

Cliff Hague (30m11s)

I would like to start by saying thank You to Veronica and Piotr for all the hard work they've put in and inviting me here, and I'm delighted to be here since I've not been in Krakow since 1970's and that a good experience to come by. And I also thought in a spirit of what Peter said, just to say a little bit who I am because people do not know me. And again I think that Rhemo correctly labeled me as an urban planer but I think my career has often been working across disciplines and I think we will discover throughout discussion that important things of learning come when we go over fields rather than just staying in our own field. So my background is: I did a geography degree, many many years ago, and then I did a town planning degree, and then I worked as a planner in Glasgow and then about as it was starting to implode and then I became an academic and I taught for a long time at Technological University in Edinburgh in a CAGH, and then I was a professor of planning and spacial development until June of this year when I left the University and continued working mainly part time and mainly as consultant I have also been president of the Raw Town Planning Institute and the president of Cromwell Association of Planners and my research in recent years has been a territorial development in Europe and around the themes of housing and housing market, I've done work on skills in planning, I shall talk a little bit about, and I work on the relationships between things like planning systems and housing markets and housing land. So that is a little summary and let me explain how I want to approach this.

I want to talk first of all about the Courbit model and as Rhemo said I want take the approach of Rhemo's five panels but not in the same order and try to talk about them, and then I want to concentrate a bit on the aspect of skills which we may look out in more detail when we come to the workshop and the discussion on tools, but hopefully I'll introduce a commence that could be taken further when we come there. Then I'll say some concluding comments. So that is roughly what I want to talk about in the next bit.

I think that clearly the issues the Courbit has focused on are important issues across much of Europe and I observed this notion of big challenges is what you have called urban implosion, the partial disinvestment, particularly but not exclusively by private sector, buildings becoming empty, land becoming vacant, a general run-down of the area, the problem is how to create a transformation, how to regenerate that area. So I think that is certainly important that matter of common wealth is involved in situations in Africa or Asia and rapid urbanization and I think the two are deep connected as you see in part but not exclusively by new international division of labor and industrial relocation, but I think that is not the whole story either. So I think definitely it is very practical issue that it is good to exchange the international experience and to involve dialog between theory and practice. I think that model that has been introduced to us this morning has certain potential to highlight some important relationships and to raise some important questions. I've tried to approach it in a critical and academic manner in a spirit that the criticism can help to improve the model, I'm not trying to destroy it by this process. When I first saw the model, I found it a little hard to understand what were the relationships that were shown in the diagram and I think that Your presentation this morning has helped me in that respect. For example You have said that all the five panels are connected, but when I looked at the diagram I didn't see the lines connecting the panels so that wasn't clear. Soon I discovered the driver was the central but I still didn't understand how it related to each of the other boxes. And I also found the use of the two axes a little bit confusing because one axis goes from stabilization to stabilization whereas I'm used to the situation where on the axis you have two opposites but I think I can see that one of the aims you achieve is a stabilization. But also a stabilization is weird as a result we want, because in English that would mean at least holding things as they are, preventing them from getting worse, whereas what we're trying to do on the left side of the horizontal axis is to improve things not just stabilize things. So I wondered about the word stabilization. I also wondered why the boxes were in that particular order, because again I would think that PPP being located between stabilization and decline is somehow the combination of the two. I am sure it was not intended, but that was simply the visual impact on me, after coming to this what we call totally cold, ignoring the thinking that we did before so I think we should improve the diagram by putting some more arrows, just rethink the visual presentation just to communicate what we think are the key connections, which are secondary, what's the direction it is heading and so on. Also what do we mean by complex urban transformation and I think it came to me as unusually more complex than what the model suggests.

So I went back to some materials that were prepared for the area I was born and brought up in in the north of Manchester. And there is a regeneration project ongoing there. The quotation on the left hand side is taken from what driver of that regeneration says about that area - it shows some of the regenerations complexity. I pulled out some data, I apologize if it is personal, but I was doing it in the rush: so this is the area I originally come from, 2001 UK Senses, almost 14'000 people, mainly white, so it's a poor white area and I put that up, because ethnicity is often part of the equation in this in many European cities. As we look on the transformations process, part of the drivers there are different ethnic groups, I would suggest to put that on the table as one we could talk about. A high proportion of these people have some kind of health problems. Almost three in ten have got some kind of illness, injury whatever and that keeps them out of labor markets. And if you of the labor market other problem make an issue. So there are health problems and unemployment problems - don't have particular data, but sure it is very high. And again the basic question about qualification, very low level of formal education and qualification. So if we're talking about transformation of area like this, even if we manage to fill those 50 sites with building the question is how will that impact the other problems in the area. Because even if the are jobs in the area and people have not got any qualifications or if they got long-term illness they will not necessarily access the jobs that we created there. So it's really just to say how difficult the problems are. To be academic - I'm not coming necessarily with answers, but really emphasizing how multiple the relations are and how very often there are self-reinforcing feedback groups in this, which create what can be really quick downward spur for an area. So the driver of the model talks about the complex network of actors not just a public administration and I think there is quite a lot of evidence from particularly British approaches to regeneration, quite a lot of evidence that says it is useful sometimes to create a special driver to create the networks, to move the people and have the vision for the area. And what I'm also saying is that we need to look at the existing institutions for it is not just a case of putting a new institution in, part of the analysis should be what I call an audit of existing institutions and got a little paper and started writing to put the kind of questions we might ask: What is to be the driver?, What powers make it the driver?. You may ask these question even if the organization is not there as a driver at the moment. So you can look at on the neighborhoods and say: Who are the organizations there? What are the institution that have their presence there already? What the powers do they have? What initiative do they respond to? If we are going to be effective as a driver you cannot do it just to give the instructions to people, you have to understand what they respond to, what makes it more likely they will do what you like them to do. Certainly many of them, and that is particularly true for public authorities, have got constraints upon their actions, they don't have money, they're constrained by legal powers, public organizations have got problem with long-term viability they may be not totally representative, but we're asking questions: what is in the area already and run these thing past them. I suggest we can also draw a diagram path and it begins to map out. There is a network over here of housing bodies, community organizations, there is a business network over there, there is public sector network. Now how do we connect these up, how do we create the driver?

