika creates knowledge for and from small cities and uses this knowledge to enable better governance and enable citizen-led transformation in these cities. Tarun is based in Dehradun, India. He is the lead researcher for Shimla on the New Urban Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals Comparative Urban Perspectives project.

Rike Sitas is fascinated by the intersection of art, culture and heritage in urban life, and straddles the academic world of urban studies and creative practice. Of particular interest is how artful practices produce new knowledge of and action in cities. Rike is a researcher at the African Centre for Cities at the University of Cape Town. In addition to being the Local Interaction Platform co-ordinator for Mistra Urban Futures, her projects include Cultural Heritage and Just Cities; Whose Heritage Matters; Power of Place; Knowledge Transfer Programme and Knowledge Exchange; Realising Just Cities; and UrbanAfrica.Net.

Warren Smit is the Manager of Research at the African Centre for Cities, University of Cape Town, and was the Director of the Mistra Urban Futures Cape Town Local Interaction Platform from 2016 to 2019. He has a PhD in urban planning and has been a researcher on urban issues for over 25 years. His main areas of research include urban governance, urban health and housing policy, with a particular focus on African cities.

Sandra C. Valencia is an interdisciplinary researcher with a PhD in sustainability science from Lund University, a BSc in physics and an MSc in development management. Until December 2019, she led a comparative research project on city-level implementation of Agenda 2030 in seven cities on four continents at Mistra Urban Futures, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg. She has worked as a research scientist at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center for the Micro-pulse Lidar Network project on atmospheric data. She also worked for several years developing and managing climate change adaptation projects in Latin America and the Caribbean at the Inter-American Development Bank.

Ileana Versace is an architect at the School of Architecture, Design and Urbanism, University of Buenos Aires (FADU, UBA), where she specialises in history and critics of architecture and urbanism. She is also a PhD student and Adjunct Professor, History of Architecture at FADU, UBA. Her other roles include main researcher, Institute of American Art and Aesthetical Research 'Mario J. Buschiazzi' and General Co-ordinator, Department of International Programs, both at FADU, UBA; and General Co-ordinator in Buenos Aires, Observatory on Latin America, The New School, New York.

SEVEN

Participatory cities from the ‘outside in’: the value of comparative learning

Beth Perry and Bert Russell

Introduction

Recent academic work on comparison has decentred strict comparative studies, where the aim is to produce generalisable knowledge on the basis of seeking standardised units of analysis and careful control of variables. While such work continues to be important and has its place in generating better evidence about ‘what works’ beyond single case studies, attention has turned to other forms of comparison, as explored in [Chapter Two](#). Increasingly, the emphasis has been on the purpose of comparison beyond generalisation, with a specific focus on the value of learning. One conceptualisation describes the ‘import mirror’ view (May and Perry, 2010: 249) which suggests that ‘the project of comparative analysis is worthwhile because in producing findings on the practices of other countries, we are better able to see the basis of our own practices’. Through this lens, we can reflect on our social systems and cultural ways of behaving, which take different social contexts and cultural practices into account. These ideas also underpin

Colin McFarlane's work, which emphasises the importance of comparison and learning for political strategies and progressive urbanism (McFarlane, 2011).

Reframing what we mean by comparison, and how it is undertaken, is particularly important given the increasing focus on engaging stakeholders meaningfully in the design, conduct and analysis of research in the context of the 'co-productive turn'. Recent work emphasises how co-produced methodologies need to be sufficiently open in their design (Perry et al, 2019) to be 'palpably affected' (Fung and Wright, 2001) by participants. As elaborated in relation to diverse research designs in earlier chapters, even where there may be an initial standardisation of approach, co-production introduces potential differentiation in design and method according to the needs of local stakeholders.

Questions must also be raised about who is supported to undertake comparison in co-production projects. International travel has traditionally been accepted as part of the legitimate work of academia, while local government officials and civil society members do not have access to the same resources or permissions to travel and have been under greater pressure to defend such decisions. Who owns and benefits from comparison and how this enables action on the ground are key challenges for those involved in co-produced research.

This chapter documents an alternative approach to co-producing comparison to draw out the value of collaborative comparative learning. The chapter contributes an otherwise overlooked perspective to the themes in the book by setting out how to support urban policy makers in comparative learning that can help them better understand and reflect on their own policy and practice. It draws on a knowledge exchange activity organised as part of the Mistra Urban Futures work stream on Participatory Cities to provide a lens on the wider issues. The activity involved two local government officials, two academics and two citizens of Greater Manchester (GM), UK, forming a delegation to the November 2018 International

Observatory on Participatory Democracy (IOPD) conference held in Barcelona. The delegation attended sessions, organised a joint workshop and identified key learning points from the conference to share in Greater Manchester. Data are drawn from a transcript of a reflective discussion among the six delegation members to highlight stakeholder views on the types and value of comparative learning. Four themes are identified: learning about participatory democracy; reflecting on policy and practice; grounding progress in international perspective; and opening the horizons of possibility.

The chapter concludes that the purpose of comparison in co-production is not only about the production of generalisable knowledge. In keeping with the ethos of 'doing with' and 'not to', involving urban officials and stakeholders in the generation of comparative insights, can enable learning from the outside in. By 'outside in', we mean using insights from other urban settings to better understand conditions, constraints, limits and possibilities in one's own context. Enabling local stakeholders to participate directly in comparative learning activities accelerates the transfer of relevant lessons that may support the realisation of more just cities.

While co-production often aspires to engage stakeholders throughout the whole knowledge process, the chapter argues that comparative learning should be prioritised over more specialised aspects of the research process, such as data analysis or academic writing, especially when there are limits on stakeholders' ability to commit time and resources to research. The chapter evidences the value of comparative learning from the 'outside in' and the need to find novel mechanisms to open up policy imaginations. Transdisciplinary co-production has a role to play in ensuring that comparison can benefit urban officials in their decision making in the context of increasingly limited resources and constraints. In line with the ethos of this book, the chapter has been written to appeal to a wide audience, drawing on academic ideas to stimulate wider reflection on the process and value of comparative policy learning.

