Resituating the Local in Cohesion and Territorial Development

D8.2
Synthesis Report:
Towards an Operational Concept of Spatial Justice

Version 1
30th September 2019
Report information

Title: Deliverable 8.2 Synthesis Report

Authors: Andrew Copus, Simone Piras HUTTON
Paulina Tobiasz-Lis, Karolina Dmochowska-Dudek, Marcin Wójcik, Tomasz Napierała, ULODZ;

Contributions from: UEF, all partners

Version: 2.2

Date of Publication: Project Month 36 – September 2019

Dissemination level: Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission services)
Project information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Acronym</th>
<th>RELOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Full title:</td>
<td>Resituating the Local in Cohesion and Territorial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Agreement:</td>
<td>727097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Duration:</td>
<td>48 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project coordinator:</td>
<td>UEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table of Contents

1  Introduction........................................................................................................................................... 1

2  Theory of Change and Mechanism Mapping ....................................................................................... 2
   2.1 ToC as a Diagnostic Device .................................................................................................................. 2
   2.2 ToC as implemented in the RELOCAL Baseline Reports ...................................................................... 3

3  Three Types of Spatial Justice ................................................................................................................. 6

4  Styles of Implementation ......................................................................................................................... 9

5  Meta-Analysis of the Case Study Action’s Theories of Change ........................................................... 14
   5.1 What ToC elements tell us about Spatial Justice .................................................................................. 14
   5.2 What do Intermediate Outcome Pathways tell us about the Paradigms which drive Policy? .......... 23

6  An Operational Concept of Spatial Justice ............................................................................................. 30
   6.1 The objective ........................................................................................................................................ 30
   6.2 Spatial Justice, and the Project Hypothesis, as defined by D1.1 ....................................................... 30
   6.3 In What Sense “Re-Conceptualising”? ................................................................................................. 31
   6.4 What have we learned about (operational) spatial justice? ................................................................. 32
   6.5 Common policy (implementation) approaches to spatial justice ..................................................... 32
   6.6 Baseline assumptions and the role of context .................................................................................... 33
   6.7 Intervention pathways .......................................................................................................................... 33
   6.8 Next Steps ......................................................................................................................................... 34

7  Some Reflections pointing forward to Policy Implications ...................................................................... 35

8  References ................................................................................................................................................ 36

9  Annex 1: Gallery of Mechanism Map Diagrams from the 33 Case Studies ........................................ 38
Tables
Table 1: Case Study Type and Spatial Justice Type ................................................................. 8
Table 2: Key dimensions of policy approaches to Spatial Justice.........................................10
Table 3: Spatial justice semantic field based on ToC reports.............................................22

Figures
Figure 1: Example of a ToC Map (Isle of Lewis Case Study).................................................. 3
Figure 2: Example of a Baseline Mechanism Map (Isle of Lewis Case Study).................. 5
Figure 3: Policy characteristics illustrated by the Case Studies.......................................... 11
Figure 4: Key statements addressing long-term goals presented in all ToC reports...........15
Figure 5: Baseline Assumptions and Contextual Conditions & Drivers described in all ToC reports..................................................................................................................17
Figure 6: Baseline Assumptions and Contextual Conditions & Drivers for Neighbourhood Effects group ................................................................................................................ 18
Figure 7: Baseline Assumptions and Contextual Conditions & Drivers for Territorial Disadvantage group ...........................................................................................................20
Figure 8: Baseline Assumptions and Contextual Conditions & Drivers for Disempowered Places group ................................................................................................................ 21
Figure 9: A Causal Pathway or Chain of Intermediate Outcomes........................................ 23
Figure 10: Example of the Public Space Pathway (CS8)...................................................... 24
Figure 11: The Housing Improvement Pathway (CS14)..........................................................25
Figure 12: An Example of a Community Empowerment pathway (CS21)............................25
Figure 13: Example of a Community Capacity Building Pathway (CS1)............................26
Figure 14: Example of Enterprise Boost Pathway (central path) (CS31)..............................27
Figure 15: Example of an Identity Building Pathway (right) CS07........................................27
Figure 16: An example of a Public Space Pathway (Left) (CS24)..........................................28
Figure 17: An example of an Administrative Scale Economy pathway (CS10)....................29
Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of RELOCAL Work-package 8 – “Coherence and Scenarios”. The goal of this part of the project is to draw together what has been learned through the empirical research so far (and primarily through the 33 case studies coordinated by Work-package 6) about the nature of spatial justice. This exercise builds upon the theoretical foundations established in Deliverable 1.1 (Madanipour et al 2017), but elaborates more “concrete” perspectives through inference from the diagnosis of spatial injustice and the intervention logic of the “actions” which address it.

The Theory of Change approach (often associated with evaluation) is adapted as a means of systematically describing the approaches to spatial injustice represented by the case study actions. In this way the long term goal is specified, together with the baseline and contextual assumptions which condition the chains of intermediate outcomes which lie at the heart of every intervention. Each of these elements have something to teach us about the nature of spatial (in)justice.

This approach allows us to identify, among the 33 case studies, three main manifestations of spatial injustice:

(i) Neighbourhood Effects: Disadvantaged or poorly performing (urban) neighbourhoods, whose residents suffer additional challenges due to the stigma associated with their address, or (if they have moved away), their origin.

(ii) Territorial Disadvantage: Poorly performing territories (often rural), whose people and businesses face greater challenges in attaining an acceptable level of well-being or sustainability, due to multiple and interrelated deficits in a range of territorial capitals, (economic, social, human, community capacity), and a lack of “critical mass” for local development.

(iii) Disempowered Places: Ineffective, or inappropriate, multi-level governance structures may leave some localities feeling disempowered, relative to neighbouring administrative areas, lacking capacity to address local needs, - such as basic service provision, supporting local businesses, - with consequences for the well-being of residents, and the entrepreneurial environment.

Although all the case study actions were selected as being “place based” they exhibit a range of implementation styles. Interestingly, a majority of them are described as “top down”, and most of them use “soft” approaches to deliver greater equality of “opportunities”, (rather than “outcomes”), to communities, (rather than individuals).

The analysis of the Theory of Change diagrams for the 33 case study actions draws attention to the importance of a variety of assumptions, some of them relating to the actors and elements which are involved in the action itself, and others which are part of the exogenous context. This aspect of the analysis will later form the starting point for short-horizon foresight scenarios, to be reported in Deliverable 8.3.
Careful examination of commonly occurring chains of intermediate outcomes leads us to identify five paradigms which seem to underlie many of the actions described in our case studies. These are driven by different aspects of spatial (in)justice:

- The first proceeds from the assumption that wellbeing can be improved by attention to the built environment and open space.
- A second is driven by the belief that local development and wellbeing is contingent upon endogenous processes rooted in community and social capital.
- The third emphasizes the importance of “identity”, both in the sense of attachment to the locality, and in the sense that this highlights the unique assets of the locality, as a starting point for “place making”.
- A fourth type of logic emphasises the role of human capital, entrepreneurial environments and innovation to raise local economic performance, assuming beneficial spread effects for the rest of the locality.
- The final paradigm addresses procedural aspects of spatial justice by focusing upon administrative scale economies and cooperation as a means of giving greater weight to the voices of smaller localities and their administrations.

All of the above findings serve to add empirical “colour”, whilst at the same time confirming the essential veracity, of the definition of spatial justice articulated in Deliverable 1.1: "...an equitable spatial distribution of resources and opportunities, and fairness in the relations of power that shape and transform the social space." (Madanipour et al 2017 p14).

Furthermore the findings highlight a number of very important questions about policy considerations, some of which will be addressed by Work-package 9.
1 Introduction

This report provides an account of work which has been carried out to represent the RELOCAL case study actions in a Theory of Change (TOC) framework. This approach has been chosen because it provides a practical framework through which to build upon, and add value to, the case study resource, whilst simultaneously achieving the objectives of WP8 in terms of reconceptualising spatial justice (in an operational, policy orientated way), and systematically describing different types (or manifestations) of spatial justice. It seeks to achieve this by a focus upon the pathways between the case study actions and their long-term (spatial justice) goals, as revealed by both the internal logic of the interventions and interaction with local and wider contexts. It is assumed that this will provide valuable inputs to WP9, where policy implications will be more fully explored. In a subsequent deliverable (D8.3) the ToC analysis presented here will provide a starting point for medium-horizon future scenarios which will explore the likely future development of the case study contexts, the actions, and the aspects of spatial justice which are the focus of the case studies.

This document presents our reflections on the lessons which may be learned from the WP8 Baseline ToC reports. It begins by providing a brief introduction to ToC, and its use as a diagnostic device. The next section describes three broad manifestations of spatial (in)justice. These are based upon a review of the ToC baseline reports, and the definition of the long-term goals of the actions in particular. These three “types” of spatial (in)justice are valuable as a way to structure subsequent analysis of the ToCs. This begins with a comparison of policy implementation styles, continues with a consideration of the baseline assumption and contextual factors, and concludes with a comparison of the logic chains, or “intervention pathways” which are at their heart. The penultimate section of the report synthesises the findings and uses these as the starting point for an operational concept of spatial justice. Finally, Section 8 presents some brief reflections on the way in which the analysis presented here may be of utility in considering implications for European, national and local policy.
2 Theory of Change and Mechanism Mapping

The ToC approach (Taplin and Clark 2012, Blamey and MacKenzie 2012, Connell and Kubuisch 1998) is part of a family of approaches to policy design and evaluation which emphasizes the (self-evident) need to clearly specify the intervention logic which underpins any “action”, in order to facilitate subsequent monitoring of the policy process in relation to a logical chain of cause and effect linkages, and evaluation of the changes achieved against the clearly specified goals. The family of approaches also includes “Realistic Evaluation” (Tilley 2000, Pawson and Tilley 2001, Pawson et al 2005), “Logic Models” (Anderson et al 2011, Kaplan and Garrett 2005, MacLaughlin and Jordan 2004) and “Theory-Based Evaluation” (Stame 2004). It is also related to “Results Based Management”, (Spreckley 2009) which is the monitoring and evaluation framework favoured by DG Regio (EC Community of Practice 2014). A very good, simple practical illustration of ToC is the “Project Superwoman” worked example, which can be found on the Centre for Theory of Change Website.