The functions concentrate on the containers rather than the contents and again I would raise some questions in the spirit of discussion and getting some ideas. Hence I just take containers. If we look on the containers as buildings this understates for example the importance of the spaces between buildings, I guess the top slide shows that - in the city of consumption. Very often it is spectacle, it is street theater, it is displays, it is tourism, these are the kinds of the things that you are looking to as important catalyst in terms of creating opportunities. So spaces is the matter as well as the buildings do. Similarly I think there is a risk if we just look at the containers of getting into of what became known about 15 years ago - a property land regeneration. And there is some experience in Britain that if just do the property part, just put new apartments, business parks and so on it puts the question what happens to the people who were in the area like that one I introduced earlier on. So in Britain we moved from the view on the containers to view on the contents and the actors. And there is a strong European narrative that you sure aware of around the agenda, competitiveness. That brings in the words I mentioned before: innovation, how do we create the innovative responses, innovative networks in the cities that are imploding and what skills does the labor force have, and territorial capital, not just looking at the city but it's region in European context and what relationships it has, what are the strengths and weaknesses that they

have. Cultures again, so it stands again with the ethnicity and again identities is another word which I forgot to mention. And all for all I'd suggest that instead of thinking of containers we should think about assets and viabilities. What have got in those containers that are actually assets. The building might be empty but it might be a great building so that can be a viability at the moment since we can't use it, but its got a potential to do something with it. Even not very attractive buildings may be an asset as they provide cheap rural space. I think underlying this is an idea that very often in the cities we've seen contested spaces a basis that people are in conflict over whose space it is, what it means, what identity it has, that approach is not very clear. There are two walls in Chicago, less than a kilometer apart and the top one is basically selling new condominiums and very much about property land regeneration and the bottom one is Mexican-Hispanic, Mexican speaking neighborhood which is very threatened by this process so they are really defending their neighborhood in these circumstances. So there is this question whose city is it and whose neighborhood is it and how all of this related to things like market strength and if the problem is disinvestment and maybe it is important that the public sector despite of what we said here really has to do quite a lot before you have a private sector's confidence in the area. So it may be very very difficult if it is really imploded area to get public-private partnership going because whats in it for us if you are a businessman. It might be a need for public sector to do it, but if you go strength in the market there is a risk that there is gentrification because people are wanted to come in this place, they want to use this. So the question is really and it was raised in the earlier presentation: What kind drivers for what kind of model and again what are the skills. There might be situations where straight PPP is right, but I think that probably in general that might be exception, because usually when you are talking major urban transformation you are talking about doing things to areas where people are already living in them and can't rip those people out of the equation. So I would like to ask what about the civil society organizations and you raise words like power institutional culture, capacity building. The visual on this is from the social housing neighborhood in Edinburgh where I did quite a lot of voluntary work in 1970's and 1980's. The main actors in this area were actually a group of women who put up an organization, because they felt their kids were threated at school like they were no-hopers and like they were not going to get anywhere. So they were really the key drivers of transformation and there are different models - that's all I'm saying. The tools bit was formed by an International Development Department in the UK. We got got the questions you are actually raising about the limitations of traditional town planning approaches, like the former master plan that says: in 20 years this area will be industry, this area will be shopping all that sort of stuff. What we really argued is that particularly in context of rapid urbanization but by no means exclusively there that holds the situation of urban implosion. The traditional plan does not solve anything. In fact it may actually make things worse. What we say you need analytical and competitive skills, things like communication, negotiation, understanding diversity, planning through inclusion, all these things are important, strategy, vision, management skills, managing people, managing spaces, managing time and managing learning, building this into the process not bolting it on it afterwards. All these things are very important. We tried through 25 case studies to illustrate this sort of skills which I highlight. I want to finish up suggesting as you are thinking of the partners: the Budapest City, Leipzig and so on doing an audit again of what skills they've got, what do they think they need, how do they get skills, how they apply, how can they share with others, so within the project really to create dynamic learning process. And in term of skills I think it is important to challenge assumptions. So in summary I think there is a lot of interesting stuff here, look for the dialog and the discussions, there is a real possibility to develop very imaginative approaches to this very serious problem of urban implosion and urban transformation. Thank You very much

(60:36)

Steve Miles (66:00)

Maybe it is a way to explain where I come from. About two years ago I researched a social and economical impact on regeneration of New Castle ... key side which is North East of England. This is a project worth hundreds of millions of pounds that saw the development of new gallery The Baltic - art gallery, the stage gate for brand new performance, also the millennium Bridge the a famous architectural prize in UK. And I got assigned to this project because the assumption

was that the New Castle would win the nomination from the UK to be the European Capital of Culture in 2008. On the morning the announcement was made I was watching the BBC and the minister concerned made the announcement: The UK nomination for the European Capital of Culture is Liverpool. I was a little shocked - my first thought was: that's the end of my career and my job is now gone because I've got nothing to reserve. So what you do in the moment of crisis? You call your mother. I called my mother and she said: don't worry, just get the same job in Liverpool. I said: that's not how the jobs work in the universities, mom, thanks for the advice. Anyway, two years later I working at the University of Liverpool, the very job my mother advised me to take.

So what do I say about the model? I have approached the model in very different way Cliff did, but I came to similar conclusions. The first thing I want to say is that the model acknowledges that the cities are highly complex and contradictory phenomenon. An my concern on any model of this type is if it is capable or suited to understand and make sense of that complexity and to take the city in a new direction in some way or the other. And next thing I think is very important is that we talk about cities rather than a city. The complexity of cities is such that it makes awkward to talked about the city on the first place. So my question is: is it possible to manage the transformation of the city? Is possible to systematize a phenomenon which by its nature is highly dynamic, highly unpredictable And all these question may have come with the development of the Courbit model up to the stage that we've reached today. But for such a model to be convincing and be effective we need to consider a bit more carefully a diversity of place, space and the actors that Cliff drew attention to earlier, that characterize the contemporary city. So concern of mine about the Courbit model is that although it professes the need for an interdisciplinary approach it so fundamentally rooted in the approach and the approach competitiveness and its view of the city may not be flexible enough to incorporate the diversities of life in cities. The model may not be complex itself enough to adequately comprehend social, cultural, economical and environmental guises of contemporary city's life. So what I want to suggest and obviously my ideas come from my experience in British world of regeneration. The key implication the debate is going on in Britain and actually what's emerging is what I call a rhetorical city. So in our view we see the city in a way in which the policy makers perceive the future of that city. So the policy makers are reproducing the vision of the city that appeals to the idealized consumer. It is not about the social and economic realities of the city but it is about moving forward to some idealized reality where everyone can consume his perfect, wonderful space of consumption. And what is being created there is very much uniform vision of the city and it is interesting to see where a model such as Courbit model fits into this process. Is there a danger that such a model actually reinforces the unity of what cities are eventually becoming. And another key concern of mine is that discussions about the cities are all to often a-historical. They virtually have paid no attention to historical development of cities as place. In it's been my concern when reading the model that it's very connected to the presence of the city and the future of the city but it's almost entirely at least on the surface unconnected to the past of the city. It makes an oblige reference to the deindustrialized past but it doesn't really engage with that in a serious way, so my suggestion is that you cannot understand the presence of the city without contemplating the past. if you want to create sustainable city a historical element is essential to that. In Britain there is always a discussion on creating the future of the cities and there is always a blind assumption that all the cities can be this competitive, successful, consumer centered spaces and places and that clearly isn't the case. Whether or not that outworks depends on the historical aspects of that particular city. So often the success or the competitiveness of the city depends on the success in the past and the problem is that the vision of the city is adopted by the policy makers is the promise of uniform consumer driven future. So the vision in the UK, I am generalizing here to make a point, but it tends to see city as an entity that attracts tourists and attracts private funding and as a particular one that promotes culture and defines culture as a driving force in regeneration. One of the reasons here is a work of this guy (name on the screen), I call him an Urban Evangelist, he's like a religious guru And a far as the British policy makers are concerned he is the god of the regeneration. His book "A rise o the creative class" has really had a fundamental impact on how policy makers are viewing that feature of the city. Richard Florida presents this way out for what could be called failing cities. He suggests that a way forward is to attract creative people to cities by providing effective cultural offer. And that makes all the noises that policy makers want to hear.