Towards ‘meaningful participation’

In an epoch where inequality is becoming increasingly severe on a global scale (Piketty, 2013), and in which far-right nationalisms and populism are becoming dominant, the search for solutions that are just – in both process and outcomes – is as urgent as ever. The search for the just city (Fainstein, 2013) means taking seriously urban structural and institutional conditions and governance arrangements. Attention must be paid to the organisation of cities, foregrounding questions around the design and ownership of municipal institutions. Different forms of citizen participation, ranging from citizen involvement in urban planning processes through to municipal energy strategies, neighbourhood budgets or citizen juries, have been supported by local governments. However, in the context of multiple challenges to the idea of the ‘nation state’ and variable decentralisation and devolution efforts, greater citizen engagement has adopted an almost panacea-like character, capable ‘not only ... of addressing issues of poverty and social justice; it is also a means of tackling the growing democratic deficit that is now widely discussed in both “mature” and “emerging” democracies’ (Gaventa, 2004: 26).

The New Urban Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals

As detailed in Chapter Six, acknowledgement of the importance of participation and the role of local governments has been embedded in both the United Nations’ New Urban Agenda (NUA) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Running through the NUA is a clear commitment that its vision requires the ‘empowering [of] all individuals and communities while enabling their full and meaningful participation’ (UN-Habitat, 2016, para 26). This is made most explicit in one of the ‘transformative commitments for sustainable urban development’, which asserts the primacy of:

... promoting institutional, political, legal and financial mechanisms in cities and human settlements to broaden inclusive platforms, in line with national policies, that allow *meaningful* participation in decision-making, planning and follow-up processes for all, as well as enhanced civil engagement and co-provision and co-production. (UN-Habitat, 2016: 14, emphasis added)

Similarly, SDG 16 focuses on 'ensuring responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels'. However, while the NUA and SDGs should be considered as 'an achievement in terms of bringing global attention to the critical importance of cities for humanity and its future', there appears to be a 'deliberate vagueness in the indicator framework' that suggests the urban SDG – and perhaps the wider SDG framework – is best approached 'as a "proxy" and policy tool, a way to simplify critical issues for the purposes of clarity and activism' (Klopp and Petretta, 2017: 96). Notwithstanding such concerns, a central message from international frameworks is to take the conditions for participation and inclusion of citizens in decision making seriously, as enabling wider sustainable urban transformations.

From co-production to comparison and back again

For these reasons, one of the comparative projects supported by Mistra Urban Futures focused on Participatory Cities. Workshops were held in 2017 in Kisumu, Kenya, that aimed to identify and support common cross-cutting themes around which international comparative work could be developed, with the aspiration of adding value to local projects already under way. The Participatory Cities workshop was attended by over 30 academic and city representatives from Cape Town, Kisumu, Malmö/Skåne, Stockholm, Gothenburg and Sheffield. The workshop was structured around presentations, discussions and workshop exercises to tease out the cultural

and epistemic differences in how participation was understood, researched and developed in practice across all six urban contexts.

As noted in other chapters, the initiation of comparative work was influenced by a number of constraining factors, largely relating to the fact that the majority of resources had already been allocated to local co-production projects by each local partnership. Limited additional networking funds were available centrally. Participatory Cities was developed as a series of related work streams, to pull together existing activity on participation in urban governance, decision making and planning from across the different Mistra Urban Futures Local Interaction Platforms (LIPs) – see [Chapter One](#).

The development of comparative work in Phase Two of Mistra Urban Futures was layered on top of existing local co-production work. A critical consideration was therefore what value international perspectives could add to each local interaction platform. Rather than initiate new projects, this meant overlaying local work, co-designed with urban stakeholders, with an international dimension (see Simon et al, [2018](#)). Three different approaches were used: twinning, comparative interviewing and international policy exchanges.

Given that local projects were already underway, the opportunity for comparative work around Participatory Cities also meant thinking through how local partners could be involved and how the opportunity for comparative learning could be aligned with ongoing trajectories. This is now illustrated using the example of Greater Manchester.

Co-producing comparative learning in Greater Manchester

Greater Manchester is a city region with a population of 2.8 million people in northern England, comprised of ten separate local authorities or ‘districts’. These districts had collaborated on a voluntary basis since 1986, through a body called the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities.

Following the negotiation of a City Deal in 2012, Greater Manchester became the first English city region outside London to secure greater devolved powers in areas such as transport, planning and housing, on condition that the local authorities agreed to a directly elected metropolitan mayor. The first mayor of Greater Manchester, Andy Burnham, was elected in May 2017 on a manifesto that promised a different relationship between local public authorities and citizens in Greater Manchester. His 'cabinet' comprised himself and the ten local authority leaders, under a new organisation called the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA).

Such developments have been the subject of many academic studies and are well documented elsewhere (Haughton et al, 2016; Kenealy, 2016; Hodson et al, 2019). Of relevance to this chapter is the coincidence of the initiation of Participatory Cities with this period of huge governance flux, changing national–local relations and questions over how the new mayor would exercise his mandate and engage directly with citizens. In this context, there was an increasing appetite from some city officials to find 'new' ideas and approaches and to open up thinking to alternative approaches to participation.

This context forms the background to the co-production of a knowledge exchange programme between the GMCA and academic researchers involved in the Sheffield–Manchester LIP (SMLIP). In January 2018, discussions began to formulate a coherent 'gateway' for decision makers at the GMCA to collaborate with a wide range of local projects supported by the SMLIP. A process called Developing Co-Productive Capacities was co-designed and co-funded to enable knowledge exchange and to facilitate the engagement of officials in the LIP as a whole. Basket funding for the process was secured from impact funds allocated by participating universities (Sheffield, Manchester and Birmingham) and by aligning existing local spend for knowledge exchange within a range of projects. Match funding in-kind was agreed in the form of officer time and the provision of venues. The negotiation

of this year-long process took over three months, with high-level sign-offs required to enable city officials to participate in activities and the identification of key personnel to take part. While delaying the initiation of some parts of the process, this led to strong buy-in and credible commitment, as well as high interest in the results of analysis. Importantly, the negotiation of a *process* for co-producing comparative learning constituted a single mechanism, with institutional endorsement, through which local overlaying of international perspectives could take place.