Mechanism Mapping (Williams 2017, 2018) is a development which incorporates the ToC approach, but adds a particular emphasis on “external validity” – the transferability of interventions between different contexts. This leads to a focus upon “assumptions” about the environment within which the action is implemented, and the way in which (to use RELOCAL terminology) “promoters and inhibitors” affect the outcome. Although Williams focuses on the use of mechanism mapping to assess “external validity” between different geographical/policy contexts, there is no reason why the same approach should not be applied to future scenarios too (to be explored in D8.3).

In practice, the implementation of ToC and Mechanism Mapping in the Baseline Reports makes it difficult to distinguish the two, and for convenience we will use the acronym ToC to refer to both.

2.1 ToC as a Diagnostic Device

It is important to emphasise, at this point, that RELOCAL has not used ToC as a means of evaluating the case study actions, but rather as a systematic way in which to “look under the bonnet” of the case study actions, as a way to learn more about operational concepts of spatial justice, and how they may be nurtured. To introduce a second metaphor, the ToC diagrams which feature in the baseline reports (one for each of the 33 case studies) might be likened to a (simple) kind of “DNA analysis” of the actions around which the case

1 In the text which follows we will, for convenience, use the abbreviation ToC to denote both Theory of Change and Mechanism Mapping.
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studies are constructed. To press the analogy a bit further, the logic chains which at the heart of the ToC diagrams could be compared to fragments of DNA which allow us to establish family resemblances between the actions (and implied concepts of spatial justice) featured in the case studies.

2.2 ToC as implemented in the RELOCAL Baseline Reports

The Baseline Reports centre around a systematic diagram which deconstructs, using graphic conventions, the intervention logic of the action, and the assumptions upon which it is conditional. For the sake of clarity, the diagram is developed below in two stages, the first roughly equating to basic ToC, and the second to Mechanism Mapping.

The diagrams have been drawn by the case study authors, drawing on their familiarity with the action and the local context. Clearly this is an art rather than a precise science, and the privileged role of the individual authors must be taken into account when comparing the diagrams.

The numbered stages described below are illustrated by an example (Figure 1), based upon Case Study 33 (Strengthening Communities, Isle of Lewis).

**Figure 1: Example of a ToC Map (Isle of Lewis Case Study)**

1. The first step is to choose a concise name, which captures the long-term goal which the CS action seeks to achieve. This is entered in the blue box at the top.
2. Next the name of the “Action” upon which your case study is based, is added to the yellow box at the bottom.
3. Thirdly, individual “intervention(s)” are added as numbered green boxes at the bottom – the Action may consist of more than one intervention. The names are also added in the “legend” box to the right.

4. The Intermediate Outcomes are now set out, using green rectangles. These should be thought of as stepping stones (states) between the initial intervention and the Long-term Outcome.

5. The Intermediate Outcomes are then connected, using red arrows, to form “causal pathways” or “logic chains”. It is possible to have multiple links from one intermediate outcome to two or more other outcomes. A single “causal pathway” may be sufficient, or a more complex multiple pathway map may be appropriate.

6. Most of the links between the intermediate outcomes are not “automatic” – they are conditional upon cause-and-effect links which are intrinsic to the place and time of the case study. In other words, whether the causal path “works”, or not, depends on “Baseline Assumptions”. These are added to the diagram by placing the blue circles labelled A-Z alongside the causal link(s) affected by them, or the Intermediate Outcome(s) conditional on them. They are named in the legend box over on the right. There can be any number of baseline assumptions.

So far, we have specified Baseline Assumptions which are “internal” to the ToC. However, if we “zoom out” a little, we would usually find that these are, in one way or another, conditional upon drivers within the wider context of the ToC.

This external environment could be divided up in a variety of ways. We have chosen to illustrate it in three parts: the geographic, the policy, and the societal and market contexts. See Figure 2 (below) for the Isle of Lewis example.

7. Key drivers from these three contexts, which condition the current behaviour of the ToC, and could potentially change in the future, are added to the diagram (yellow circles with Roman numerals).
Figure 2: Example of a Baseline Mechanism Map (Isle of Lewis Case Study)
Three Types of Spatial Justice

Since the notion of spatial justice is rather abstract (see: Conceptual Framework presented in D1.1) and its translation into policy concepts varies among countries (see: national reports, WP 6) and localities, we can recognise a broad spectrum of approaches among the 33 cases studied within the RELOCAL Project.

However, in almost all the CS, the Action tackles some form of inequality which is associated with a place, or a category of space. Broadly speaking, the underlying motivation of the Actions is to ameliorate disparities in opportunity, potential, or socio-economic outcomes, which are in some way associated with particular locations. However, in the CS contexts (spatial) injustice generally remains implicit, it is rarely articulated by the various actors involved. However, in the Baseline ToC reports the requirement to “spell out” longer-term goals, and to explicate the (ex post) intervention logic underlying the remedial actions taken, can reveal much about local perceptions of spatial (in)justice. Reading the Baseline reports can therefore form the starting point for a tentative and inductive classification of the forms of spatial (in)justice encountered in the case studies.

Generally speaking, it seems that the implied injustice can take three different forms. These are partly differentiated in terms of the nature of the perceived injustice, and partly by the different geographic scales at which they are manifested:

1. **Neighbourhood Effects:** One of the most common is associated with (urban) residential segregation. This form of spatial injustice usually occurs on a neighbourhood scale. In this case the original concentration of deprived, disadvantaged or low-income families or individuals may be caused by ill-conceived planning policies, or by unregulated development. Spatial injustice is added by secondary effects, such as the stigma or sense of limitation, associated with coming from a disadvantaged neighbourhood, leading to narrower education and training options, difficulties finding employment, or raising capital, and so on. This kind of spatial injustice tends to be addressed by urban planning interventions which are focused upon specific districts within a city.

2. **Territorial Disadvantage:** A number of the case studies perceive spatial injustice to be associated with a locality, often a municipality, or a group of municipalities (which may be either urban or rural), within which it is for some reason more difficult to find employment, or to achieve the same level of income, or to receive the same level of services, or wellbeing, as elsewhere. The reasons for this may be purely geographical, for example, due to remoteness from major centres of economic activity, or a lack of resources. Alternatively, there may be historical reasons, related to some form of structural inertia, or a lack of local control of key resources, which inhibits economic activity. Softer forms of territorial disadvantage include an
absence of social capital, which inhibits various forms of cooperation both between individuals and local businesses, weakening local capacity for social, institutional and economic development. The key point here, in relation to spatial justice, is that, whatever the underlying reason(s) for disadvantage, it affects local residents and enterprises by “raising the bar” (in relation to comparable areas) for making a living, succeeding as a business, or achieving a satisfactory level of wellbeing. This kind of spatial injustice tends to be associated with broad-based economic and social development programmes targeting larger areas than the previous type, such as municipalities, or groups of municipalities.

3. **Disempowered Places.** A third kind of spatial injustice, which is evident in some of the case studies, derives from shortcomings in governance, administrative or institutional structures. Living or working in an area which for some reason suffers from such an institutional deficit, or lack of influence, can be prejudicial to the life chances of individuals, or to the growth prospects of businesses. For example, municipalities which have experienced demographic shrinking, or which are just too small to benefit from scale economies are commonly vulnerable to such place-based institutional disadvantages. This kind of spatial injustice is indicated where the policy response is centred upon administrative or institutional reform. It is experienced by local communities (municipalities) but the solution often lies in cooperation across larger territories.

A few of the 33 case studies were very difficult to classify; they seem to represent combinations of (two of) the three kinds of spatial (in)justice described above.

The three kinds of spatial (in)justice above all address two key components which were identified in the RELOCAL Conceptual Framework (D1.1, Madanipour et al 2017) i.e. *distributional* and *procedural* justice, but, arguably, to different degrees. Thus, in Neighbourhood Effects the concentration of poverty and disadvantage, and the subsequent stigma effects are arguably very much about distributional justice, whilst (external) prejudice, and the weakness of social capital and institutional capacity within the neighbourhood are often caused by (secondary) procedural effects. Similarly, Territorial Disadvantage will usually be associated with both components of spatial justice, with procedural effects growing as the endogenous capacity of the region diminishes. In the third kind of spatial justice, Disempowered Places, procedural justice is very much the driver, any distributional affects being secondary impacts. A classification of the CS according to the thee typologies is provided in Table 1.
### Table 1: Case Study Type and Spatial Justice Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS No.</th>
<th>Name (Baseline Report)</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Neighbourhood E.</th>
<th>Territorial Disadvant.</th>
<th>Disempowered P.</th>
<th>SJ Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smart Countryside Ostwestfalen-Lippe</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Youth Centre Görlitz</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Post Mining Regional Strategy for W. Macedonia</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alexander Innovation Zone</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Overcoming Fragmentation in Territorial Governance</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Karditsa’s Ecosystem of Collaboration</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Monistrol 2020 – Local Strategic Plan</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Llei de Barris in Premiá de Dalt</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Transformation Plan for La Mina Neighbourhood</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Assoc. of Municipalities – Eix de la Riera de Caldes</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lieksa Development Strategy 2030</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Civil Action Initiative in Kotka</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Give Kids a Chance</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gyögy-telep – Urban Regeneration</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Production Organisation – Szentes Town</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Balaton LEADER</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Euralens</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>EPA Alzette-Belval</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Northeast Groningen</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>National Programme Rotterdam South</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Participatory Budget for Lodz</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Communal service – social cooperative</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Goth Village</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rural Public Spaces</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pata Cluj Project</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mara-Natur LEADER</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mălin-Codlea</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Regenerating Plumbuita</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Digital Västerbotten</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Stockholm Commission</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Northumberland LAG</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Homelessness Project in Lewisham</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Strengthening Communities – Isle of Lewis</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Styles of Implementation

Examining and comparing the CS Actions can inform about the different styles of implementation of actions designed to strengthen or restore spatial justice. More importantly, in the context of this deliverable, these approaches open a window upon stakeholder, and policy practitioner, perceptions of the nature of spatial justice itself.