And that makes all the policy makers think big, because no policy maker would think: my city can't be creative, my city can't be cultural. So it appeals to the way in which policy makers think of the world that they live. Not intentionally but by accident what Florida does is he implies culture or creativity regeneration is an easy option. And that obviously is a mistake to make. He doesn't argue that all the cities can be archetypal creative cities. By identifying a packing order by using sort of tables of creativity creates this aspirational model that everybody wants to tack into. So the problem with Florida's work in my opinion is that creativity and culture and by implication you might say competitiveness are presented as universal assessment of the urban problem and constitute this problem to present perspective solutions to the developing city. And this is my concern in the context of the Courbit model we have to start from the point if it is possible to prescribe the future of cities. I'm not saying that the model is trying to do that but there is danger it falls into that trap. So other authors in this field such as David Harvey have identified historically as a broader shift from urban governance from managerialism to ontopenuralism. As a result what's being constructed is an environment based around PPP which focuses on investment and economic development and therefore on speculative construction and development of urban space. Sorry to Paul for quotation on you but this is a useful way of thinking about what we're talking about here, and this quotation is from Gibson and Kokke: *Rather present authoritative ways of imagining regional features what seems to be happening is that singular interpretation of creativity is being incorporated into a rather uncreative framework in which private sector solution to regional problems, an idea of creating independent ontopenural subject and the primacy of placed competition of global market remains paramount. It demonstrates how nearly brought ideology operates as normative framing of economic relations, even coopting and subsheding ideas that intuitively appear to challenge this orthodoxy.* So my concern is again that of this imposition of the particular view of the city underestimates its diversity, while the diversity of the city or the cities is the quality, is the essence of the city that we need to be encouraging not dismissing from the position of any particular view of what city should be doing. So broadly then my concern is whole debates in Britain around culture, creativity etc is simply approximative consumption. And as I mentioned earlier I'm proudly involved in a research project called Impact 08 and it's the biggest project yet to look at social, economical impact of European capital of culture. The role of culture in Liverpool within being the capital of Culture 2008 is highly debated and many critics of what's happening in the Liverpool at the moment describe the city not as the capital of culture but as the capital of regeneration. And because this sort of feeling, this criticism of capital of culture comes with the feeling of what is going on, is it redesign maybe aimed at attracting middle class professionals who are more concerned of the cafe culture that would be a culture of city's history in whatever shape or form. So the problem is that in Britain the policy has gone down the culture land regeneration line without absolutely any evidence whatsoever that it works. Department of Culture in UK have no idea whether this kind of regeneration is successful. They are flaming around not knowing whether this is the way forward. And success stories the used to justify that approach are highly questionable. One such example is Glasgow - the first European City that has used this title - City of Culture as a means of urban renaissance. It's often presented as a success story but in reality it created as many problems as it did advantages. One of the policy makers said that often the success stories attached to this sort of regeneration approach use the notion of culture to sort of camouflage the realities of very divided populations. Very often the focus of such regeneration has been on the city centers, the downtown areas being a sort of shop window of city. My concern is if competitiveness goes down that line what does the city in its broader conception become. Is it simply a store room for the dilapidated, worn out shop dummies who are misused and have no use because the shop window of the city is all that matters. And the doom's day scenario in this situation is one where you got a rapidly regenerated gentrified urban core. And this core is surrounded by intensely disadvantaged residential areas. That's the doom's day scenario that has happened in the past and will happen in the future. So if the rhetorical view of the city continues to present the positive economic view of the city and perhaps a view that is unintentionally presented in the Courbit model itself, a vision that promotes the city as a center of consumption and what that will do it will promote the city as exclusive and not inclusive. So such an approach may have unintently consequence of providing temporary solution for the problem of the deindustrialized city. This vision of consumer city may perpetuate instability of the city. The experience we had in UK around the nomination process,

that is competition between six cities ultimately to get nomination for the European Capital of Culture, illustrates the rhetorical nature of the city because it allowed local governments to redefine their city based in the flimsiest evidence and it kind of fueled the highly uncomfortable relationship with regeneration that already exist in the UK. And I want to sort of highlight that fact that certainly we realize that fact that regeneration is not absolute solution and often it causes more problems than it does solutions. But I want to briefly talk about some of this work, I think it is really really effective in making us think about these issues. And that's the work of Richard Williams who describes regeneration in England as being particularly uncomfortable experience, because in England we have what he call an anti-urban culture Williams discusses the impact of gentrification I think one point I should raise is that in the Courbit model, the model must seize to imply the notion of gentrification as this organic process led by artists and creatives whereas often in the UK we think about gentrification, I am saying from the sociological point of view, it's sort of negative word, we're concerned about the sort of fall-out of gentrification and I think that is quite unrecognized in the model. Williams claims that it's not the gentrification that creates strength in culture but actually the reverse. Many of the city's new residents have no need for the collective services that a city provides, its schools, health care, public transport so the public space in the city has evidently declined as a result. And not surprisingly then Richard Williams argues that the city in the UK is ultimately underpin but its class dimension I won't read the whole quotation now, but I think the key aspect is in the middle of quotation *What we're describing here is a revolution, a revolution of a bourgeois taste which excludes that the working class is traditionally defined and also that aristocracy still exists. It exists in tension with the other kinds of taste and with the other attitudes clear that underpin them.* So we have this vision of regeneration in UK, iconic forms of new architecture, a culture consumption driven world that actually divides the city more than it can ever hope to provide for that city. So in this light, a city such as Liverpool where I am currently working, have what Richard Williams calls a very anxious relationship with regeneration. The example that Richard Williams uses is an Outer Dock, and the dock is actually the core of the industrial past of the Liverpool. But from the 1950's onwards the dock was unable to maintain its economic function for very simple reason - it wasn't big enough to take the size of ships that were developed on that time. So in 1980's the dock was redeveloped with the Tay Art Gallery. So the public funds were used and the private capital but what happened according to Williams was a misguided attempt to impose the view of the regeneration of the city a great light of the regenerated space, to create like a symbol of regeneration that had impact on the broader city. And what you have now in the dock is a low-end shopping opportunity, a few designer bars, eating and drinking opportunities. According to Williams what it represents is a manifestation of picturesque. So response to the urban problem, not response that seeks to solve the main characteristics or the causes of this problem but ascetisizes the problem. An approach to regeneration that sees the cities as nothing more than something to be consumed, to be gazed upon by privileged audience. And that really is the very essence of what I'm saying here is a regeneration about creating a city for the privileged members or people who live in there. For Williams the dock is about the superficial ascetic thrills that offer no solutions, a strategic stadium of culture that diverse attention from the real divided city that lay beyond the confines of the dock. So my question is how can the model such as urban model offer a solution for a terrain that is so clearly placed specific. Liverpool as well as many other cities is what you might say industrially redundant. Its history, its industrial past is no longer sustainable. But as many other cities its future success depends not on the abstract notion of the city but on the specific need of Liverpool on specific needs of any city that is inevitably the product of its own history. So I am asking is there actually such thing as city, can we describe a city? For we've reached the state where city exists but it only exist in a rhetorical way. Now debates about regeneration might imply that the city has a social character. But ultimately the way the city is currently constructed the social dimension of the city has to be denied, it has to be pushed to one side, so much so because the city is perceived to be the profit making vehicle in which only some citizens of the city are able to have the keys to start the car. And regeneration is presented in a way that will inevitably exclude some members of that society. So another piece of literature I would thoroughly recommend is, my French is nearly as bad as my English, is (*french name*). This is really interesting book on regeneration in Beijing, and I think china is very interesting, it can teach us a lot of lessons about the process, it would have been so rapid and he saw positive and negative aspects of