A central part of Developing Co-productive Capacities was the identification of three learning opportunities for city officials and stakeholders to undertake comparative learning. While comparison is usually undertaken by academic researchers, who then distil and represent relevant lessons back to urban officials, Participatory Cities sought to disrupt this division of labour by enabling stakeholders to engage in direct, unmediated comparative learning. The first learning visit was to the Mistra Urban Futures' annual conference in Cape Town in November 2018, during which Greater Manchester and Gothenburg officials were invited to present their urban contexts and governance arrangements.¹ The second visit shortly thereafter involved a mixed delegation from Greater Manchester to the IOPD meeting in Barcelona. The third was a three-day learning visit to Gothenburg with a wider delegation including citizens, third sector representatives, activists and local officials from Greater Manchester, as well as from the West Midlands Combined Authority.² A condition of participation was that participants would write blogs on their reflections and commit to internal workshops to ensure that learning was embedded in wider institutional contexts.³ To comprehend the value attributed to these exchanges by local stakeholders, the next section focuses specifically on the November 2018 trip to the IOPD to provide a microcosm of the wider issues.⁴

The International Observatory on Participatory Democracy

The IOPD is a network of over 800 cities in 91 countries collaborating to improve local participatory democracy and describes itself as 'a space open to all cities in the world and all associations, organisations and research centres interested in learning about, exchanging impressions and applying experiences of participatory democracy on a local scale with the aim of deepening the roots of democracy in municipal government'.⁵ The network was officially founded in 2001 and in 2006 co-ordinated closely with the United Cities and Local Governments global municipal membership organisation, also headquartered in Barcelona, to provide strategic intelligence on participatory democracy.

Annual conferences have been one strand of the IOPD's work to create a space for exchanging practices among members. IOPD conferences require much preparation and many sessions are dedicated to joint decision making and planning between member cities to progress the core work of the organisation. Although there are hundreds of global members, there are very few from the UK—the only local authority listed as a member is Bristol City Council, along with three academic-affiliated organisations and three consultancies/social enterprises.⁶ Through the Participatory Cities initiative, the University of Sheffield's Urban Institute had become an associate member, but had not previously attended or been involved in any aspect of the IOPD. Notably, the conference was neither academic in nature nor was held in a space owned by any of the Greater Manchester delegation participating. One delegate reflected that this meant the experience was far more co-operative, flat and equal than it otherwise would have been.

In mid-2018, as part of the Developing Co-productive Capacities process agreed with the GMCA, it was decided to send a delegation to the planned IOPD conference comprising two academics, two GMCA officials and two citizen/civil society co-researchers. The focus was the co-design and

delivery of a workshop – ‘How to co-produce the city’ – which eventually comprised a joint scene-setting presentation and an adapted world café-style exercise. The workshop was recorded on video and a short summary is available online (<https://youtu.be/RebvaBaMXMQ>). This approach and workshop were unusual in the context of the conference as a whole, where predominately academic *or* practice sessions were delivered, but rarely combined.

The IOPD conference was organised according to three key themes: direct democracy, citizen initiative and ecosystems of inclusive democracy. In total, there were 50 sessions on offer around these key themes. The delegation discussed and agreed collectively which sessions each member would attend, to achieve a good coverage and fit with individuals’ areas of interest. Each person agreed to take notes and reflect on relevant lessons and insights for Greater Manchester. On the last evening of the conference, all the participants discussed their reflections and insights in a two-hour group discussion that was audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed. The data from the reflection discussion are presented in the following section. Quotes from delegates are denoted D1, D2, D3 and D4. Given the small number of participants, and based on feedback, job roles are not attributed, in order to preserve anonymity.

Reflections from the conference

The array of case studies, tools and techniques presented at the conference stimulated wide curiosity and interest in what other cities were doing. The volume of activity by local authorities and urban actors in cities around the world served to legitimise an agenda around participatory democracy that has less current coverage in the UK context. Our delegation reflected on the specific challenges facing different urban areas – for instance in cross-border spaces between France and Germany where multiple regional identities are present – and on the different

extents to which citizens' initiatives, such as referenda, are binding in different urban contexts.

Beyond specific examples of tools and techniques that could be applied in Greater Manchester, the conference opened up conceptual questioning about participatory democracy and different ways of thinking about participation: "I found that very useful" (D2). While desk-based reviews of the literature had previously been carried out, for instance, outlining the differences between participatory and deliberative democracy, the impact of hearing cities speak directly enabled such ideas to land more powerfully.

Delegates' reflections on the conference echoed wider intellectual concerns regarding the purpose and outcomes of participation:

'I would love to see the outcomes of some of these things. Because that's where it never went. So they named a square after something. Or they agreed to have a community garden. Is that where we are here? Or is there something better coming out?' (D1)

Critical questioning followed, supporting a bridging of perspectives between different members of the delegation. For instance, through the experiences of other cities in developing ecosystems of participation, delegates "noticed that feminism and gender identity had been placed at the core of a lot of these conversations about democracy (D3)", something that also reflected one of the political priorities of Barcelona City Council. However, they reflected that questions of race were not similarly central. While struck, on the one hand, by the "radicalness" of what was being presented, this was accompanied by concern at a parallel "lack of radicalness" given the "bigger, more urgent challenges at stake" (D2).

One delegate reflected that the composition of attendees was significant in this respect, noting that there was little consideration of "citizens" within the conference itself. Conference

participants presented themselves in their professional roles and city officials “talk about citizens as if citizens are ‘over there’”. This delegate also noted the importance of leading by example and the need for skills and capacities to make participation real rather than symbolic: “there’s something ironic about attending something called the International Observatory on Participatory Democracy and participating in nothing, other than being a passive recipient of information” (D4).

This led to a questioning of whether the agenda around local participatory democracy was “ducking the big questions” (D2). Listening to a presentation on local community participation in Mozambique – a context that was not initially presumed to offer comparative insight to Greater Manchester – this delegate reflected that there was a general lack of prioritisation at the conference. Municipal authorities were foregrounding initiatives that gave citizens control over parks or community squares, through mechanisms such as participatory budgeting, but issues of homelessness or drug addiction were absent from the agenda.