Table 2 provides a list of dichotomous characteristics which may be inferred from actions addressing spatial justice. These are not mutually exclusive, but neither are they necessarily “correlated/associated” in fixed ways.

The fact that some of the actions involve investing in “hard” infrastructure (roads, business incubator units etc), whilst others focus entirely on “soft” interventions, (training, social or business network building, cooperation, provision of information) reminds us that spatial (in)justice involves both material environmental features and less tangible human, social and institutional characteristics of the local environment.

A similar, but separate distinction could be made (at least in theory) between policy approaches which seek to improve procedural justice through institutional adjustments, (for example by countering territorial stigma effects), from those which seek to improve outcomes directly, and thus to enhance distributional justice.

The effects of spatial injustice may be both aggregate and/or individual, and it is therefore appropriate that the direct beneficiaries of the CS actions are sometimes groups or economic sectors, and sometimes individuals, families or businesses. In both cases the initiative for the intervention may be either “top down” or “bottom up”.

Spatial (in)justice can be driven by quite specific issues, or, by contrast, may be woven throughout broad (place based) socio-economic systems. These differing situations often trigger different responses, narrow and focused or broad and systemic.

In most cases, by definition, the “baseline” to which local opportunities, potential or outcomes are compared relates to the surrounding areas, or a national or regional average. In a few cases, such as in response to natural disasters, such as earthquakes, the comparison may be with a past state within the same region.
### Table 2: Key dimensions of policy approaches to Spatial Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soft vs hard</td>
<td>“Hard” actions refer to infrastructural improvements and, in general, actions aimed at improving the material capital of the territory; “soft” actions target immaterial capital (social, human, cultural), e.g. marketing, education, festivals, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural vs distributive</td>
<td>“Procedural” actions address institutions and procedures to make them fairer towards disadvantaged territories; “distributive” actions address the distribution of goods, services and opportunities to achieve a more balanced endowment of the territories; these two aspects could coexist in a single action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity vs outcome</td>
<td>“Opportunity” actions, inspired by an understanding of spatial justice as equality of opportunities, aim at building equal opportunities for a territory or its people (e.g. education &amp; training, advice &amp; support); “outcome” actions, based on an understanding of spatial justice as equality of outcomes, tend to deliver the final material or immaterial goods (e.g. jobs, housing, land, funding).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual vs community</td>
<td>“Individual” actions tend to target individuals/households, in general aiming at improving a community’s situation by improving the conditions of its parts (e.g. education &amp; training); “community” actions target the community as a whole, seen as the main policy recipient (e.g. infrastructures, festivals).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom-up vs top-down</td>
<td>“Bottom-up” actions are promoted by local stakeholders possibly in collaboration with local administrations; “top-down” actions are promoted by the national government (or by upper tier administrations) with limited involvement of the local actors, and tend to be quite standardised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad vs focused</td>
<td>“Broad” actions tend to have general (overarching) goals, such as the overall economic development of an area, and thus tend to include a large number of constituting interventions; “focused” actions are more targeted, i.e. they intervene in a single sector, or have a specific goal, although they can generate larger benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal vs external baseline</td>
<td>“Internal baseline” actions aim at restoring a previously existing local baseline in terms of wellbeing that was compromised by a location-specific event (e.g. funds for home repair after earthquakes); “external baseline” actions see spatial injustice as a deviation from a baseline wellbeing defined externally, usually at national level (e.g. for rural areas).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 shows how these dichotomous characteristics were observed in the 33 case studies. In the brief description which follows the third “type” of spatial justice is not discussed separately, due to the small number of cases.
Figure 3: Policy characteristics illustrated by the Case Studies
**Soft v Hard:** The majority of actions (19) incorporate a mixture of soft and hard interventions. Of the remaining 14 actions, 12 use mainly soft forms of intervention.

**Procedural v Distributional:** Again, the majority of actions (15) address both aspects of spatial justice. The remaining 18 actions are evenly split overall. Within the Neighbourhood Effect subset distributional aspects are dominant in the majority of case studies, whilst in the Territorial Disadvantage group procedural issues are slightly more commonly addressed.

**Opportunities v Outcomes:** More than half the case study actions address equality of opportunity, rather than outcomes directly. The dominance of this approach is particularly evident in the Territorial Disadvantage group. In the Neighbourhood Effect group the majority of actions are mixed, and of the remainder there are slightly more actions which go directly to outcomes.

**Individual v Community:** Two thirds of the actions address community rather than individual needs. Of the remainder the majority are mixed. Only two actions focus mainly upon individuals.

**Bottom-up v Top-down:** Almost half the actions are judged to be mainly top-down. However, the sub-groups show different patterns: Most Neighbourhood Effect actions are carried out in a predominantly top-down manner, whilst the Territorial Disadvantage group is quite evenly split between actions which are “mixed” and those which are bottom-up.

**Broad v Focused:** More than half the case study actions are seen as broad rather than focussed. This bias is more evident in the Neighbourhood Effect group than in the Territorial Disadvantage group, where an equal number of actions are considered focused.

**Internal v External baselines:** The overwhelming majority of actions (24) were seen as addressing inequality in relation to baselines external to the case study area. There was no strong difference between the sub-groups in this respect.

In addition, there are some relationships between the seven dichotomies:

- None of the “soft” actions are at the same time “distributive” actions, and most of these are “community” actions – e.g. CS 2, 5, 15, 16
- Most “opportunity” actions are also “community” actions - e.g CS 1, 3, 21, 33
- Most “community” actions are “broad” actions and at the same time “opportunity” actions – e.g CS 3, 5, 9, 11
- “Bottom up” actions are not “hard” ones – they are “soft” (CS 6, 11, 12) or “mixed” (CS 10, 19, 21, 23)
- Most “broad” actions are “community” and “soft” - e.g. CS 5, 11, 17, 30

We may conclude that the typical case study action addresses both distributional and procedural aspects of spatial justice, using a combination of hard and soft approaches, to
enhance opportunities (rather than to directly deliver outcomes), for communities rather than individuals, through broad, rather than focused, top-down policies, with a view to spatial justice defined by a baseline exogenous to the region.

One of the most striking differences between the Neighbourhood Effect and Territorial Disadvantage subgroups related to top-down and bottom-up implementation, the former group being more likely to have top-down approach and the latter more likely to use a bottom up style. Territorial disadvantage actions also seem to be more likely to use broad (rather than focused) actions, which create opportunities, rather than deliver outcomes.
5 Meta-Analysis of the Case Study Action’s Theories of Change

5.1 What ToC elements tell us about Spatial Justice

In order to identify important facts about spatial justice and allow for generalisation of the findings, a meta-analysis of the ToC schemes was implemented. Long-term goals, baseline assumptions and contextual conditions, within three identified “types” of spatial injustice (Neighbourhood Effects, Territorial Disadvantage and Disempowered Places), were extracted from the Baseline reports, grouped into categories and further reduced in order to achieve a higher level of generalisation.

5.1.1 The long-term goal

At a very general level, the long-term goal of the actions described is to improve life quality, and enhance opportunities, in the area targeted. However, within the three types of spatial justice, this very broad aim is being achieved by focusing on different problems, different target groups, and by using different tools to implement changes (see: Figure 4).

Interventions presented in ToC reports for the “Neighbourhood Effect” category of spatial injustice aim at targeting the problems of poverty, segregation, and polarization by means of ad hoc interventions, or through promoting economic revitalisation and renewal in the area, so that everyone can benefit from spill-over effects. Key targets of these actions are vulnerable categories and/or the youth, due to the long-term effect of intervening on the latter – e.g.: CS 2, 25, 28. Housing (affordability, good quality, no spatial segregation) is the most frequent field of intervention in this specific group – e.g.: CS 27, 32.

Considering the “Territorial Disadvantage” category of spatial injustice, actions described in ToC reports, aimed at reducing development disparities framing living conditions and quality of life as perceived by people in target areas such as: rural municipalities, remote areas, post-industrial regions. Interventions are mainly focused on finding alternative development paths and new functions of particular areas through integrated or inclusive development programs requiring empowerment of social capital (CS 2, 11, 12, 13, 23, 24), cooperation of various institutions and organisations within the area (CS 17, 19, 26, 31, 33) as well as institutional or administrative changes (CS 4, 6, 7). Digitisation as a tool for sustainable development has been implemented especially in remote, rural areas lacking the “critical mass” to provide sufficient access to goods and services for residents – e.g.: CS 1, 29.

Actions implemented within the third category of spatial (in)justice – “Disempowered Places” are mainly focused on the areas' sustainable development profile. Disempowered places are often as small-scale municipalities (which are merged in order to improve their
situation in the future –CS 5), border areas (in which cross-border governance model are implemented – CS 18), or localities under economic transitions – challenging for providing goods and services to local people as well as attracting investments (CS 10).

