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Content of the presentation

• Development in ISUDS
• Connection local strategy and EU
• The NPRZ
• The ITI
• The questions
The questions we like to discuss

1. How to best organise the municipal administration for an ISUDS?

2. How to make big change with small steps? (facilitating role)

3. How to effectively link urban strategies to EU support mechanisms? (connection)
Experience in ISUDS

Rotterdam has long planning tradition:
- adapting to societal challenges.
- has changed from sectoral to integrated
- combining economic, social & physical objectives, in a sustainable way
- from expansion areas to transforming existing urban/industrial sites ‘from greenfield to brownfield development’
- area based development in combination with overall vision

Changing role:
- from directing role to more facilitating
- from public to private initiatives (or public - private)
- model of co-creation
How do you think you can benefit from the workshop?
- ‘Fresh’ look from our peers, specifically on integrated programming and European support

How do you think the other peers can learn from your experience?
- Experience of the Rotterdam approach in respect to:
  - Integrated area-based development
  - Co-creation (several partners, both public - private)

Which specific experiences would you like to share
- How to create an effective organisational structure and programme, with governments as facilitator
Subject: Rotterdam South Bank
Introduction: from vision to strategy

Rotterdam, Gateway to Europe (Rotterdam Urban Vision 2030, 2006)

Development strategy:
- strong economy & attractive residential city in an international region
- port extension, metropolitanisation, regional transport & innovation and urban spatial development

Elaboration per area/ vision for the various parts of the city:
- international city along the river
- taking advantage of qualities Rotterdam North
- twofold strategy for Rotterdam South

Strong economy

Attractive residential city
Strategy of Rotterdam

NPRZ: National Programme for Rotterdam South Bank

Plan area (blue line)
33,15 km² = 3.315 ha
197,000/3,315 = 59.4 inh/ha

Focus area (bright yellow)
6,32 km² = 632 ha
75,000/623 = 118.7 inh/ha
ITI: Opportunities for Rotterdam II
NPRZ: National Programme for Rotterdam South Bank

NPRZ: three pillars

Employment   Education  Housing

ITI: three priority axis

Low carbon economy

Employment      Business climate
National Programme

- Signed by several parties at 19 September 2011
- Longterm commitment to achieve the objectives (20 year)
- Integrated approach based on three pillars
- Substantial investment ambition

Action plan

- With measurable goals and concrete actions
- Periodically updated (every 4 year)
- Annual progress reports
Focus areas have challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nederland</th>
<th>Total G4</th>
<th>Rotterdam</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Focus areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% h.h. with unemployment benefit</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% h.h. with children, income to 105% (of social minimum)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students in secondary school (grade A)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% dropouts 17-22 jaar</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% children with low educated parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% small outdated appartment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 1st and 2nd generation immigrants</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average housing value</td>
<td>€ 237.000</td>
<td>€ 220.000</td>
<td>€ 163.000</td>
<td>€ 126.000</td>
<td>€ 103.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing value
Jobs within travel time
Social performance
Context

Harbour activities moved away

Both opportunity and threat
- Transition of harbour to city: Stadhavens
- Social Economical impact
Institutional background

Horizontal partnership (within NPRZ)
- local government
- housing corporations
- educational institutions
- chamber of commerce / employers organisation
- citizen organisation

Vertical partnership (within NPRZ)
- national (Ministery of the Interior)

Links with other existing strategies at local/regional/National level

Rotterdam Urban vision, Spatial Development Strategy 2030; Cluster Plan, Work & Income; RIS3, Regional economic programme, Stadshavens, Hart van Zuid etc
Integrated approach 2

City as ecosystem

Quality of life
- Public space, Social network and Safety

Housing
- Diversity and Quality

Employment
- Amount of jobs and Diversity

Accessibility
- Travel time, Reachability

Amenities
- Schools, Shops, Culture, Sports etc

Citizens
- Education, Income, skills, housing, education
Weaknesses

- Poverty
- Poor public transport
- Abundance of small housing
- High drop out of school
- High unemployment
- Social and safety problems

(Building the evidence base for the) strategy
Strenghts

- Strong local engagement
- Near the centre
- Space for densification
- Population is young
- Each district has unique qualities

(Building the evidence base for the) strategy
Action perspective

For each district; Hands on approach

classic - perspective - strategy
**Objectives**

**USP rotterdam zuid: is its young population;**

**Invest in people and making them want to stay.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Improve learning outcome,</td>
<td>Make better use of the potentials of</td>
<td>Keep social climbers at south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elementary &amp; secondary school</td>
<td>labour force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training in skills which is</td>
<td>Create work at south or in region</td>
<td>Create basic quality (short term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>required by market</td>
<td></td>
<td>Make attractive living environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(long term)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Emphasis on powerful sectors such as port industry & health care*

*Renewal of 35,000 houses 12,000 social rent & 23,000 private owners*
Participation

What is the experience/background of citizen and stakeholders participative processes?