Reflections on what was heard in different sessions led the discussion naturally to the relevance for Greater Manchester. These implications were motivated by initial concerns to replicate or avoid the practices of other cities. For instance, one delegate reflected on the role of intermediary organisations in supporting smaller and under-resourced municipalities, concluding that “one of the things I’ll take back is to what extent we can support our Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise sector to organise and to be able to engage with us, not [on an] equal level, but with some legitimacy” (D1). Delegates found specific interventions relevant and useful – such as the role of digital decision-making tools, participatory indicators or participant-led evaluation as a process for building power.

Understanding the priorities of other municipalities enabled delegates to think back on policy and practice in Greater Manchester. An awareness of the knowledge gaps was

shared – while there is “no shortage of ways of doing it”, one delegate asked, “Does Greater Manchester understand what the different approaches are? Does GMCA understand it? And are we evaluating what works for our citizens?” (D2). Delegates specifically noted the need to centre the “participation of people who are really struggling and on the breadline” (D2) as well as engage with ideas around participatory budgeting, youth engagement and the SDG agenda. Specific city experiences, such as those of Barcelona,⁷ provoked a different policy imagination, but one grounded in an understanding of contextual difference. For one city official, the prospects of radical change are far from Greater Manchester: “Our democratic system is what it is, that’s not going to change any time soon. Ours is about broadening what we already have” (D1). This assessment was based on reflecting on the different roles, responsibilities and resources of municipal governments and specifically the limits of the current devolution agreement:

‘One of the challenges you have with local government is you are seen as everything to all people at all times, when actually, we have quite defined powers and responsibilities. And even when we want to go beyond and strengthen some of those and work in different ways, there’s a limitation of what you can do ... we have a role, which is not everything.’ (D1)

How to take control and organise “without seeking permission” was the take-away message for another delegate (D3):

‘Ada Colau [mayor of Barcelona] was talking about people organising themselves without seeking permission ... that being something we should all value and appreciate rather than being scared of it and threatened by it.’

While many urban officials want to identify best practice, the dialogue around replicability was nuanced through the

self-identification of constraining and enabling conditions and contexts. Our delegation was struck by the extent of institutional support for participation in other municipalities, where there were full departments for participation or participation officers: “that was something that was seriously committed to, there was resource, there was capacity” (D1). This provoked reflection on whether such an initiative should be owned by city-regional or local authorities and whether, if desirable, it was possible in the context of austerity: “I used to be paid to do it, way back when, when we had a lot more money”.

Attendance at the IOPD drew back the veil on the scale and scope of municipalities’ active engagement with the theory and practice of participatory democracy in other parts of the world. A central take-home message was that Greater Manchester needs to pay attention to this and consider whether and how to participate in such networks:

‘We need to connect more and we need to be an importer of ideas. Places are ahead of Greater Manchester on this. We need to take stock of some of what we have heard and also reach into that network.’ (D1)

The vibrancy of the network in supporting cross-local learning stood in stark contrast to the current situation in the UK where the urban policy context encourages more competition than collaboration or sharing of practice (May and Perry, 2018).

The experience grounded the need for a less ‘boosterist’ discourse⁸ that seeks to reflect honestly on Greater Manchester’s strengths and weaknesses and learn from others. It also enabled delegates to frame what a coherent Greater Manchester contribution could look like. Notably, in the context of multiple discussions about participatory democracy generally, there was very little discussion about co-production in democratic ecosystems of participation: “It’s also about putting GM out there. We have dipped our toes in the water talking about co-production today” (D2).

The combination of concrete learning about participatory democracy with reflections on GM's policy and practice in international perspective served both to confirm and challenge existing trajectories. One consequence was to open up discussion about the horizons of possibility beyond the now, to where GM might want to be in the future. "It ranged from things we have done in the past ... things we might do in the future ... and then things which are beyond our current contexts" (D1). The challenges of ceding power and engaging with citizens led to reflection on the need for greater social movement building on GM:

'Whether that was Peru, or it was in America, or in unions ... the question for GM is to what extent do we facilitate or put up barriers to that type of social action? Is that in our destiny and where does legislation fit within that as a city region? Generally, we are governed by what's agreed at a national level. So are we a blocker to that sort of movement?' (D2)

One delegate acknowledged that organised social movements can help cities move forward progressively and "that's not always a bad thing". Inspired by examples in Barcelona and Berlin of cities and citizens taking control of their energy or water infrastructure, delegates returned to the issues of risk aversion and embracing social movements. This stimulated wider discussion about the preconditions for wider urban transformations.

'That's the question for us: how do we really engage our citizens around the big issues? And are we prepared that people will galvanise and come with alternatives, try and push the system and push ourselves?' (D2)

Honest reflection on institutional cultures within existing organisations followed, noting the need for cultural change

and support for city officials and professionals to undertake participation:

‘The problem is, we always get the answers we are expecting to get when we ask people ... and actually maybe we need to start asking different questions. If we want new ideas, how on earth do we go about asking different questions or allowing different spaces or whatever it might be ... for those curveballs to start coming through to “wow, there’s actually an idea that no one had seen”. Where do we get these ideas coming through?’ (D1)

Centring the knowledge and skills of citizens in this respect was seen to be key:

‘We don’t go outside of our boundaries in that way, when we think about the skillset of our communities. When it comes to thinking creatively about solutions to tackle some real big issues, what do people bring from communities?’ (D1)

Discussion: the value of comparative learning

Through this discussion, we can identify four key themes relating to the value of comparative learning. First, the approach enabled learning about participatory democracy through direct engagement with specific tools, techniques, approaches and methods. Second, delegates reflected on policy and practice in their own context, through honest consideration on the strengths and limits of existing approaches. Rather than looking for ‘quick fixes’ or models that could be transferred from context to context, comparative learning enabled context-specific lessons to be drawn building on pre-existing understandings of institutional constraints and possibilities. Third, looking from the ‘outside in’ meant that progress could be then grounded

in international experiences and perspectives. This enabled better understanding of where there were learning opportunities and where Greater Manchester had a distinctive offer to make. Fourth, and importantly, the experience started to open up discussion on different horizons of possibility for action and the necessary institutional and cultural changes required to bring them about.