The analysis of the terms used in defining the Long-term Goals in the Baseline reports is illustrated in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Key statements addressing long-term goals presented in all ToC reports

Note: the size of the font corresponds to the frequency of particular statement being used.

5.1.2 General Baseline Assumptions and Contextual Conditions & Drivers

The results of the analysis of baseline assumptions and contextual conditions and drivers, that framed intermediate outcomes of the actions and their final goals, have been presented and interpreted below (Figures 5-8). In these diagrams, the size of the graphic elements represents the importance (frequency) of baseline assumptions – collected in the inner ring chart, and of contextual conditions and drivers – collected in the outer bubble chart. These represent internal and external factors which influence the interventions in their pursuit of spatial justice. The graphics also show the “key words” which identify specific categories of these internal and external factors.

At a very general level, in almost all CS actions the most important Baseline Assumption categories are represented by human and social capital, institutions and administrative
structures, geography and society, political will, exogenous conditions, the presence of leaders, efficient funding, adequate scale and scope of the action and local economy (Figure 5).

Human capital and social capital assumptions include the sufficiency and quality of human capital, and willingness to learn, e.g. digital empowerment (CS 1, 29), learning capacity (CS 4, 8, 22, 23), existing social trust, level of willingness to collaborate (CS 6, 8, 9, 12, 16, 28), and stability in terms of the persons managing the action. Baseline assumptions that focus on institutions and administration underline the need for adequate institutional settings (CS 9, 10, 17, 18, 19, 22, 25, 26, 30), as well as effective governance practices (CS 5, 12, 16, 33). Many of the ToC reports stated that the geographical and social conditions framing the action are given and they are not subject to sudden exogenous change. This was also true in regard to local assets such as housing, services, household stability (CS 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 33), demographic stability or growth (CS 2, 24, 31), and economic stability or growth in general (CS 15, 22, 25, 26, 28, 32). The importance of the level of commitment (political will) of public authorities and other key stakeholders is underlined in 13 ToC reports (CS 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 20, 25, 29, 30, 32). Ten reports pay much attention to recognised leaders who are able to manage the action during its whole duration (CS 3, 6, 10, 11, 12, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30). In a few cases an appropriate scale and scope of the action is outlined (CS 5, 8, 9, 19) as well as available and efficient funding (CS 2, 3, 15, 16, 18, 19, 26, 31).

Often, some of these assumptions do not hold, e.g. there are no opportunities to valorise local assets; there are embedded biases (in the actors implementing the action, or in labour and housing markets) which undermine the delivery of the expected outcome; social capital is weak, local people have limited interest in the action, the political situation is not stable, etc.

The contextual conditions can refer to the geographical, societal and market, or policy contexts. Since there is a great overlapping between the groups, all conditions are here presented together, specifying in which out of the three categories (geo, soc, pol), they are most often indicated.

Considering all CS actions, the most important Contextual Conditions and Drivers categories are represented by: (1) opportunities in terms of asset valorization (geo); (2) continuity or discontinuity of political, technical or administrative support (pol); (3) economic conditions – crisis, decline or growth (soc); (4) neighbouring areas in terms of comparative advantages or disadvantages (soc) but also in terms of territorial coherence (pol); and (5) demography in terms of favourable or unfavourable processes of natural change and mobility (soc) but also in the regional context (geo). In a few ToC reports, authors pay attention to administrative coordination of described actions, or lack thereof (CS 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 18) as well as to development strategies at different administrative levels – from local, through national, to EU.
5.1.3 The Type 1 (Neighbourhood Effect) Group

If we focus upon the Baseline ToC reports addressing the first generic type of spatial justice - Neighbourhood Effect - the most frequently described baseline assumption is the institutional setting. This underpins effective institutional solutions, administration capabilities, issues of management, autonomy or dependency of territorial units and cooperation between different authorities (CS 20, 22, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32). Human capital (in terms of willingness to learn) and social capital (in terms of civic engagement and collaboration), are also important in this group of actions (CS 8, 9, 20, 22, 25, 28, 30). Linked with human capital, but underlined only in this type of interventions, were
baseline assumptions of formal education as a tool to achieve equal life opportunities and competitive labor markets (CS 20).

The most important contextual conditions and drivers within the Neighbourhood Effect group were connected with demography (favourable or unfavourable structures and processes) assigned both to geographical and social context. Social policy, especially focusing on problems of housing and socio-economic welfare, assigned to all three contexts – geography, society and market, policy, were in second place, and specific only for this group of actions (CS 20, 25, 27, 28, 30). Continuity of institutional and financial support by local authorities, leaders, cultural and business entities, assigned to policy context was underlined in four reports out of ten in this group (CS 8, 20, 22, 28).

Figure 6: Baseline Assumptions and Contextual Conditions & Drivers for Neighbourhood Effects group
5.1.4 The Type 2 (Territorial Disadvantage) Group

Among all baseline assumptions important in the scope of Territorial Disadvantage group, special attention is paid to human capital (CS 2, 13, 15, 17, 23, 24, 29, 31, 33) and social capital (CS 4, 6, 16, 17, 19, 24, 26, 33). In some cases, these two categories overlap. Many reports underlined the need for existing human and social capital as a trigger for further development of creativity, digital competences and strategic learning capacities in the implementation of interventions. Local assets such as: natural environment, cultural heritage, economic specialization, (provided they are stable and not a subject of a sudden, unexpected change), are also important in this group of actions (CS 3, 4, 6, 7, 17, 19, 23, 24, 26, 33). Stable institutional settings, the will among stakeholders to implement actions, adequate funding, effective leaders and other endogenous conditions were also included in ToC diagrams as factors shaping the intermediate outcomes of particular interventions. “Rule of law” is a baseline assumption about ensuring the application of the decisions related to the action, which is specific to the Territorial Disadvantage group (CS 7, 11).

Among local contextual conditions and drivers, the availability of, and equality of access to, “opportunities”, were most frequently cited, across geographical, socio-economic and political contexts. Underlying economic conditions – (whether they are stable or not, the subject of growth or decline) also a seem to play an important role. Neighbouring areas – in terms of comparative advantages or disadvantages were frequently indicated as geographical context, especially for cases framed in border regions, metropolitan areas, rural urban fringe (CS 2, 3, 4, 7, 17, 31). However, in terms of development strategies focusing of territorial coherence, they were indicated as political context (CS 7, 17, 31). Continuity of support, as the main condition within the policy context, was outlined in 12 out of 18 reports. The importance of this particular driver results from the nature of these actions – usually broad and long-term strategic regional programs aiming at structural economic or administrative reforms (CS 1, 2, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 23, 24, 26, 33).
5.1.5 The Type 3 (Disempowered Places) Group

Three baseline assumptions: (1) political will, (2) institutional setting, (3) geographical and social issues were the most frequently cited in this group. This distinctive set of assumptions befits this specific type of spatial injustice, which although experienced by local communities (municipalities?), can often be addressed by changes in governance structures, institutions and cooperation across larger territories.

Contextual conditions and drivers seem to follow the same narrative. The political environment and cooperation of institutions on various levels of administration especially over strategic planning of development are the most frequent contextual condition in this type of cases (CS 5, 10, 18). Within the geographical context, attention is again paid to neighboring areas – their character and comparative advantages or
disadvantages, as well as coherence of implemented policies (CS 5, 18). For this group, key aspects of the social and market context included potential economic or social changes (such as new development paths: from industry to services; change in housing needs, economic crisis etc.), which were seen as future opportunities or threats (CS 5, 10, 18).

Figure 8: Baseline Assumptions and Contextual Conditions & Drivers for Disempowered Places group

In order to summarize what we have learned about spatial injustice from the long-term goals, baseline assumptions, contextual conditions and drivers described in the ToC Baseline reports, a semantic field analysis technique was implemented. This technique derives from linguistic studies which began in the 1930s and may be also associated with a qualitative text analysis or discourse analysis (Carley 1990). Analysing the semantic field consists in separating the elements of a statement only to put them back together in accordance with their meaningful readability. In our case, this activity consisted in (1)
extracting all the long-term goals, baseline assumptions and contextual conditions from ToC reports, (2) their grouping into homogenous categories within three types of spatial justice and (3) making it possible to read their full meaning and the context in which they appear. We have built an inventory consisting of six fields (Table 3).

**Table 3: Spatial justice semantic field based on ToC reports**

| Definitions – indicating the features of spatial justice according to analysed elements (long-term goals, baseline assumptions and contextual conditions) | Providing all persons with equal opportunities to carry a decent life in line with their aspirations in the place where they decide to settle regardless of the characteristics of this place and of their place of origin |
| Associations – indicating what spatial justice is associated with, what it entails; | Improving living conditions and the quality of life as perceived by individuals, enhancing opportunities |
| Oppositions – indicating its opposites; | Stigmatisation, polarisation, spatial segregation, inequalities in living conditions and life opportunities |
| Equivalents – expressions which may substitute spatial justice in particular contexts; | Social justice, a fair economic competition, guarantee of minimum living standards |
| Activities undertaken towards spatial justice; | From ad hoc, specific and narrow interventions, to broadly understood renewal activities consisting of socio-economic and spatial transformations. |
| Effects of spatial justice on target groups and target area; | Everyone benefits: vulnerable groups, plus the spill-over effects |

*Based on Robin (1980).*
5.2 What do Intermediate Outcome Pathways tell us about the Paradigms which drive Policy?