regeneration. And my suggestion is that the dog of regeneration, to use the English phrase, is being wagged by the tail so the regeneration is being pushed along without attention to its more negative implications. So we have this idealized vision of the cappuccino sipping culture. And the quotation there: *The ready made identities aside by city boosters and disseminated through the massive India often reduce several different visions of local culture into a single vision, they reflex the aspiration of the powerful elite and values lifestyles and expectations of potential investors and tourists. This praxis is highly elite and exclusionary and often signified to more disadvantaged segments of the population that they have no place in the revitalized and gentrified urban spectacle.* So we're constructing the vision of this fantastic, spectacular, revitalized city, but by its very nature that city will exclude vast number of actors from social and cultural groups. So to use the way I would see the city then as sort of entity in itself is being consumed. Consumption as the center point of the contemporary city is in danger of engulfing the whole notion of the city so the city becomes nothing more than a prestige in itself. Then we create all these boundaries of the cities. Just walking around Krakow you can see the immense cultural identity, historical identity. Obviously we're not trying to rip the city of that history but I think that history will become harder and harder to come by worldwide, because of this imposition of the model of regeneration. So the city becomes nothing more than the visual tableau to be consumed. The issue is that the city is presented as much as a cultural democracy as it is consumption. It is often dressed up in the rhetoric of social inclusion, regeneration is often presented as something that is pushed forward by social inclusion but this cannot and is not the case. The city is presented where everything is possible and anybody can aspire to be free if they can consume. You might think I am very negative and possibly I am but my concern is that model of regeneration that intends to be perpetuated is one that there is no room for heterogeneous city. Ultimately the city has to be uniform, has to behave in a uniform way to succeed. In Britain it is very much connected with debates about the third way which aims on one hand to have socially and economically marginalized populations the opportunity to adapt to changing economical conditions but by doing so puts a blame by the feet of those individuals and makes no effort to deal with the core of the social injustice that is going on. So what happens here is a range of policy solutions are presented to solve the question of the exclusions where in fact there is no solution to this problem other than to blame individuals along the way.

In terms of the Courbit model itself eight models of the city or eight components were presented as part of the European model. I'd like to sort of throw into the ring the suggestion that these components underplay the key sociological dimensions of the city. And in particular the negative dimension of the process that promotes the service space in the cities that will have inevitably negative repercussions. The way the contemporary city exists today ultimately the dining of the city has to be satisfied with the menu. But most of the offers doesn't reach the majority of the people living there. I'm trying to say that the development of the city, the process that underlaying the emerging city remains largely mysterious. Because it is ideological and rhetorical process, because there is no adequate research to understand the impact of regeneration. But in the way I have described the city moving there is a deep uncertainty about the effectiveness of such an approach. So the process that I described the sort of cautionary approach to the city the one that is concerned about the negative implication of the consumption. The repercussions of that approach to the city may not be reversible. They may be certainly not reversible in any model of the city. Maybe we've gone too far down that line to actually save the city. But without the recalls to cultural and historical dimension of city life they are too easily denied by sort of modelistic approach to the city that promotes particular view of the city. We're in danger of promoting the notion of the city at the expense of specific ideal sincretism of place and that is pretty much fundamental point. How do you create the model of the city that incorporates questions of place and above all a model that incorporates the actors that live in the place.

(99:15)

Bryn Jones(103:00)

I am particularly concerned in trying to bring management tools to wider context, a wider framework and a bigger foundation. My experience and experience of my colleagues is that you cannot easily have management tools without considering the political framework or context. And in particular I am going to talk about research we've done on involvement of community

organizations, associations, sometimes voluntary, sometimes professional sometimes economic, in regeneration skills in two particular cases in England and Italy. I work involved in a program of research and teaching which we do for business and community, which I think shows increasing interactions between business and community and society issues. I work at the University of Bath and Bath is one of few in Britain UNESCO's world heritage site, which is in common concern a model of meroplavian architecture with all the benefits and all the problems that would come with that. The Courbit model emphasizes the centrality of the private-public partnerships, and as Cliff mentioned it earlier there is a danger in focusing on these partnerships, danger of some partners being more equal than others, business dominating the local public organizations and a danger of disruptive partnerships. And the point I am trying to make here is that maybe we should not talk about dual partnerships of private-public that is business and state, but rather triple partnerships involving civil society representation. Civil society in informal, semi-formal organizations, semi-professionalized of charities, of voluntary association, neighborhood groups, a whole range of these which tend to exist in northern and western societies in Europe. And I also want to ask if PPP can be multi purpose and whether partnerships really are the best in modeling all cases. In some cases it may be better to have single driver rather than a network driver, also because of the relationship to the broader political context in each case. Already the British speaker have referred to that the developing policy framework has been a move-away from unilateral government where the central state or its local version presents a command and control model for urban development planning. The movement has been as in other areas of policy in UK towards more a multilateral governance process. Central government can set some target and some general objectives but the detailed objectives and goal achieved are left to negotiation, consultation, interaction amongst businesses, local government and civil society organizations. In the UK some of the policies for example in the financing of regeneration insist that civil society or community representatives must always be involved in the planning process. The problem here has emerged said the critics in the UK is that: should it always be a case? can it always be the case? In many cases the civil society organizations are weak, they're underdeveloped and therefore some of the regenerations schemes are confusing in their objectives and are trying both to develop the regeneration plan and also are trying to build up a capacity to try and bring out and develop civil society and local community organizations whether they are weak or nonexistent. And therefore there is a confusion of objectives and the complication of the process. And of course the civil society organization aren't always constructive partners in these arrangements. Often they have their own objections, there are agendas and they may be obstructive, they may make the process more difficult. And this is what democracy is all about. Democracy is not an easy process. It is always complicated and difficult. The third issue I want to address is this issue of the driver. Of course in English the word driver has two different connotations. One is a force pushing, and the other is of course and the other is of course somebody in the motorcar driving, steering and problem is of course you can have single driver and a lot of people in the car. You may have some people who are just passengers not really saying where things are going, you might even have a what we call in English a back-seat-driver, you may not know this, but you know the concept - you're driving your car and your wife or your mother or your son sits in the back and says no, go this way! No, go that way! So if we use the metaphor in community you may have these back seat drivers. There may also be the cases that the political conditions are such that maybe it is better to have a single agent as a driver where network or a team of drivers doesn't work. Very often it implements consultation and involvement rather than influence on decision making. Nevertheless there are good reasons why there should be participation. First of all, as mentioned by previous speakers, regeneration projects are no longer exclusively about economics or bad infrastructure. Increasingly(111:35) of policy makers in America and the UK it has been recognized that to develop or regenerate an area especially when it is declining or imploding means attention of all sides to be paid to developing the health of the citizens, welfare, facilities or cultural aspect as we heard already from Steve or enhancement of the environment, that aspect is becoming more and more crucial and certainly central in the two cases. So regeneration now has to take these other aspects into account for all sorts of reasons. There is a danger if they were left simply to PPP the interest of the citizens and residents in some of the health and welfare and environmental issues will be neglected, they may be disadvantaged. Governments in the UK recognize some of those problems and make social inclusion also