Space was created for urban officials and stakeholders to think outside their usual constraints. One delegate referred to such learning as a 'luxury' not afforded in their everyday professional settings. Attending the conference and being exposed to ideas was valuable, but the post-conference discussion was the key mechanism through which exposure translated to learning. In the reflective dialogue, delegates prompted, questioned and challenged each other, for instance in relation to ideas of what was or wasn't deemed 'possible' in Greater Manchester. Members of the same local governance organisation had the opportunity to engage with each other's ideas and perspectives in ways that were not seen to be feasible at work. Stimulating critical thinking and space for reflection was as valuable as concrete tools and actions.

Collective experience and discussion had other impacts, in strengthening relationships between delegates. Rather than a critical agenda owned solely by academics, a greater shared problem space and critical lens started to develop among delegates. Learning together built trust that affected the quality of the co-productive relationships locally. This was designed from the outset within the wider Developing Co-productive Capacities process. While this chapter builds on a single moment within this process, the themes and values of comparative learning are echoed in the process as a whole. This exchange was only possible as part of a wider negotiated learning partnership that was signed off within GMCA, and due to pre-existing academic-civil society collaborations. Since the IOPD conference, the delegates have continued to work together locally – building a coalition for change to

#CoProduceGM, developing policy commitments towards communities of practice in co-production and co-designing an international policy exchange on co-producing urban policy.

On co-producing comparison

When resources for comparative learning are scarce, where does this leave participatory urban decision making? Urban officials are time-poor and institutional constraints limit the opportunities for learning about what is happening elsewhere, or reflecting on institutional conditions. Similarly, civil society engagement in decision-making processes relies on individuals giving their time voluntarily. Comparison is usually left in the hands of academics who are charged with transferring knowledge to potential users in the form of case studies or examples of best practice. Academics are used to populating international spaces and have had the relative luxury of time and space to think comparatively.

This chapter opens up a debate about what comparison means in co-production and who undertakes it. In this example, comparative learning was co-produced between different individuals from academia, government and civil society organisations through a shared collective experience and reflection. Comparison served to generate thinking from the ‘outside in’ on the need for, approaches to and possibilities for creating more participatory cities. By undertaking comparison in this way, learning is better embedded in local organisations aiding the exchange of knowledge between academic researchers and urban stakeholders. It simultaneously strengthens trust and relationships as a precondition for better co-productive partnerships locally over time.

On the basis of this experience, we reflect that current knowledge on co-production is not sufficiently sensitive to issues associated with comparison. Structured comparison aimed at generalisation is important to generate better knowledge about ‘what works’, but is resource-intensive and requires specialised

skills (Richardson et al, 2019). Participatory methods do exist to undertake such comparative studies in a more inclusive way in the research process. However, being trained to undertake such tasks is not always desirable or possible for those within an organisation to engage with transdisciplinary knowledge co-production. Comparative learning is not a replacement for systematic analysis, but can support better understanding of different possibilities and prospects for cities beyond the best practice case.

This opens a new avenue of consideration for those concerned with implementing and evaluating the United Nations' urban SDG and New Urban Agenda, and the particular commitment to 'meaningful' participation. Our experience suggests that while traditional technologies of participation such as participatory budgeting (see Chapter Two) or people's assemblies are specific instances of meaningful participation, we must also strive to create boundary spaces that facilitate reflective 'out-of-context experiences'. While the former are often promoted by institutions such as the World Bank (see Goldfrank, 2012), such replicable off-the-shelf techniques provide little substantial challenge to the governing status quo on their own. Comparative learning, when allied with a critical orientation, may provide more important opportunities for subtle moments of rupture to dominant governing logics to be aired, discussed and promoted. If meaningful participation is to be more than a shoring up of business as usual, this suggests that processes of co-produced comparative learning should be taken seriously, if we are to move 'beyond critique' (Perry and Atherton, 2017) and realise the potential of participatory cities.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the following people for participating in this process: Jacob Botham, David Rogerson, Katie Finney and Alice Toomer Mc-Alpine. The use of the data solely reflects the views and interpretations of the authors.

Notes

- ¹ www.mistraurbanfutures.org/en/event/RJC2018
- ² <https://realisingjustcities-rjc.org/blog/co-production-working-local-democracy> and <https://realisingjustcities-rjc.org/blog/changing-world-learning-and-reflections-göteborg-visit>
- ³ See, for example, <https://realisingjustcities-rjc.org/blog/greater-manchester-barcelona-and-back-again-lessons-co-production-and-digital-democracy> and <https://realisingjustcities-rjc.org/blog/how-co-produce-city-no-easy-steps>
- ⁴ At the time of securing the book contract, the Göteborg learning visit had not taken place.
- ⁵ www.iodp.net/en
- ⁶ Information correct as listed on website www.iodp.net/en September 2019.
- ⁷ The election of Barcelona en Comú in the 2015 municipal elections has led to Barcelona being seen as ‘a flagship of [a] new municipalist movement’ (Russell, 2019: 992), one in which the relationship between citizens and the state has been a central focus for transformation.
- ⁸ Associated with the emergence of the ‘entrepreneurial city’ from the mid-1980s onwards (Hall and Hubbard, 1996), city boosterism encapsulates the range of ‘place-making’ behaviours, such as the rush to host major sporting events (Cochrane et al, 1996), orientated towards the attraction of capital investment.

References

- Cochrane, A., Peck, J. and Tickell, A. (1996) ‘Manchester plays games: exploring the local politics of globalisation’, *Urban Studies*, 33(8): 1319–36.
- Fainstein, S. (2013) ‘The just city’, *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 18(1): 1–18. doi: 10.1080/12265934.2013.834643
- Fung, A. and Wright, E.O. (2001) ‘Deepening democracy: innovations in empowered participatory governance’, *Politics & Society*, 29(1): 5–41.
- Gaventa, J. (2004) ‘Strengthening participatory approaches to local governance: learning the lessons from abroad’, *National Civic Review*, Winter: 16–27.
- Goldfrank, B. (2012) ‘The World Bank and the globalization of participatory budgeting’, *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8(2): 1–18.