In terms of the RELOCAL ToC diagram template, the intermediate outcome pathways are a collection of green boxes occupying the centre of the graphic, and connected by red arrows, indicating that the intermediate outcomes form links in chains of causality, initiated by the intervention, and stepping towards the long-term goal of improving spatial justice.

For example, a simple chain, with the long-term aim of delivering equality of well-being in a lagging region, might begin with an intervention to train local people, to better equip them to participate in, and contribute to, local development initiatives. This should lead to a first intermediate outcome of greater community development capacity. This in turn could be expected to help the community to lobby for, or organize themselves, better services. A third link in the chain might be that better services provide a better environment for enterprise, and a more attractive destination for in-migrants. As a consequence of this chain of contingent outcomes the area attains development momentum, and critical mass, so that the long-term goal of the action becomes achievable.

Most of the ToC diagrams developed for the case studies feature two, or even three “chains” of intermediate outcomes, which jointly lead to the long-term goal. Often there are links between these pathways, showing that they are mutually supportive.

The 33 ToC diagrams are reproduced in Annex 1. The full baseline ToC reports are available as a separate document (Annex 2).

5.2.1 Commonly Occurring Pathways

Each of the ToC diagrams is unique, not only in terms of the local situation which it illustrates, but also because reality is mediated through the perception and judgement of the 33 case study authors. Nevertheless, keeping this in mind, a review of the 33 ToC diagrams suggests that there are a number of common pathways. These are combined in the ToCs in a variety of ways. Sometimes they are abbreviated, in other cases they are fully

---

3 Strictly speaking the diagrams reproduced in Annex 1 are “Mechanism Maps, because they incorporate contextual conditions and drivers. We use the term ToC here for conciseness and convenience.
articulated. By analogy these may be seen as DNA fragments which provide clues to the underlying paradigms which have (consciously or unconsciously) steered the local stakeholders responsible for the actions. We shall organize our account of the Common Pathways according to the three types of Spatial (In)justice introduced in Section 2.

5.2.2  The Type 1 (Neighbourhood Effect) Group

1.1  The first common pathway relates to the improvement of public spaces and other aspects of the urban built environment. This is said to have both a direct effect upon well-being, (personal security, health benefits of access to open/green space) and a secondary benefits in terms of community cohesion, social capital, and community capacity. This features in case studies 8, 9, and 21.

![Figure 10: Example of the Public Space Pathway (CS8)](image)

1.2  The second common pathway also relates to a part of the physical urban environment, but is more specific, in that it deals with housing improvement, and its use to revitalise deprived communities, to improve wellbeing, and to address issues of social segregation. This pathway can be observed in case studies 14, 25 and 32.
1.3 The third common pathway is variously labelled “community empowerment”, “capacity building”, “cooperation”, “integration”. This pathway is “softer” than the preceding two, being concerned with human/social/institutional capacity. This kind of pathway can be observed in case studies 8, 9, 14, 20, and 21.

Figure 11: The Housing Improvement Pathway (CS14)

Figure 12: An Example of a Community Empowerment pathway (CS21)
5.2.3 The Type 2 (Territorial Disadvantage) Group

There are 4 “generic” pathways observed within the Territorial Disadvantage group:

2.1 The first has already been described above. It may be termed the Community Capacity Building pathway. It can be observed in case studies 1, 2, 6, 12, 13, 17, 24, 30, 31 and 33. In the majority of these case studies, the goal relates to opportunities and well-being in the case study locality as a whole, compared with other regions around it. In two cases (12, and 13) the goal is to deliver equality of opportunity (inclusion) for disadvantaged groups within the case study area.

2.2 A second common pathway might be described as Boosting Enterprise. This chain begins with various forms of support designed to nurture, or increase capacity for entrepreneurship, including training, advice, networking, and marketing support. This pathway is observable in the ToC diagrams of case studies 4, 6, 7, 11, 23, 26, and 31.

Figure 13: Example of a Community Capacity Building Pathway (CS1)
2.3 A third pathway (Identity Building) is similar, in some ways, to Community Capacity Building, but is orientated to strengthening the identity, and improving the
image of the case study locality. This chain of logic can be observed in the ToC diagrams of case studies 2, 7, 11, and 23.

2.4 One of the case studies, (24) exhibits a causal pathway which does not fit into any of the above categories. It centres upon a set of intermediate outcomes which relate to the local environment and public space. As such it is perhaps more closely related to the “Public Space” logic chain which is recurrent within the Neighbourhood Effects group.

![Figure 16: An example of a Public Space Pathway (Left) (CS24)](image)

5.2.4 The Disempowered Place Group

There being just three case studies in this group it is less easy to identify common pathways. The overall “philosophy” of these actions seems to centre upon cooperation in order to achieve scale economies and critical administrative mass. CS10, for example, envisages the Association of Municipalities directing the benefits along two pathways, one focusing on economic development, and the other strengthening territorial identity. We might term these pathways “administrative scale economies”.

---
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Figure 17: An example of an Administrative Scale Economy pathway (CS10).
6 An Operational Concept of Spatial Justice

6.1 The objective

In this final section of our report we would like to draw together some conclusions which address the key objective of WP8 “re-conceptualising spatial justice”. In order to achieve this, it will be helpful to place the findings described above into the context of the Conceptual Framework of RELOCAL, as set out in D1.1.

The first seven sections of D1.1 provide an account of a number of components, and related ideas; space and spatiality, social and spatial justice, territorial cohesion, sustainable development, solidarity, regionalism and localism. The final section brings these elements together in “a theoretical framework for RELOCAL”.

Before commenting upon this framework, and considering what we have learned in WP8 through the use of the ToC approach, it is perhaps worth emphasising that developing a conceptual (or theoretical) framework is overwhelmingly an academic exercise. Whilst it may refer to policy paradigms (such as that of Cohesion Policy) it would not normally stray beyond the realm of abstract ideas and logic. It is entirely appropriate that such a framework should be delivered in academic language.

By contrast, the underlying mission of WP8 is to review the empirical work carried out in earlier work packages, and the case studies of WP6 in particular to see what they have to tell us about how spatial justice is understood by policy stakeholders, and how, in practice, the 33 “actions” seek to promote it.

6.2 Spatial Justice, and the Project Hypothesis, as defined by D1.1

A number of alternative formulations of a definition of spatial justice are presented in D1.1 (p75). A selection of these are reproduced in Box 1 (below). Perhaps the most concise version is “...an equitable spatial distribution of resources and opportunities, and fairness in the relations of power that shape and transform the social space.” The other quotations in Box 1 serve to emphasise the close alignment to social justice, the importance of distributional and procedural processes, and the relevance of the temporal dimension.

However, it would be wrong to give the impression that the RELOCAL project is solely concerned with the concept of spatial justice. In fact, the focus on spatial justice is given a strong policy relevance, by associating it, within a research hypothesis, with localisation and place-based policy. This hypothesis is stated (D1.1 p74) as follows:

“...the processes of localisation and place-based public policy can make a positive contribution to spatial justice and democratic empowerment.”
Box 1: The Concept of Spatial Justice according to D1.1 (p75)

“The concept of spatial justice indicates equity in social space, integrating five dimensions of justice: social, procedural, distributive, spatial and temporal, which distinguish it from these related concepts.”

“... social processes find spatial expression and spatial processes influence the social processes. Spatial justice is the term that is used to capture this dialectical relationship...”

“Spatial justice is the spatial dimension of social justice.”

“Spatial justice, therefore, means an equitable spatial distribution of resources and opportunities, and fairness in the relations of power that shape and transform the social space.

Spatial justice (incorporating social justice) focuses on both the just geographic distribution of resources and opportunities, and on the power relations that cause (in)justice between social groups and between spaces. Social and spatial justice are complex and overlapping theoretical concepts, with a strong normative character and a wide variety of different interpretations.”

6.3 In What Sense “Re-Conceptualising”?

It should be emphasised that “re-conceptualising” spatial justice was not intended to mean articulation of an alternative definition – or that the definition quoted above would no longer be applicable. This is made clear once the phrase is quoted in the context of the WP description:

“The objective of this work package is to integrate results achieved in previous work packages by linking the theory (WP1), empirical quantitative and qualitative research (WP2-6) to policy debates (WP9) by:

- re-conceptualising spatial justice described widely within different contexts: in a theoretical context in WP1, in a policy, governance and practice context in WP3-4, and empirically in WP2 and WP5-6,...”

This makes clear that the intention was rather to illustrate, and to express in more concrete terms, in a variety of contexts, how the concept of spatial justice is understood, and acted upon, by policy practitioners, and by ordinary people. This has been achieved through the analysis reported above through the following steps:

- Expressing the case study actions in a concise, standardised and systematic format (Baseline ToCs).
- Deriving three broad types of spatial (in)justice addressed by the actions.
- Assessing each ToC in terms of a set of dichotomous characteristics.
• Categorizing elements of 33 ToC: long-term goals, baseline assumptions and contextual conditions and drivers to synthesise results within Semantic Field Analysis.
• Identifying common “causal pathways” in the baseline ToCs – illustrating different approaches to addressing the three broad types of spatial justice issue encountered.

6.4 What have we learned about (operational) spatial justice?

The baseline ToC reports highlighted 33 actions perceived by the case study authors to be place-based or local interventions, addressing three common manifestations of spatial injustice:

(i) People who live in disadvantaged or poorly performing (urban) neighbourhoods suffer an additional challenge due to the stigma associated with their address, or (if they have moved away), their origin.

(ii) People and businesses in poorly performing territories (often rural), face greater challenges in attaining an acceptable level of well-being or sustainability, due to multiple and interrelated deficits in a range of territorial capitals, (economic, social, human, community capacity), and a lack of “critical mass” for local development.