frequent governmental requirement for the regeneration schemes. That is there should be if an area is going to be redeveloped economically it should also try to enhance the social enclosure of disadvantaged groups, provide resources, try to provide employment, education and facilities for these disadvantaged groups. So you put these criteria about social inclusion etc together with the governance approach and that means you really have to have some involvement of the people who are supposed to benefit. As I mentioned some state supported schemes require community participation. And the questions become even more acute and more complex and wider. Who should be involved? Just all the individual citizens? Representative groups? Are there representatives? If so, how many? What form should consultation and participation take? Should it be simply a low level meeting which often the standard case inviting inviting some representatives along telling them what the plans are, inviting some commence, making some notes, going away and perhaps not really changing anything? Or should it be a high level consultation and involvement at earlier stages in the formation of the plan? At what level? Neighborhood level? A district level? City level? In what political forums? Should you create a special political forums? Or should it be involvement in the official decision making process? It all very difficult for state actors, maybe more difficult for businesses absolutely not used to this form of participation. So we've got spectrum of involvement. From mere consultation and information on one hand through to fuller participation in decision making on the other hand. So I turn out to the importance of what I call a political framework and I think I'm using the word framework in the different sense that Rhemo has, and what I call a civil society institutions. And research I'm drawing much of these ideas from comes in two cases: the south of Bristol in the United Kingdom and the Bagnoli district of Neapol in Italy. Bristol we chose as a prime case for this governance model because it handles very vital, well embedded and newest network of community associations of residents. Hundreds of groups, well organized in federal organizing bodies well along history of negotiating and often being in conflict with the town. Many studies of UK governance rushing into regeneration discovered relatively weak community association involvement and relatively weak impact on decision making process. It certainly wasn't the case in Bristol. The best case for the urban model. On the other hand these institutional network, the traditions of the groups and previous lessons that were being drawn made it a much more complex process and not quite straightforward and successful. So it was successful in some respects but in many brought more complexity than this. And the Neapol is polar opposite case. For historic, political and economical reasons, the new administration of Neapol in 1990's decided that it had to exclude civil societies in business interest. And the past things that had negative impact on development, on planning, on construction.... there were negative alliances between the construction firms and the civil societies group such as labor representatives aligned to them. And if you go to the center of Neapol you will find that there is a lot of those very poor, speculative, brutalist, modelist construction in a lot of classical architecture. So the council led them to legitimate new plan for the city, for the district. And this Bagnoli district, which could be described as the top down, it was centralized, it presented all the data and then sort of impose this on this Bagnoli district. Bagnoli had the steelworks which was planned to be reconverted to the mixture of environmental, small business, touristic and leisure resources. But this was done without the civil society participation and without the public-private partnership. The council were fortunate to negotiate the use of the land with the nationalized industry that owned the steelworks. And they were fortunate not to have direct economic interest to do. Despite the dissimilarities in these both cases, they both achieved the mere consensus on the final uses of the redevelopment sites. This wasn't completely truth because in the situation of Neapol exclusion of some society groups and organizations led to some conflict over two or three particular parts of this work where there already have been some development for example science center and social and leisure resources. And of course in Bristol there was a long process of conflicts and disagreement before the area in south Bristol finally approved for mixed use development and again a very similar environmental community a leisure, a little bit of retail and a health resources community. The important point is that both of the models were quite different and yet they achieved the similar outcome which seemed have broad measure of consensus. Bristol was only handicapped by the powers of driving the development unlike the Neapol had to deal with private large choke of land of former factory as part of the area for regeneration and had no control over this as this was developed by private industry. And Neapol was only disrupted by disputed locations the third

sector organizations already developed within the site. Just turning to network, to government aspect, a contribution of response community association I said there was a dense political network influence. If they had only to rely on business partnerships or if they were being excluded then these group would create obstacle or severe oppositions for the plan as this was they involved their effort on disagreement and conflicting on specific aspects that were taken along with the process. And consultations sometimes extended beyond mere consultations to participation. And they were fortunate to have some alliances with some of their councilist and political representatives increasing encouraged participation rather than mere consultation. In this instance a private sector rather than being involved as a partner more than a constrained by civil society organizations. So this governance model is universal model because of the example of Neapol. In this instance the mayor and his administration was capable of acting as a single driver, unilateral driver to achieve generally acceptable plan. Other UK governance cases are not being seen as successful because community involvement was being artificial. It was only possible in Bristol because politics of civil society have gradually meshed in local government politics in planning functions. It is primarily about political fundament being produced. So I will draw some conclusions and some questions for the Courbit model. Competitiveness is perhaps the wrong variable. If you focus exclusively on economic competitiveness you either reduce this social, environmental and cultural aspect to mere details and you may not achieve competitiveness because the competitiveness depends now on much wider social, cultural and environmental factors that simply on infrastructure of facilities, resources and effect efficient money. Businesses shouldn't be the sole vehicles in this process but also civil society institutions. And we must remember that civil society institutions nowadays comprise a whole spectrum, whole range from organizations that are very close to be businesses, the social enterprises to full time professional charities to representative organizations, to environmental organizations, neighborhood residents organizations, a whole spectrum and all these have to be considered. We call this civil society spectrum a social capital. And if we want to involve the social capital in the development of the competitiveness then we have to logically involve the owners of the social capital that is the residents, the community groups and so on. I want to ask a question if this means that we can extrapolate these general points. Whether the social model described in this paper will always subsume or contain the economic ones. Even though there may be attempt to simply focus on economic development. It may conflict and interact with the social models. Just the question as a have no knowledge on developments in what we usually refer to as Eastern Europe, I think there is a question mark of that whether the large cities in the east of Europe can leap over the trajectory that the western cities are following to these new post-industrial social governance model or whether they have to go through some of the same stages. What resources they try to exploit? For example libraries much cheaper so they should be more focus on short term immediate economic development and things like that rather to employ these complex models. The question is again can we have a single planning model for urban regeneration. And that is another problem that many cities even in countries like UK have social capital, civil society institutions underdeveloped They aren't always vital, they aren't always strong then there is this sort of question when something like Neapol approach may be more effective in terms of regeneration. Finally I would like to suggest that all purpose management model is probably not possible. Because of the political framework not just the economical constraints will contain and will probably try to apply the universal model of regeneration. Thank You.