- Hall, T. and Hubbard, P. (1996) 'The entrepreneurial city: new urban politics, new urban geographies?', *Progress in Human Geography*, 20(2): 153–74.
- Haughton, G., Deas, I., Hincks, S. and Ward, K. (2016) 'Mythic Manchester: Devo Manc, the Northern Powerhouse and rebalancing the English economy', *Regions, Economy and Society*, 9(2): 355–570.
- Hodson, M., McMeekin, A., Froud, J. and Moran, M. (2019) 'State-rescaling and re-designing the material city-region: tensions of disruption and continuity in articulating the future of Greater Manchester', *Urban Studies*, 1–20. doi: 10.1177/0042098018820181
- Kenealy, D. (2016) 'A tale of one city: the Devo Manc deal and its implications for English devolution', *Political Quarterly*, 87(4): 572–81.
- Klopp, J. and Petretta, D. (2017) 'The urban sustainable development goal: indicators, complexity and the politics of measuring cities', *Cities*, 63(1): 92–7.
- May, T. and Perry, B. (2010) 'Comparative research: potentials and problems', in T. May (ed) *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process*, Maidenhead: Open University Press and McGraw-Hill.
- May, T. and Perry, B. (2018) *Cities and the Knowledge Economy: Promise, Politics and Possibilities*, Oxford: Routledge.
- McFarlane, C. (2011) *Learning the City: Knowledge and Translocal Assemblage*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Perry, B. and Atherton, M. (2017) 'Beyond critique: the value of co-production in realising just cities?', *Local Environment*, 22(Sup1): 36–51.
- Perry, B., Durose, C. and Richardson, L. with the Action Research Collective (2019) *How can we Govern Cities Differently? The Promise and Practices of Co-Production. Project Report*, Greater Manchester, Creative Concern.
- Piketty, T. (2013) *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Richardson, L., Durose, C. and Perry, B. (2019) 'Moving towards hybridity in causal explanation: the example of citizen participation', *Social Policy and Administration*, 53(2): 265–78.
- Russell, B. (2019) 'Beyond the local trap: new municipalism and the rise of the fearless cities', *Antipode*, 51(3): 989–1010.
- UN-Habitat (United Nations Human Settlements Programme) (2016) *New Urban Agenda*, New York, NY: United Nations.
- Simon, D., Palmer, H., Riise, J., Smit, W. and Valencia, S. (2018) 'The challenges of transdisciplinary knowledge production: from unilocal to comparative research', *Environment & Urbanization*, 30(2): 481–500.

Index

A

active intermediaries 23
African Centre for Cities 66, 69
African Food Security Urban Network 69
Agenda 2030 5, 113, 114, 119, 126, 129
 see also Sustainable Development Goals
Angered Farmstead 70
Applied Food Strategy (Gothenburg) 70
assemblage building 98, 100–2
assemblage theory 90, 96
Atherton, Mark 128

B

Ban Ki-moon 5–6
Björling, Nils 89
Buenos Aires Urban SDG project 114, 116, 119, 120, 124–5, 127, 128

C

Cape Town CityLab programme 66–7
Cape Town LIP (CTLIP) 7, 24
 food project 69
 Knowledge Transfer Programme 66–8, 73–5
 transport project 73, 78–82
 Urban SDG project 114, 115–16, 117, 121, 122, 125

central design *see* internationally initiated projects with local co-production
citizen participation 136–7
 Participatory Cities workshop 137–8
 reflections on IOPD 142–8
city branding listings 26
city officials *see* local government
climate change 5
clustered projects 31, 90–1, 159–60
 benefits and challenges 105–7
 contribution of 107–9, 164
 evolution 91–8
 theoretical basis 98–105
clustering 90, 98–105, 108
co-creation 1–2
co-design 1–2
co-production 1–5
 of comparative learning 138–40, 150–1
 process and practice 74–5
 see also transdisciplinary comparative co-production; transdisciplinary unilocal co-production
communication 169
comparative learning
 co-producing 138–40, 150–1
 reflections on IOPD meeting 141–8
 value of 133–5, 148–50
comparative urban research 20–1

see also [transdisciplinary comparative co-production](#)
 comparison 20
 reframing 133–4, 150–1
 compositional approach 96, 101
 consolidation 105–6
 consultation methods 2
 Consuming Urban Poverty project 69
 Croese, Sylvia 113
 cross-city learning 121
 cultural differences 168
 see also [global North–South dynamics](#)

D

data collection 127
 DeLanda, Manuel 101
 design thinking 90, 91, 101
 Developing Co-Productive Capacities 139–40, 141, 149
 Diprose, Kristina 113
 diversity 7, 22–3, 32, 156, 161
 documentation 99–100, 107
 Durakovic, Elma 63
 Dymitrow, Mirek 63

E

entry points 102–5
 environmental change 5
 evidence 51–2
 expertise 50

F

Fainstein, Susan 109, 161
 flexibility 106, 119, 123–4
 food projects 34–5, 69–72, 75–8, 155, 163
 funding 8, 108, 122, 134, 138, 139, 167

G

global agreements 5
 see also [Agenda 2030](#); [New Urban Agenda](#); [Sustainable Development Goals](#)
 global challenges 5–6

global North–South dynamics 53–4, 78–80, 84, 155
 Gothenburg LIP (GOLIP) 24
 food project 70
 migration project 90, 93, 97
 transport project 72, 78–82
 Urban SDG project 114, 115, 123, 125
 governance 168–9
 Governance and Policy for Sustainability project 8
 Greater Manchester
 co-producing comparative learning 138–40
 participation in IOPD 134–5
 reflections on IOPD 141–8
 value of comparative learning 148–50
 Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) 139, 141
 green focus, in food projects 76

H

Haysom, Gareth 63
 Helsingborg SWM project 42, 158–9
 benefits and limitations 53–6
 comparative dimensions 50–3
 strategies and experiences 45–9

I

idea phase 78, 84, 159
 ‘import mirror’ view 133
 indicators, in SDG project 123, 124
 Ingelhart, Karin 63
 institutionalisation 105–6, 107
 intermediary organisations 144
 international comparison 121, 122
 International Observatory on Participatory Democracy (IOPD) 134–5, 140, 141–2
 delegate reflections 142–8
 value of comparative learning 148–50
 international projects
 with translocal co-production 31, 32–3

internationally initiated projects
 with local co-production 31
 Urban SDG project 158,
 160, 164
 background 113–15
 benefits and challenges of
 central design 118–25
 benefits and challenges of local
 co-production 125–8
 engagement and contribution
 of 128–30, 164
 strategy and experiences
 115–18
 intersectionality 104