(iii) Ineffective, or inappropriate, multi-level governance structures may leave some localities feeling disempowered, relative to neighbouring administrative areas, lacking capacity to address local needs, - such as basic service provision, supporting local businesses, - with consequences for the well-being of residents, and the entrepreneurial environment.

It is not claimed that these three manifestations are representative of the full range of spatial justice issues. The 33 selected actions to some extent represent the interests and (local) knowledge of the RELOCAL consortium. However, they do provide a window on “real world”, concrete, situations of injustice, as opposed to the abstract generic theories of the academic literature.

6.5 Common policy (implementation) approaches to spatial justice

All of the 33 case study actions are, by definition, “place based”. However, they vary considerably in the degree to which they could be described as “bottom up”. Perhaps surprisingly almost half the actions were judged to be conceived and carried out in a predominantly top-down manner. This was particularly evident in the Neighbourhood Effect cases. Most of the interventions we studied were mixed in terms of “soft” (people and institution based), versus “hard” approaches (investment in material infrastructure). Most addressed both procedural and distributional aspects of spatial justice. Most focus upon equality of opportunity, rather than outcomes, and at a community, rather than an individual level. More than half the actions were considered broad rather than focused,
and the majority addressed inequalities between the case study locality and other areas, rather than intra-area disparities.

The evidence thus suggests that actions to address spatial justice draw upon a fairly wide repertoire of forms and styles of intervention, mixing and matching in flexible ways. Notwithstanding the commonalities between the approaches adopted with respect to the three broad types of spatial justice, there are also some nuances of differentiation.

6.6 Baseline assumptions and the role of context

Interesting patterns emerge when we compare baseline assumptions and contextual conditions with characteristics of implementation styles summarized in Figure 3 (p. 15).

Among all Baseline Assumptions, the presence of an appropriate level of human capital appears to be most important in (1) “opportunity” actions seeking equal opportunities for a territory or its people, (2) “community” actions targeting local communities as a whole and (3) “external baseline” actions which see spatial injustice as a deviation from a baseline wellbeing externally defined. Institutions and administrative structures is a harmonized category for baseline assumptions most frequent in (3) “external baseline” actions and (4) “broad” actions with general (overarching) goals, including a number of constituting interventions. The presence of local assets, in terms of geography, historical heritage, economic and social condition (also social capital), which can be valorized, are important factors for (1) “Opportunity” actions and (2) “community” actions as well as for (5) “soft actions”. Strong interest and commitment by public authorities and other stakeholders is most common for (6) “top-down” actions – most reliant on political will and support. Efficient and continuous funding is most important for (2) “community” actions.

Among Contextual Conditions and Drivers, opportunities identified with assets, within the geographical context, are most frequent for (1) “Opportunity” actions, (2) “community” actions and (3) “external baseline” actions. Continuity or discontinuity of political, technical or administrative support as well as economic conditions (growth, stability, decline/crisis) are important to (4) “Broad” actions, (2) “community” actions and (3) “external baseline” actions. (4) “Broad” actions are also seen as dependent on demographic changes and situation in neighboring areas.

6.7 Intervention pathways

Although all the case study actions are, of course, unique, and perceptions of the case study authors result in idiosyncratic ToC diagrams, it is interesting to note that a number of common causal pathways may be identified (section 5.2). At a further level of generalisation these seem to fall into five generic “paradigms” for enhancing social justice:

- The first proceeds from the assumption that wellbeing can be improved by attention to the built environment and open space.
A second is driven by the belief that local development and wellbeing is contingent upon endogenous processes rooted in community and social capital.

The third emphasizes the importance of “identity”, both in the sense of attachment to the locality, and in the sense that this highlights the unique assets of the locality, as a starting point for “place making”.

A fourth type of logic emphasizes the role of human capital, entrepreneurial environments and innovation to raise local economic performance through increasing wealth creation, assuming beneficial spread effects for the rest of the locality.

The final paradigm addresses procedural aspects of spatial justice by focusing upon administrative scale economies and cooperation as a means of giving greater weight to the voices of smaller localities and their administrations.

**6.8 Next Steps**

The focus of the current report has been upon exploring the richness of the case studies in a systematic way in order to develop the empirical profile of the concept of spatial justice, and the ways in which it is commonly addressed by place-based policies. The next deliverable (D8.3) will report findings from a short horizon foresight analysis, which will use the ToC Baseline reports as a starting point for scenarios for the case study actions within the changed context of 2030, as envisaged by the case study partners and local stakeholders.

The findings reported here are also provided as an input to the work of WP9 (Policy Considerations). The ToC approach which structures the analysis of WP8 is intended to shed light upon intervention logics and policy paradigms. It is hoped that the insights acquired will provide a variety of useful points of departure for practical policy advice. Some of the key questions raised are presented in the concluding section below.
7 Some Reflections pointing forward to Policy Implications

The findings presented above provide a window on the way in which 33 place-based policy actions, in 11 EU Member States seek to address a variety of issues of spatial injustice. Many of these actions are carried out within the framework of EU Cohesion Policy. Others are components of national, regional or local policy. The questions which arise from considering the work reported in this deliverable will of course be shaped by the specific interests and responsibilities of the reader. They may, for example, include:

- Is the relative importance of top-down and bottom up approaches revealed by the 33 case studies representative of the situation across the EU and across all parts of Cohesion Policy? Is the balance right? Is bottom up always best?
- Similarly, is the finding that soft approaches dominate representative? Is this a welcome trend, or is there a risk of going too far?
- The common “paradigms” are very widespread (though in local forms). Can we say anything about which is more effective, in which kinds of environments?
- To what extent do the findings show that place-based approaches are more effective than “spatially blind” policy?
- Could the ToC approach, making assumptions and logic explicit, improve the design and local implementation of future policy measures?
- What seem to be the key barriers, challenges and bottlenecks for local, place-based policy to address spatial justice?
- What has the analysis of baseline assumptions and contexts to tell us about how future policy to address spatial justice might evolve?
- How do the three types of spatial justice issue (Neighbourhood Effects, Territorial Disadvantage, and Disempowered Places) map onto different elements of Cohesion Policy? How is this likely to change in the next programming period?
- To what extent should there be prioritisation between the three types of spatial justice in EU Cohesion policy. Do current proposals for the next funding period reflect such priorities?

Of course, some of these questions are strongly political, rather than academic, and the focus of future research within RELOCAL will reflect the limitations of imposed by the need for objectivity and impartiality. Nevertheless the above example serve to emphasise the high degree of practical relevance of the analysis carried out in Workpackage 8.
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Type 1: Neighbourhood Effects
Baseline Assumptions

A. Adequate housing can remain affordable
B. Capacity building can help to overcome structural unemployment
C. Integrated living environment increases opportunities
D. Housing and social regulations on higher scales will not be exclusionary
E. Basic prerequisites of community building exist

Contextual Conditions and Drivers

I. Changing urban geography of the city
II. Local politics
III. EU regulations
IV. Economic position of the city
V. Market cycles

Interventions

1. Soft interventions tackling poverty
2. Hard interventions tackling housing poverty
CS20: Rotterdam South: NL

Positive correlation school hours - school performance
Interdisciplinary approach to problems
Effective peer coaching
Home base in order
Talent development
Wellbeing, social skills, knowledgeability
Competitive labour markets
Triangle labour market perspectives, societal integration
Life chances for the younger generation
Regional economic development Rotterdam region
Stakeholder acceptance of interventions
Changes in national and local government

Geographical Context

Societal and Market Context

Spatial Justice

Accountability Ceiling

Empowering young people

Better school performance
Less social problems
Broader view on the world
Better societal integration

Enhanced competences and capabilities
Better labour market perspectives
Improved life chances for the younger generation

Policy Context (EU, National, Local)

Additional school hours
Neighbourhood Intervention Teams
Mentors
CS21: Participatory Budget for Lodz: PL

ASSUMPTIONS and CONTINGENCIES

A. Role of the local leader(s)
B. Capability of collaborating
C. Learning capacities
D. Role of the organizational units of the City of Lodz Office as a moderators

The city of disparities
Spatial justice as a key objective of urban planning
The impact of national legislation on local law
Increasing public participation, activity and involvement

INTERVENTIONS
1. Improving public spaces and infrastructure facilities
2. Increasing the public participation, activity and involvement within the process of the participation budget creation
CS25: The Pata Cluj project: RO

Spatial Justice

Territorial desegregation and housing resettlement

Accountability Ceiling

IDA-CMA is willing to implement a new Norwegian Fund project

Institutional racism and other exclusionary attitudes

Municipality has not changed its housing policies (social housing, evictions, etc)

No contribution from City Hall for housing resettlement

Housing resettlement could not be supported with soft measures from the project budget

Housing component came late in the project's lifetime

General consensus around the need for a housing component

Geographical context

1-8, 10

Pata Cluj

Contextual Conditions and Drivers

ID: Cluj Napoca belongs to the "magnet cities" of Romania, economic development, jobs, higher average salaries, higher housing prices

II: Outsourcing welfare services from governmental bodies to project-based organizations

III: Rescaling governmental responsibilities from cities to metropolitan areas

IV: Mechanisms pushing impoverished people to the city margins or out from the city

V: High prices on the housing market, and low salaries in jobs available to people living in Pata-ri

VI: Stigmatization of people living in Pata-ri

VII: Lack of inclusive urban development and housing policies

VIII: Lack of concrete (short, medium and long-term) plans for the desegregation of Pata-ri

IX: Public housing shortage due to national housing politics aiming privatization and marketization

X: Use of discriminatory allocation criteria in the local social housing policies

Interventions

1-8, 10

Soft measures package (empowerment, social protection, wellbeing, safer communities, social cohesion, cultural participation, access to education, employment, awareness raising)

Desegregation and housing resettlement
CS27: Mălin-Codlea: RO:

**Spatial Justice**

- **Legalization of informal settlement**: Households hardly had financial resources to purchase the land.
- **Involvement of Codlea Town Hall in the project implementation**: Due to ownership matters, the Town Hall could apply the procedures only on the half of the lands from Mălin.
- **NGO willing to implement a local project for legalization**: Implementer NGO not from the town of Codlea.
- **Very short term project, inflexible financial scheme, complicated legal procedures under the control of other institutions**: Very short term project, inflexible financial scheme, complicated legal procedures under the control of other institutions.
- **Due to ownership, the Town Hall could apply the identified procedures only for the half of the lands from Mălin**: Impoverished households from Mălin hardly had financial resources to purchase the land.