(129:10)

Simon Guy(132:20)

I work at the University of Manchester as a professor of architecture, even though I'm not trained with that background. But I have spent years now trying to understand the issues around designing a city with projects in UK, Europe and beyond. What I want to do today is to raise some issues about what we mean about model and I'm picking up the frame of the interpretive urban model so I want ask the question what are actually models doing for us. And that is a key stage of the project now. And it is important that all the different members of the model share the same idea about what this model is for, where it comes from, what it means what is representing and who's gonna use it and what for. So what I want to talk about in the beginning is that there is a challenge or even a danger that the your interpretive model is somehow a singular and universal

model. And actually what does it mean to set a multiple model for the city. And perhaps the multiple models state the fact that there are competing pathways to different kinds of urban future depending on actual context you're working on and the particular future you want. Can we imagine that we develop the flexible models that can handle this idea of diversible futures? So I want to put this context and the challenge you have in this project into concept trying to catch this diversity to avoid the attempt of trying to fix and discipline the city. To illustrate this I want to use the illustration of the danger which the whole language of complexities. So the literature that was collected in 1996 spoke about the complexities and this phrase is picked from one of the books:

Compact cities all today are full of illusionary solution, there are no embracing paths out....(136:47) This book illustrates that the universal common model was promoted and was echoed through policy and approaches. However in the same book we find another approach that says ***.....(137:30)*** So about just the same time I had a talk with professor Graham Hunter who wrote a very interesting paper called: "Sustainable urban models". He illustrated three models which were dominant. So when everybody was trying to find universal model there were number of models operating. So the first model he described he called redesigning city model. And here he talks about designing the city with lower urban metabolism. So when I was doing this work I was looking for ideas of sustainable city as a very particular kind of urban future. The focus is within the city and that is important. It is important where we draw the lines of the interventionism, since people draw the lines very differently so we need to be very careful how we design this. So the focus is within the city itself. Little attempt to define or reduce original broad boundaries from which city derives its resources flows. So the focus tend to be very physical - about planning, redesign, reshape resources and behavior We captured this in this kind of diagram. You can see here the resources coming in and out of the city but the focus is very much a physical intervention. Now it is also important to consider who are the actors here involved in this issue. And if the actors are working physically on the city they are going to be architects, developers, planners. These are very particular key people depending on the model you develop. There is a very little opportunity to talk about the dialog between the cities. So the second model is what he called externally dependent city. So in this case a city is building a much wider regional network and it actually suffers in terms of the environmental costs of this linear metabolism. So the challenge here is rather to refocus the city, reshape it, is to buy in additional caring capacity. So this is about encouraging the resource managers to invest in the infrastructure supply, tapping into available resources beyond the city with less debate actually on the city itself. So the debate is less about the redesign and development but more about the economic process. So it is not about the architects but regional or even national utility companies - these kind of actors. So you need to take care about the market efficiency and sending the encouraging signals to actors to get the expected behavior So different actors involved, different spacial definition of what the city is and different discourse of what needs to be done. The final model the Graham Hunter suggests is very different - a self reliant city. So this is not looking for the interregionalizing but actually intensifying internalization of actions, looking for what is called a circular metabolism. So there is greater emphasis on a small scale technology, recycling, demand management. So this is a shift from either technical disaster, the economic market start to a localized community based form of decision making. So then you see here in terms of the arrows we have some sense of interregional focus in a wider spacial definition and still have focus on the city. And who are the actors here? Now it is obviously utility makers and national policy makers, not necessarily developers, but there is a language of localities and uses and a different style of decision making being encouraged. So these models defined as they are provide each a very different context social, economic, technological within each the kind of debates we have this morning take place. They notch the particular direction the debates go. They encourage particular actors to be involved or excluded. They have their value but they will loose when put in sociological and political conditions which prevent consideration of the wider process. So anytime when we try to universalize one of these model we start the process of exclusion and inclusion, we start to set spacial boundaries, we start to encourage particular economic interventions and we start actually to prefer a particular kind of urban future and perhaps close down debate a little bit early. So we need to start to integrate the best features of different models, different background. So the problem with those models is that they are not inclusive enough. We can have the universal model and we will be still concerned about that. We found out that when you put any of these

model into a particular context they start to fall apart, close debates and encourage particular kind of direction, particular kind of approach and design. So we say, wait a second, why don't we start to use heuristic tools, kind of windows in which we can map the contrasting visions? That seems to us to be extremely useful. We can imagine these models as range of different constructions of what our future might be. Then we can implement filter tool lens through which we decide on which kind of policy to take. So model from this point of view start to define different pathways rather than the universal blueprint that can be just set in a universal context. So we decided to explore the pathways through some issues of sustainability. We tried to map who are the social actors, agencies involved in all debates, what are the different view points in these debates, how are they constructing the sustainability issues and what are they recommending we should be doing. Can we use these different viewpoints to Graham's different models? And we've done that we can say there are different resonances and dissonance between the different models and actually bring to the surface all the tensions.

We took the issue of energy efficiency, the kind of issue that is going to be there in any kind of future of sustainable cities and we tried to look for some key actors and we started to use a quality interviews to map what we call the story lines. What were they saying about the issue of energy efficiency. They all agreed we need to use energy more efficiently so there was a consensus and coalition. The problem started when we started to explore the actors to find what they thought the strategy should be. So central government said about controlling the market, how do we reshape the market in order to make people to think of energy as a cost and look for different ways to use energy more efficiently. The local people said: we need to encourage local initiatives, what about interregional equitable, you need to put national standards to other cities also, what about the importance of local groups, important thing is to raise environmental consciousness, said the environmental groups. So there are different views. Another group would think about socially disadvantaged group and people who suffer disproportionately. So we started to map these perspectives on the Graham's different models of cities. So we noticed that from the first point of agreement and consensus we started to break down in terms how to get there, the pathways to energy efficient city and that eventually would lead to different models. The danger is if we picked in advance particular model and design action accordingly to that model then working up the model you would see that we marginalized different group of actors.