J

Jacobs, Jane M. 21–2, 26,
 89, 104
 Jernsund, Eva Maria 89
 Johansson, Magnus 63
 justice
 focus in food projects 76
see also urban justice

K

Kibuye Waste Management 51,
 52
 Kisumu LIP (KLIP) 7, 24
 food project 69
 migration project 90, 97
 SWM project 42, 158–9
 benefits and limitations 53–6
 comparative dimensions 50–3
 strategies and experiences 45–9
 transport project 72–3, 78–82
 Urban SDG project 114, 116–
 17, 123, 124, 125
 Kisumu Waste Actors' Network
 (KIWAN) 49
 knowledge alliances 92, 96, 97,
 99–100, 116
 knowledge exchange projects
 66–9, 73–5, 83–4, 139–40
 knowledge products 74
 Knowledge Transfer Programme
 (Cape Town) 66–8, 73–5
 Kotze, Shelley 63
 Kraff, Helena 89

L

learning visits 47–8, 74, 140
see also International Observatory
 on Participatory Democracy
 local co-production 3–4, 8–9,
 22–5, 125–8
 local government
 knowledge exchange
 projects 66–8
 in LIPs 7
 Manchester collaboration 138–9
 Urban SDG project 115–16,
 118–20, 125–8
 Local Interaction Platforms
 (LIPs) 7–10
 methodological lessons 22–5
 projects 32–5
see also Cape Town LIP;
 Gothenburg LIP; Kisumu LIP;
 Sheffield–Manchester LIP;
 Skåne LIP
 local projects replicated *see*
 replicating local projects
 local projects retrofitted *see*
 retrofitting local projects
 Locally Produced Food for Public
 Kitchens project 70

M

McFarlane, Colin 30, 36, 101,
 102, 134, 162
 Malmö
 knowledge exchange
 project 68–9, 74
 migration project 90, 93, 94
 Urban SDG project 114,
 117, 126–7
 Manchester *see*
 Greater Manchester;
 Sheffield–Manchester LIP
 May, Tim 23, 133
 meetings and workshops
 clustered projects 94–7, 103, 106
 internationally initiated
 projects 115, 116–17, 120–1
 Participatory Cities 137–8
 replication projects 74,
 78, 81, 83

researcher access to 125–6
 retrofitted projects 47–8
 virtual 120–1
see also International Observatory
 on Participatory Democracy
 methodological lessons 22–5
 #MeToo movement 28
 migration
 clustered projects 90–1
 benefits and challenges 105–7
 contribution of 107–9
 evolution 91–8
 theorising clustering 98–105
 and comparative urbanism 89
 Mistra Urban Futures (MUF)
 comparative projects 12, 33–5
 organisational structure 6–10, 20
 overview 6–10
 research framework 10–12, 30–5

N

Nagrika 116
 narratives 107, 166–7
 Ness, Barry 41
 networks 52, 91
 New Urban Agenda (NUA) 5, 6,
 10, 113, 114
 local government engagement
 with 119, 120, 124–5
 MUF research on 33–4
 and participation 129, 136–7
 Nordqvist, Joakim 113
 Novy, Andreas 99

O

objectives, replication of 65
 Oloko, Michael 41, 113
 Omondi, Lillian 89
 outputs 24, 29–30, 82, 124, 168–9

P

Palmer, Henrietta 1, 19, 89
 Paris agreement 5
 participants
 changing 23–4, 99, 117
 characteristics and skills 24,
 50, 51–2

different resources 134
 engagement 92–3, 95, 96–7,
 118, 119–20, 128–30, 169
 group consolidation 105–6
 in knowledge alliances 92–3, 95,
 96–7, 99–100
 in knowledge exchange
 projects 67–9
 PhD students 31–2, 35, 67,
 68–9
 positions and values 55, 76–8,
 92–3, 127–8
 relations between 71–2
 and research impact 29, 169
 in SWM project 47–8, 50,
 51–2, 53, 55
 in Urban SDG project 114,
 115–20, 128–30, 160
see also local government;
 meetings and workshops
 participation
 concept of 136
 constraints on 134
 NUA and SDGs 129, 136–7
 Participatory Cities
 workshop 137–8
 role of comparative learning 151
 see also International Observatory
 on Participatory Democracy
 participatory budgeting 2
 Participatory Cities
 initiative 137–8, 141
 participatory democracy
 IOPD 134–5, 140, 141–2
 delegate reflections on 142–8
 participatory research 2
 partnerships 7, 74
 see also knowledge alliances
 peer-to-peer review 115, 121
 Perry, Beth 23, 128, 133
 personnel *see* participants
 PhD researchers 31–2, 35,
 67, 68–9
 politics 74
 power relations 3, 20, 21, 74,
 78–80, 84, 168
 privatisation 52–3
 public finance project 35
 public sector-led research 68

Q

- qualitative research
 - replication 65, 82
- quality monitoring and evaluation (QME) 165–6
- quantitative research
 - replication 65, 82

R

- Realising Just Cities
 - framework 10–11, 20, 31–2, 37n.3
 - co-production contributions to 107–9, 129, 161–5
- Realising Just Cities project 27, 34, 37n.3
- reflection/reflexivity 23–4, 142–8, 165
- replicating local projects 31, 63–4, 65–6, 82–4, 159
 - comparative processes 73–82
 - contribution to urban justice 163
 - food projects 69–72, 75–8
 - initial research 66–73
 - knowledge exchange 66–9, 73–5, 83–4
 - transport projects 72–3, 78–82, 83
- replication 64, 145–6
- replication crisis 64–5
- research demonstration
 - site 49, 50–1
- research networks 91
- researchers
 - characteristics 24, 50
 - PhD students 31–2, 35, 67, 68–9
 - positionality 77, 127–8
 - see also* participants
- resource focus, in food projects 76
- resources 122, 134, 138
 - see also* funding
- retrofitting 43–4
- retrofitting local projects 31, 41–2, 56–7, 158–9
 - benefits 53–4
 - comparative dimensions 50–3
 - contribution to urban justice 163
 - limitations 55–6