**Contextual Conditions and Drivers**

1. **Strategic level**: 
   - Brasov county, Brasov Metropolitan Area (defined as a Growth Pole), and Center Development Region are among the better-off areas of Romania, however they have impoverished localities and neighbourhoods.
   - In the past three years, Codlea now some economic growth due to the new companies that were established in its territory, but this did not have a positive effect on the impoverished Mălin district.
   - Mălin as informal settlement was informed at the intersection of the result of Romanian policies regarding Roma and policies of private property.
   - The housing policies of changing regimes in Romania could not respond to the housing needs of people from Mălin, which grew as an informal settlement, without benefiting of infrastructural improvements.
   - National strategies for Roma inclusion were implemented in Romania starting with 2001, and the National Roma Agency established in 2004 launched a program for the legalization of informal settlements in 2014.
   - There are local, county, regional and national strategies of development, but there are no concerted action plans regarding the informal settlements (improving living conditions and housing security for the impoverished).
   - Legislation regarding informal settlements is complicated and incomplete, while the law conditions the issuing of legal documents on a legally recognized domicile.
   - Despite of decentralization of public administration, there is no local autonomy in what regards informal settlements. Local measures regarding them (recognition versus eviction) depend on the political will of the mayors and on the market value of the lands.
BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS

A  Political will, mandate and directives
B  Organisation (semi-autonomous)
C  Devoted process leaders
D  External expertise
E  Steering Committee
F  Internal expertise

CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS

I  Competitive but segregated city
II  Scaled jurisdictions
III  Population growth, housing and labour market
IV  Migration and integration

INTERVENTION

1  Intervention: Creation of the Commission
CS32: Homelessness Project in Lewisham: UK

BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS
A. Uptake is by enterprises each location/site can support
B. Range of services (e.g. schools) is available locally
C. Industry and local authority have long term stake in demountability effectiveness
D. Industry and local authority have long-term stake in building quality
E. Long-term economics of cost recover do not alter markedly in 60 year lifespan
F. Regeneration on major estates increases local social housing availability
G. Sufficient alternative sites with planning permission exist in the Borough

CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS
I. Continued substantial population increase in London
II. A very young Borough and city with high levels of churning and transience
III. High index of multiple deprivation score area
IV. Low housing affordability area
V. Local housing and welfare policy favourable to addressing homelessness
VI. Major infrastructure development in locality (Bakerloo line, South Circular)
VII. Policy to spread model across London through PLACE Ltd collaboration

INTERVENTIONS
1. PLACE/Ladywell flats for 24 homeless families
2. PLACE/Ladywell ground floor enterprise hub
Type 2: Territorial Disadvantage
CS1: Smart Country Side Ostwestfalen-Lippe: DE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A More cooperation between local governmental and non-governmental actors thereby increased integration of place-based knowledge in local governance structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &quot;Digital village experts&quot; are successfully educated and impart their knowledge to other villagers; &quot;village app&quot; is commonly used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Intra-regional digital empowerment, especially of elderly people, and keeping as well as attracting younger digital-oriented inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Increased attractiveness in terms of digital possibilities and strengthened village cohesion reducing outmigration and increasing immigration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Geographical potentials of rural areas (e.g. closeness to nature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Remoteness (e.g. state borders, access to public transportation, key infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Population change (Re-urbanization vs. Counter-urbanization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Regional economic potential (regional labour market strength)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V OWL 4.0 (Integrated regional action programme), permanent local funding and supportive politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI National policies and funding programmes tackling remoteness, and supporting rural areas and digital transformation processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Organizing village conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Organizing digital training courses and digitally themed events &amp; field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Equipping community centres with technical infrastructure (&quot;IT media centres&quot;) and creating digital platforms (&quot;village app&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CS3: Post Mining Regional Strategy: GR

**Baseline Assumptions**
- A: Exploiting expertise in energy sector
- B: Tackling environmental degradation
- C: Efficient & long-standing funding
- D: Need for visionary leadership
- E: Centre-periphery model dominates
- F: EU & National supporting towards transition

**Contextual Conditions and Drivers**
- I: The only landlocked region in Greece
- II: Bordering with low cost countries
- III: Cultivate innovative entrepreneurial culture
- IV: Impacts of economic crisis
- V: The governance and administrative setting
- VI: Lack of visionary leadership

**Interventions**
1. Improve infrastructure and increase private investment
2. Improve & restore the environment
CS4: Alexander Innovation Zone: GR

BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS

A. Exploiting the extensive academic & research community
B. Taking advantage of the low-cost and skilled human resources
C. Geographical & geopolitical importance of Thessaloniki
D. Historic, cultural and touristic assets of Thessaloniki
E. Need for connecting the ‘scattered islands’ of innovation
F. Weak relocation incentives for companies

CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS

I. Territorial Assets of the locality
II. The metropolitan character
III. Cultivate innovative entrepreneurial culture
IV. Impacts of economic crisis
V. The context of decentralization
VI. Lack of visionary leadership

INTERVENTIONS

1. Establishing a cooperation platform towards innovation
2. Innovation Hub in a delimited land plot area

Spatial Justice

Support and coordinate the metropolitan innovation ecosystem

Attract FDI

Boost extroversion

Support start-ups and existing companies

Enhance the 'culture of cooperation'

Improve human resources capacity

Connecting Innovation Strategy with Public Land

Alexander Innovation Zone in the Metropolitan Area of Thessaloniki
CS6: Karditsa’s Ecosystem of Collaboration: GR

Spatial Justice

Accountability Ceiling

Bottom-up and inclusive development

Multifunctional Rural Development
- Effective Community Development
- Extroversion & Promotional activities

Growth of Community Mutual Trust

New economic activities, local products, events

Better valorization of local resources

Strngthened Social Capital

Enhanced Human Capital

Karditsa’s Ecosystem of Collaboration

Baseline Assumptions:
A. Capability of constructive collaboration
B. Strong Leadership
C. Local assets valorization
D. Smart economic specialization
E. Healthy social ventures

Contextual Conditions and Drivers:
I. Connectivity
II. Landlocked-central position
III. Legislative framework
IV. Institutional support
V. Demographic shrinking and ageing
VI. Endorsement ratio by the local population

Interventions:
1. Joint promotion of products and services
2. Training and education of the local stakeholders
3. Support to the social & solidarity new and existing start-ups
CS7: Monistrol 2020 – Local Strategic Plan: ES

Spatial
Justice

Accountability Ceiling

Baseline Assumptions

A. Development of local assets and endogenous potentials
B. Community network
C. Political and technical support
D. Legitimacy

Contextual Conditions and Drivers

I. Cultural, social and economic relations with Montserrat Mountain
II. Relative differences between neighbour municipalities within Metropolitan Region
III. Promotion of local economic strategies in the Barcelona province
IV. Level of institutional and stakeholders cooperation
V. Technical capacity of administration
VI. The role of political forces in the town hall
VII. Extension of metropolitan dynamics originated in Barcelona
VIII. Industrial transition and reconversion
IX. Economic and financial crisis 2008-2014

Interventions

1. Public space upgrade for social and relational purposes
2. Environmental and landscape improvement
3. Promotion of cultural assets
4. Supporting local economic activities and entrepreneurs
5. Attracting new activities
6. Supporting associative networks
7. Tourism and external promotion
8. Urban integration of Monistrol transport terminal
9. Better public services for local residents
10. Community-led strategic dialogue
11. Tourism and local economy group
Saturation point for change
Self-confident and reform-affine city leadership
Basic appreciation of local knowledge and stakeholder involvement
Depolitization of local decision-making
Receptive local stakeholders and effective communication with them

High distances to markets and higher-level service centres
Natural resources and tourism opportunities
Demographic Shrinking (ageing and out-migration)
Socio-economic distress (unemployment, dwindling financial resources)
Planned social/health care and regional reforms
Local autonomy enshrined in the Local Government Act

Entrepreneurial approach to local development
Lieksa-centered approach to local development
Enhanced participation of stakeholders and residents
BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS
A Flexible and inclusive multi-level governance
B Support from local and regional level public authorities
C Local actor with special know-how, embeddedness and links to multiple levels of governance
D A participatory shift in local governance (new City Strategy)
E Culture of cooperation and social trust

CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS
I In relative proximity to the capital city and situated on the highway between Helsinki and St. Petersburg
II Important harbour town with strong industrial traditions, but challenges of restructuring
III Demographic ageing, outmigration of the young, increasing disparities across society
IV Participatory shift in local governance
V Continuity of EU support to CLLD type of initiatives
VI Continuity of Finland’s support to CLLD type of initiatives

INTERVENTIONS
1 Sepra utilising EU and national opportunity structures (CLLD approach, ESF Priority 5)
2 Additional resources to CSOs to accomplish their tasks
3 Urban Board (platform of co-operation)
BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS

A. Long term vision of social change to reduce child poverty
B. Access to services improves children’s life chances
C. Capability expansion can help overcome structural unemployment
D. Service provision locally for marginalized communities improves social inclusion
E. Providing integrated spaces to extend social relations
F. Integrated service provision improves social inclusion

CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS

I. Changing regional position of the district
II. National politics
III. EU regulations
IV. Economic position of the district
V. Transformation of social structure

INTERVENTIONS

1. Modernization of child welfare services
2. Improving quality and access to child welfare services locally
**CS15: Szentes Producer Organisation: HU**

**BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS**

- A: The PO accepts members from relatively large distance
- B: High professional skills of the (new) management
- C: Access of members to loans and in-kind credits
- D: Members’ high level of trust towards the management endures
- E: Availability of funding

**CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS**

- I: The slightly inner peripheral situation of the area does not worsen
- II: Stability or increase of the EU CAP support and national top-up
- III: Tax allowances to smallholders
- IV: Exemption from the reinjection of thermal water lasts
- V: Market competition does not get much stronger
- VI: The shortage of labour does not worsen

**INTERVENTIONS**

1. Establishing and operating the Producer Organisation
2. Planning and implementing major investments
CS16: Balaton Uplands LEADER: HU

**BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS**

A. Availability of the LEADER Programme at national level
B. Willingness of local actors to co-operate
C. Available human and social capital within and outside of the LAG
D. Best practice government measures (LEADER approach)
E. High level of trust between actors
F. Strong civic organisations working with vulnerable social groups (youth)

**CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS**

I. Extended LAG area; divide between advantageous and disadvantageous locations
II. Improved accessibility
III. Emerging opportunities generating additional income for the AGENCY
IV. Increased demand for local products and assets
V. Safe position of LEADER at EU level post-2020
VI. EU-level plans against national-level mis-management will come into force

**INTERVENTIONS**

1. First cycle (2007-2013)
3. Third cycle on new bases (2021-2027)
CS17: Euralens: FR

Spatial Justice

- De-peripheralisation and de-marginalisation of a post-mining locality
- Renewed local democracy
- Social and territorial trust
- Horizontal and participative government
- Effective territorial government

Genuine localised development
- Human capacity building
- Experience-based and inclusive local development strategy

Effective local initiatives support

Accountability Ceiling

Policy Context (EU, National, Local)

Baseline Assumptions
- A: Technical, financial and long-term support for local initiatives
- B: Political and technical cooperation between local institutions
- C: Technical coordination at the service of an LI strategy
- D: Inclusion of inhabitants and civil society in decision-making processes
- E: De-self-colonisation of minds: the mining basin is not perceived by its inhabitants as a losing territory
- F: Social (gender- and age-based) and territorial (place-based) signification is declining
- G: Adaptation to local (territorial and social) specificities

Contextual Conditions and Drivers
- I: Support for environmental and energy-related transition of post-mining territories
- II: Substitute for metropolitan advantages
- III: Valorisation of diversity in conceptualising development (no recipe, less benchmarking)
- IV: More societally-based approach of development
- V: Democratic transition valorising better representation of the diversity of society
- VI: Support for relocalising development

Interventions
- 1: Metropolitan governance laboratory
- 2: Roser local development by supporting local initiatives (label)
**CS19: Northeast Groningen: NL**

**BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS**
- A. Significant scale and pace of the repair program
- B. Institutional framework results in awarded claims
- C. Causal relationship between extraction and earthquakes
- D. Effective building measures
- E. Claimants get all costs covered
- F. Residents perceive lower risks, minimal earthquake costs

**CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS**
- I. Depopulation of the Northeast Groningen region
- II. Negative image and vicious circle of decline
- III. Significant part of the population is traumatised
- IV. Continuous value depreciation on the housing market
- V. Energy transition & (inter)national climate policy changes
- VI. Enactment of the *Nationaal Programma Groningen*

**INTERVENTIONS**
- 1. Physical Repair & Strengthening Dwelling Construction
- 2. Procedures & Legal Framework for Compensation
- 3. Decrease and Terminate Gas Extraction by 2030
CS23: Goth Village: PL

Spatial Justice

Multifunctional Rural Development

New economic activities, local products, events

Goth Village - an open-air museum & a village center

Plot of land purchased by the Municipality

Goth Village Association - better access to funds

Strengthened Social Capital

Demographic sustainability

Greater sense of belonging

Enhanced Human Capital

Growth of Community Mutual Trust

Thematisation of Rural Space

Baseline Assumptions

A Local valuable assets exist and are recognised as such
B Existing capability of collaboration in the local community
C Recognised local leaders able to catalyse support
D Creativity and ability to adapt by individuals
E Recovery of historical roots is enough to generate interest of young people in staying
F Strategic and learning capacities of the Goth Village Association

Contextual Conditions and Drivers

I Future regional economic development
II Economic base of the region
III Continuity and uncertainty of the support
IV Backing of cultural and scientific institutions
V Demographic shrinking and ageing
VI Development of rural tourism

Interventions

1 "Material": Local development strategy and spatial planning management by the local self-government of the Hrubieszów commune
2 Non-material: soft interventions aimed at reconstruction and promotion of the cultural and historical heritage of the region
**BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS**

- A: Increase broadband capacity
- B: Develop digital competence
- C: Develop digital learning
- D: Increase participation
- E: Increase quality and efficiency in health and care
- F: Strengthen research and innovation from a digital perspective, strengthen digital entrepreneurship and business development

**CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS**

- I: Feeling of being a region "left behind"
- II: Declining and aging population
- III: Long tradition of providing services to remote regions
- IV: Long tradition urbanisation and declining population
- V: New Swedish rural policy
- VI: Västerbotten Regional Development Strategy

**INTERVENTIONS**

1. Increased physical capacity mainly broadband capacity across the entire region
2. Increased digital competence by both those in municipal governments and also end users, mainly citizens;
3. Digitalization in new areas such as e-health
CS31: Northumberland Uplands Local Action Group: UK

**BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS**

- A Adequate rural outreach and connectivity
- B Smart Specialisation (local entrepreneurial discovery)
- C Jobs created recruit young people
- D Age balance affects sustainability of rural services and facilities
- E Economically weaker rural actors can access and benefit from NULAG
- F Host body operates with clarity and transparency
- G Two-way information exchange between NULAG and various levels of local govt

**CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS**

- I Economic opportunities from land, tourism and culture
- II Substitutes for agglomeration advantages
- III Demographic ageing
- IV A post-crisis agenda focused on job creation
- V EU rural communities funding through LEADER
- VI A governance structure favouring urban areas

**INTERVENTIONS**

1. NULAG phase 1 (LEADER 4: 2007-2013)
2. NULAG phase 2 (LEADER 5: 2014-2020)
CS33: Isle of Lewis: UK

**BASELINE ASSUMPTIONS**

A. Community Land Trust identifies revenue sources
B. Local assets exist and market context allows valorisation
C. Smart Specialisation (local entrepreneurial discovery)
D. Stability/growth associated with enhanced wellbeing
E. Flexible and inclusive multi-level governance
F. “Adequate” locally defined - adaptation to sparsity and remoteness

**CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AND DRIVERS**

I. Economic opportunities from environmental assets
II. Substitutes for agglomeration advantages
III. Demographic Shrinking and ageing
IV. Valorisation of cultural distinctives
V. Continuity of HIE support, local autonomy
VI. S.G.’s progressive approach and inclusive growth

**INTERVENTIONS**

1. HIE support for community land purchase
2. Community Account Management
Type 3: Disempowered Places
CS5: Overcoming Fragmentation in Territorial Governance: GR

Baseline Assumptions:
A. Small and remote areas are able now to solve serious problems
B. Scale effects & size effects are critical in the new setting
C. Improved consultation mechanisms are launched
D. Difficulties in managing huge and heterogeneous geographic area
E. Limited autonomy
F. Dominant centre-periphery model

Contextual Conditions and Drivers:
I. The relationship of the city with the mountain and the sea
II. The geography of unification
III. A city with an old industrial activity which is shifting to services
IV. Impacts of economic crisis
V. The governance and administrative setting
VI. The territorial imbalances

Interventions:
1. Institutional arrangements
2. Developmental planning arrangements

Geographical Context
Policy Context (EU, National, Local)
Societal and Market Context

Overcoming fragmentation and reorganize local government through merging 1034 Municipalities into 325
Enhance transparency
Boost technical capacity
Increase efficiency in sectoral policies
Enhance the ‘culture’ of planning
Increase human resources capacity

Accountability Ceiling
Spatial Justice

Overcoming Fragmentation in Territorial Governance
CS18: EPA Alzette-Belval: FR

**Baseline Assumptions**

- A: Sound financial management and partnership with Lorraine land agency
- B: Equitable participation, transparency and trust between municipalities
- C: Financial feasibility, supported either by the EPA, other public authorities and/or Luxembourg
- D: Strong political willingness and commitment on both sides of the border
- E: Ability to define economically viable activities in complementarity with Luxembourg
- F: Legal, technical and financial feasibility of developing common infrastructure projects
- G: Political acceptance on the need to share responsibility on cross-border planning
- H: Local assets exist, valorisation is technically and economically realistic

**Contextual Conditions and Drivers**

- I: Sensitive locality (i.e. risks of draught, landslides)
- II: Brownfields located on the border require development and planning
- III: French State involvement through EPA Alzette-Belval
- IV: Political stability in Luxembourg
- V: Cross-border metropolisation process
- VI: Rapid change in housing needs
- VII: EU single market and effective Schengen Area

**Interventions**

1. Developing the locality via housing (i.e. renovation and construction)
2. Reinforcing territorial governance