Strategic level (consulting role)

- **Burgertop** – Resident summit, 26 Jan 2013
- **Jongerentop** – Youth summit, 7 Nov 2014

Small scale level (active role)

several initiatives by citizens but also entrepreneurs, artists, designers, researchers etc

Trattoria Borgo d’Aneto  
ECO childrenpark, Creatief Beheer  
Elevatoren Maassilo
No blue printed masterplan
Process of co-creation (governments as facilitator)
Regular initiatives
(governments in active role)
Cities are a seedbed for science and technology, for culture and innovation, for individual and collective creativity, and for combating the effects of climate change.

However, those same cities are very often also plagued by problems such as unemployment, segregation and poverty.

The growth of the knowledge economy is, paradoxically, threatening to widen the gap between the different groups making up our society.

The long-term approach on a city-wide level tackle labour market mismatch and displacement, both on demand (businesses) and supply side (job seekers and study programmes), and focus on improving the regional business climate (eg. establishing high quality business and work sites).
Investment priorities

• Intervention logic > labour market mismatch

• Economic:
  • Developing (demand based) future labour supply (8b)
  • Improve conditions for establishing a business (9b)
  • Reducing energy consumption in the built environment (innovation, employment and training) (4c)

• Social:
  • Match unemployed job seekers to available jobs (ESF art. 3.1.a (i))
• ITI Rotterdam (One of four ITI’s in Opportunities for West)
• One CLLD under the ITI of the city of The Hague
• Rotterdam is MA, and implements also the ITI Rotterdam
• The ITI’s in Amsterdam, The Hague and Utrecht are delegated
  • (Slides on ITI)
• Rotterdam responsible as MA
• Other ITI’s fully mandated for ERDF (selection, M&E of projects, own budget)
• ESF through 2-year framework contract between the City’s Social dept. and Ministry of SA
How to best organise the municipal administration for an ISUDS?

**Why:** To get the real issues on the agenda, to ensure transparent/professional decision making, to be responsible for implementation and to be accountable.

**What has been done:**
+ NPRZ: Developed a National programme that is in implementation;
  + ITI: Built the ERDF MA structure in the organisation;
  + OP/UP: Initialised and implement an accountable programme;
  + Connect: Brussel, G-4, South wing, city departments.

**What worked:**
+ Long term experience connecting structural funds - City programmes;
+ Professional civil servants;
+ Elections have no disrupting effect on programme;
+ Long term vision.

**What did not work:**
+ Integrating ERDF with ESF is a challenge
+ Truly EU integrated approach as for URBAN II, is not possible
+ Single MA for ERDF and ESF
+ Regulatory requirements remain substantial
How to make big change with small steps?

**Why:** There is a high overall ambition (long term) and we need all parties to take a share in this. (facilitating role)

**What has been done:**
- there is an overall vision and action perspectives
- these document were approved in the board of NPRZ: all parties agree on this
- at different levels citizens/local parties are involved

**What worked:**
- program office NPRZ is a compact organisation
- different parties, that signed the ambition, do make their contribution
- programme NPRZ is connected with the input by different municipal services (economic, social and physical)

**What did not work:**
- in some areas there is a better collaboration between the local parties than in other areas (depending on individuals)
- in the elaboration of the vision, parties sometimes lower the ambition (threat)
- results need to be shared in a wider circuit (not only administratively) in order to create more involvement.
- there is little citizen power by itself (intermediaries are needed to make social weak groups participate)
Question for round table 3: Connection

How to effectively link urban strategies to EU support mechanisms? (article 7, ITI, etc.)

**Why:** size of local development vs available EU support (both monies and policies)

**What has been done:**
- from integrated support to small geographical area
- to wider areas linking problems and opportunities
- new approach is more financial engineering that programme design

**What worked:**
- small area is very focused and visible, combining a broad approach to local challenges, with little administrative issues
- larger area offers possibility to trigger pathways to tackle challenges, but also difficulties in getting the right mix supported and administrative barriers

**What did not work:**
- integrating ERDF with ESF objectives is still challenging
- development of a truly EU integrated approach due to limitations in the regulations,