Another issue that was affecting Yorkshire - a water transfer. You can imagine that there is an incredibly rainy city we actually have problem with water shortages. The problem was pronounced and there was idea to transfer the surface water from north-east, because we have built reservoirs we only needed to transfer that water where it is needed. We did research with some key actors from different groups and we tried to map the story lines, we tried to identify where they were particular coalitions. They all recognized there was a surface water in New Castle. There was an interregional equity issue that needed solving. The problem was when we started talking how to transfer water. The water companies said there is no physical problem to transfer the water. However the regulators said the region equity was the problem. Because the water company said the water company should be compensated and the regulators said the customers should be compensated. So the level of economic thinking was the issue. The environmental groups didn't agree that the water transfer was no problem. It was huge engineering project with huge impact on environment and they said that the environment needs to be compensated in this case. And the environmental groups actually said that we shouldn't be doing this at all, we should think about demand management. So looking at those models it was even more clearly the very very different cities: on one hand the utility companies, the regulators seeing the city as the externally dependent in this kind of linear urban metabolism with the clear relationship between the cities and on the other hands environmental regulators and to a degree economic regulators saying that there needs to be fair shares, there is an equity issue here. So again working back up the table if you processed any of the models from the bottom you would have ignored a lot of these tensions. So my conclusion on these models are that they are no options that you can choose from any point of view, which is the best, which is the optimum. Instead they should be used heuristically to orientate our thinking about the potential of different types of sustainable city. When you're looking on the issue of water shortages who should be involved in decision making, what are the implications in adopting the particular kind of model economically, environmentally and socially. We need to recognize different strategies that can

coexist supporting different coalitions of actors and those coalitions may shift over time and over space. Different visions may become dominant or marginalize different types of context. If you take one model that worked in one place to the other place you may find the different set of dynamics and a very different set of social, environmental and economical potentials. So in this case we were talking about the environmental debates and this afternoon the questions is if some conclusions from our research are relevant to Courbit model. We would argue that all debates about the future of the city you have to see those, you have to start them, you need to understand them as such and complete the interpretation. That's the key analytical move. And with all those technological or economical strategies represent distinct philosophies of the environmental processes. So understanding, developing particular approaches to the cities represent various ideas, a particular vision of what the design would look. So the designs and strategies are prefigured by the those visions. So rather than searching for this singular universal pathway we need to listen to a range of voices which comes back to this idea of an audit. Who are the state holders? Who are the people that really have concerns? And the regeneration of city is dependent on the dynamic strategies of the city, development and the power to implement the chosen strategies. And the issue is the development of land and persuading the institutional investors. And the question is not actually how to persuade the institutional investors to think a bit more like us, but actually to understand what is their vision of city, what kind of values they are looking to extract because that explains the logic in which they are developing. So coming back to Courbit model I got this question: how is the city imagined here? Where is that line being drawn? I am talking about containers. Where is that line being drawn? Is it around the building? Is it around the city? Is it around the region? Where are the connections? Is this model designed, focused just on the city itself? Or is it a set of cities? Is that a city or is just a regional consciousness? How does the city relate to the region? What does the nation say? Who are the actors involved here? We see the PPP and again that's only one model of social organization, but there are many others and when we start to accept this we're starting to move away from the universal model. We may have to accept a whole set of social organizations, which may be involved in developing those particular visions. There is another question: where does the model come from? Models don't come from nowhere, there is a particular vision surely. What kind of research is based on? Is this research made in this project? Is it literature? Is it based on experience from previous models? The Courbit project seems to have two dimensions: theoretical dimension and empirical dimension. How do those things connect? Is it the suggestion that the model goes first and then shapes the material? Or is it the empirical research was started and the empirical research was somehow derived? So what's the relationship between model and empirical? So that's a little bit about the construction of the model. Then the next thing: who is going to use this model? Is it going to be used by planners? Local authorities? By European Commission planning cities across Europe? Is it national governments? Designers and developers working in the part of the city? How is it going to be used? Is it going to be used to shape state holder meetings? To illustrate the possibilities? Is it going to be used to say: this is your problem, if you check these boxes and follow that path and this is your solution? What's the purpose of the model? What's that vision of the future? When you finished the model as you are going with the project, it has to be accepted and then used. What kind of cities will it produce? Let's imagine that all cities in Europe say this Courbit model is fantastic, we're going to use it, share development plans, use the strategy - what will European cities look like? Those are crazy big suit kind of questions but I think it is important to have some kind of answers to that.

(160:20)

Mike Raco(164:40)

I'd like to focus a little bit on the empirical work that I have been involved in. I looked at the role of the businesses in the private sector in partnerships particularly relating to urban development, I also looked at the business involvement in regional policy making as well, I worked in Scotland few years ago looking at the businesses attitude towards new Scottish parliament. So I was thinking about the model here and thinking about the PPP. I thought I will concentrate on some questions surrounding motivations, I was thinking why particular actors, particular groups actually engage in partnership building as a process. It's a very important question. My senses when looking at the Courbit model were that it does presuppose a set of rationalities, it presupposes