- strategies and experiences 45–9
- Righard, Erica 89
- Riise, Jan 1
- Robinson, Jennifer 21, 26, 96, 108
- Russell, Bert 133

S

- scale focus, in food projects 76
- Science and the Future of Cities 170
- SDGs *see* Sustainable Development Goals
- Self-organising Action for Food Equity (SAFE) project 70–1
- Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 5
- service provision 3
- Sharma, Tarun 113
- Sheffield–Manchester LIP (SMLIP) 7, 139
 - food project 70–1
 - Sheffield Urban SDG project 114, 117–18, 119, 121, 122–3, 125, 127–8
 - see also* Greater Manchester
- Shimla Urban SDG project 114, 116, 117, 119
- Simon, David 1, 19, 113
- Sitas, Rike 63
- Skåne LIP (SKLIP) 7
 - knowledge exchange project 68–9, 73–5
 - migration project 90, 97
 - SWM project *see* Helsingborg SWM project
 - see also* Malmö
- Smit, Warren 63
- social inclusiveness 128–9
- social movements 147
- solid waste management (SWM) 42, 43, 45–6, 56–7
 - technologies 45, 46, 48, 49, 53–4, 56
 - waste governance 49, 52
- Solid Waste Management (SWM) project 42, 158–9
 - benefits/limitations of retrofitting 53–6

comparative dimensions 50–3
 strategies and experiences 45–9
 Stadslandet (Urban Rural
 Gothenburg project) 70, 71, 72
 stakeholders 29, 71–2, 169
see also participants
 sustainable cities 128–30
 sustainable development 5–6, 25–6
 Sustainable Development Goals
 (SDGs) 5, 6, 10
 local government engagement
 with 119–20, 129–30
 MUF research on 33–4, 113–14
 and participation 129, 136–7
 and solid waste management 43
see also Urban SDG project

T

team members *see* participants
 themes and
 processes 10–11, 26, 32
 time constraints 106, 167
 timing 158
 Tourism in Multicultural Societies
 project 95
 trans-language (transformative
 language) 98, 102, 103, 104, 109
 trans-sectionality (transformative
 practices) 98, 102, 103–4, 109
 transdisciplinarity 3, 169–70
 transdisciplinary comparative
 co-production
 challenges 36, 155–6, 157–8,
 160, 165–70
 contribution to urban
 justice 161–5
 diversity 156, 161
 impacts/outcomes 24,
 29–30, 168–9
 key messages 157–61
 learning from 27–9
 MUF comparative
 projects 12, 33–5
 QME framework 165–6
 reasons for 21–2, 25–7
 typological framework 10–12,
 30–5, 161

see also clustered projects;
 internationally initiated projects
 with local co-production;
 replicating local projects;
 retrofitting local projects
 transdisciplinary unilocal co-
 production 3–4, 8–9, 22–5
 transformative collaborations 98,
 102, 103
 transformative themes 95, 97, 98,
 102–5, 109
 transit-oriented development
 (TOD) 73
 translocality (transformative
 territories) 94, 98, 102, 103, 109
 translocally clustered comparative
 research projects *see* clustered
 projects
 transport projects 72–3, 78–82, 83
 Transport and Sustainable Urban
 Development project 78–82, 83
 travel 134
 twinning 26
 typological framework 10–12,
 30–5, 161

U

uncertainty 106–7
 unilocal co-production 3–4,
 8–9, 22–5
 United Nations (UN) 5
see also Agenda 2030; New
 Urban Agenda; Sustainable
 Development Goals
 universities 7
 University of Cape Town 66–7
 urban context, and global
 challenges 5–6
 urban justice 10–11, 26,
 109, 161–5
 urban research 4, 20–1
 urban retrofit 43–4
 Urban Rural Gothenburg project
 (Stadslandet) 70, 71, 72
 Urban SDG project 158, 160, 164
 background 113–15
 benefits and challenges of central
 design 118–25

INDEX

benefits and challenges of local
co-production 125–8
engagement and contribution
of 128–30, 164
strategy and experiences 115–18
Urban Station Communities
project 72–3, 83
urban sustainability 4, 6–7

V

Valencia, Sandra C. 113
value positions 76–8
Verapark 46, 48, 50–1, 52
Versace, Ileana 113

virtual meetings 120–1

W

waste management *see* solid waste
management
Watson, Vanessa 80
When Municipalities Set
the Research Agenda
(project) 68, 73–5

Z

Zingira 49, 52

"This book is packed with insightful information on how knowledge co-production actually works in the most diverse cities across the Global North and the Global South."

Patricia Romero Lankao, NREL, Transforming Energy

"The authors show how learning through co-production and across differences can inform locally relevant directions for social justice in cities, and generate new possibilities in conversation with, and for, other places."

Colin McFarlane, Durham University

David Simon is Professor of Development Geography at Royal Holloway, University of London and former Director of Mistra Urban Futures.

Henrietta Palmer is an architect and researcher and former Deputy Scientific Director of Mistra Urban Futures.

Jan Riise is at the Gothenburg Centre for Sustainable Development (GMV) and former Engagement Manager at Mistra Urban Futures.

Available Open Access under CC-BY-NC licence.

Reporting on the innovative, transdisciplinary research on sustainable urbanisation undertaken by Mistra Urban Futures, a highly influential research centre based in Sweden (2010–19), this book builds on the Policy Press title *Rethinking Sustainable Cities* to make a significant contribution to evolving theory about comparative urban research.

Highlighting important methodological experiences from across a variety of diverse contexts in Africa and Europe, this book surveys key experiences and summarises lessons learned from Mistra Urban Futures' global research platforms.

It demonstrates best practice for developing and deploying different forms of transdisciplinary co-production, covering topics including neighbourhood transformation, housing justice, sustainable urban and transport development, food security and cultural heritage.

POLICY PRESS **SHORTS** POLICY & PRACTICE

P **Policy Press**
PUBLISHING WITH A PURPOSE
@policypress PolicyPress
policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk

ISBN 978-1-4473-5312-6