that partnerships can and will happen and I think it also presupposes that public private partnerships play the main role in urban development. What is it that different actors want and take from partnerships, what is it that they imagine partnerships to be. I want to think how do actors understand that process. What is that beyond what we may call rationalities in partnership building, I want to think a little bit about partnerships perhaps more as networks, more than it has appeared. We're thinking more of the dynamic networks more than a static models or understanding the partnership. And being a geographer I want to talk about the contextualization of the model, think about the context in which the partnerships are formed, how they differ in different context and different place, and how they may include that kind of spacial contextualization, perhaps in more direct sense. I think about the questions of who, why and how of partnerships, the basic questions when thinking about the model. It seems to me that many people think about the rationalities of the model in simple way, we think about the private sector actors, why they get involved, partly for economic reasons, partly for political reasons, legitimization, influencing the planning process is very important aspect, and we may think about the social dimensions as well. We may think about the local business actors as members of society and of course the people we are dealing when talking to private sector are people of course and they have particular social perspectives, who they are, what their responsibilities are and what business should they be doing in terms of urban planning, urban development. As it comes to public sector, when I go to European meetings I often hear from the local policy makers: "we're in the top 5's out of 200" and that seems really important to them, less to the publics but very important for policy makers. And that is actually rational for partnerships to include the private sector, it will help us to move up some imagined lead table. It is certainly very important in the research I've done. There are some economic justifications. Many struggle financially for resources and this is obviously a way to tap into the resources of private sector money and political popularity. These things are important and they need to be somewhere in the model. So what is the reason people get involved into partnerships. Now we might define motivation as a reason a person acts in particular way, a motive, rationality and reason for doing something. When we analyze models of partnerships there are sometimes assumptions about the rationalities used by actors that are simplified much too easily. I would argue that the reasons why people engage in PPP are very much driven by socioeconomic processes. My understanding from the interviews on different level of businesses is that the reasons they get involved into politics, into partnerships are very very diverse and often have very little to do with what we call market building or economic criteria, very often this is about: "well I am Scottish person, I want Scotland to be a better place, I will involve because it is something I want to do". Often it is not economic logic and often it is opposite, they say: "it is not good for my business to engage in partnerships, but I am just a person who believes passionately in independent Scotland". And these things are critically important. I am not sure how they potentially fit into the model that is being presented in terms of PPP and justification in terms of bringing resources into a city. But rationalities of these business people are very diverse and very broad. Just thinking a little bit about the processes of partnership, what I would argue is that we need to think about partnerships in many ways. I'd like to see them very much as a dynamic and fluctuating networks. My experience of looking at the partnerships, particularly at the urban level, is to think of partnerships as of things that are contextual but things that are developed to solve particular problems. Partnerships emerge around particular imagined problems. An example might be a town in the south of England where official unemployment is less than 1%, you have a new development in the center, there is 3000 jobs and you need 3000 people to fill those places and you find partnership being developed incredibly quickly between local authorities public sector and private sector to try to deal with that particular problem and that partnership involved particular type of network. In the same time and the same place other networks are being established around other imagined problems, for example security as an issue in the town center and so the different type of partnership involves the different type of actors and in different ways. I tried to think of partnership as a kind of form of network building, something therefore that is quite contextual, something that is issue specific and something that depends on sort of imagination of what problems need to be addressed in a particular time. And there is Keith Basset's work on partnership building and he's talking in the context of Bristol: *A strong leadership and a dominance of one network ideology, different networks can cohere into a recognizable urban*

regime under one overarching ideology discourse. He talks about the ways in which networks form and emerge, he tries to think of the ways of understanding policy of partnership in that city. His ideas of the network is perhaps network theory thinking is the best approach adopted. Just in terms of what these processes of contextualization might be it strikes me that these issues need to come to the model in some way. One of them is of course marking some conditions. I spent three years working in Glasgow in west of Scotland, a place where local authorities were desperate to get private sector investment. I think the whole issue of the political culture has to come in the model in some way in some form. What type of politics exists in different places, how does that influence the type of partnership once it is emerging, this is absolutely critical question. And the traditions of partnership working or the tradition failure make a lot of difference of what subsequently takes place.

Local perception and opportunities and development problems, the particular understanding of how the problems are constructed. We need to think all the time about the local state relationships. In other words: where does the power lay behind: resource allocation? Politics? Partnership formation? For what reasons are actors at city level engaging in partnerships? Is it because of local circumstances, politics? Or are the partnerships formed because local agents are being told they have to form partnerships in order to acquire some governmental funding for example. That is what will shape the form and character of partnership. Not the kind of internal set of dynamics - that is implied by the model that currently exists. There are questions about the institutional presence - what organizations exist in particular places because that makes a huge difference. And there is a question about the leadership - who should lead the partnership. How does that process work. How do we understand where leadership comes into those processes if at all. It strikes me in observing PPP in different cities in UK that there are strongly public sector leaderships. The kind of myth that private sector, entrepreneurs are dynamic, active can come in, take a lead. The reality is that public sector bodies always lead partnerships. There is the policy of building a new place and this is where the partnership can be an important aspect. So the policy focus is about changing place, changing the characteristic but who is it that shapes things, who decides what the new place should be, what should it look like. There is interesting aspect about the partnership building processes, they tend to be issue specific politics and agendas You find that in many cities partnership is almost like a fire-fighting role. That is the basis of partnership building: to deal with particular problems rather than strategic, long term thinking. A lot of public actors in Britain like to be seen working with private actors for political reasons. I think this has also some relevance. In recent work I am looking at the business attitude to the evolution in Scotland and the emergence of the Scottish parliament. And there is an interesting thing because earlier the people had totally different attitude than I expected. I expected to find them very anti-state, anti-bureaucratic, anti-new parliament. Actually very positive messages. They wanted to engage in the set of partnerships and network building. They wanted things to succeed in a broader sense. And finally some other work I've done that brings some other issues: what is a private sector anyway? It is actually critical. The private sector is the fragmented thing of course. I've done some work in Britain looking on the relationships between local business and global international businesses and they have very different needs, very different priorities a very different understanding of what a pro-business agenda might be. I just think this is important thinking about this, the issues surrounding diversity, formal and informal representation, questions about mobilizations are very important. When talking about public and private partnership: what public, what private in particular, how are cooperating with these people? Thinking about the relevance of some of this stuff to the model and I want to focus on three important questions: (i) who should be included, (ii) why include the selected interests (iii) how should the processes of PPP operate and how to be structured. It is very important to identify who these key actors are. Why particular groups are selected? Why are particular types of private sectors included? Are critical voices included? Do you include voices of different types of businesses? What kinds of private sectors are we talking about? Are different types of business mobilized? How do we measure motivation? What reasons businesses have in getting involved? What type of public sector institutions should be included? Again you might think this is a network when dealing with security issues - you may think about including the police, community groups? Which groups should be involved and which one shouldn't be. I have to ask the basic question: is PPP always the best way to proceed? The British experience is that the central government is

always telling people that public private partnerships are always the best way to proceed, whereas in reality PPPs have often been a disaster, the motivations are misunderstood why business is involved, the competences and abilities of private sector are misunderstood. The question is never asked why should the business person be telling anything on the public services. If you want to make city competitive you need to talk to people who make it competitive. And yet many business involvement is fractured, poorly constructed and lacks the vision. The last question: how should the processes operate. I'd like to suggest broader processes motivation, why is it people involve, their reasons. At what point should the business people be involved in setting the development frameworks, should they be involved in setting the original visions, should they be involved in design of construction of the places? The use of PPP is probably to positive way to fix the commitment of the private sector in some sense. We can try to use this as a way of fixing commitment from groups who show little commitment or maybe have different priorities. It is also interesting thing to think about the governmental mentality. We might think of how different way of government are driven by policy. How implementing PPPs tries to shape the thinking of the actors? How may we use the policy to shape the way the actors think. It useful to observe the ways of thinking about governments. I think there is question about the responsibility of different actors, how the responsibility should be spread for the city, urban area. What are the responsibilities of the actors, how should they function, how should they be encouraged. I think it should establish more recursive relationship. One danger of PPP is it they encourage very dependent relationship so that the public sector increasingly depends on private sector in resources and vision. I would argue for more recursive or two-way relationship. My experience is that even in a place with strong market growth and public sector in good position to shape the development most developments are shaped by the private sector because they actually bring resources and make things done.(191:00)