Working Paper

The Design of IEP Sites: Aiming for an Inclusive Economic Participation of Urban Citizens in Flanders

Nathalie VALLET, Simon DE NYS-KETELS & Michelle BYLEMANS

The Design of IEP Sites: Aiming for an Inclusive Economic Participation of Urban Citizens in Flanders

Nathalie Vallet[*], Simon De Nys-Ketels and Michelle Bylemans

University of Antwerp, Faculty of Design Sciences,
Henri van de Velde Research Group

[*] Contact person: nathalie.vallet@uantwerpen.be

Abstract

In order to remedy the economic position of socially vulnerable citizens in Flemish cities, the University of Antwerp has launched the concept of an "Inclusive Participation (IEP) site". According to the CIRIEC workgroup "SSE and territories", an IEP site can be defined as a particular territorial network that accommodates partners who jointly try to resolve, under the environmental constraints of an urban setting, the challenge of an inclusive economic participation. On the basis of two explorative research projects, the working paper illustrates the fine-tuning of the concept and the development of strategic-spatial blueprints to successfully design and manage these IEP sites.

Keywords: inclusive economic participation, Flemish cities, IEP site, grounded theory

JEL Codes: H70, J64, O35, P13, L31

1.   Introduction

When focusing on the relationship between the territory and the social and solidarist economy (SSE), urban territories generate interesting challenges. Given the territory definition[1] used by the CIRIEC workgroup "SSE and territories", an urban territory refers to a dense and heterogeneous spatial context[2] gathering "... players that seek to bring out, then attempt to resolve under environmental constraints, a shared societal or production problem" (Pecqueur and Itçaina, 2012). Within an urban context these problems are related to the particular features, evolutions and future challenges of an urban society. Consequently, the associated definition of territorial governance refers to a complex urban network of numerous private, social profit and public organizations where the local urban government fulfils an important key-position or "nodal" role (Leloup, Moyart, Pecqueur, 2005).

In relation to the scientific investigation of urban territories, our attention is drawn by one particular challenge that manifests itself within many Flemish cities: the considerable high and expanding amount of socially deprived urban citizens[34]. An important cause of their socially deprived position is their weak and insecure economic position, both on the production side as a provider of labor and on the consumption side as a consumer of goods and services (Termote 2006; Coene, Dierckx, Vranken and Van Haarlem, 2011; Termote and Galand, 2012; Coene 2012 and 2013). Although there exist many Flemish[5],

---

[1] The territory as a social construction, see: CIRIEC International Scientific Commission Social Economy, proposed working group SSE and Territories: between interaction and co-construction, http://www.ciriec.ulg.ac.be/fr/telechargements/WG_ES-Territoire_programm.pdf, March 2015.

[2] The dense and heterogeneous features are related to the closely intertwined relationships between multiple activities, functions and people of an urban territory.

[3] The evolution of socially deprived citizens within Flanders has been investigated by the Service Platform to Combat Poverty, Insecurity and Social Exclusion (in Dutch: het Steunpunt tot Bestrijding van Armoede, Bestaansonzekerheid en Sociale Uitsluiting) http://www.combatpoverty.be as well as by the Centre on Inequalities, Poverty, Social Exclusion and the City of the University of Antwerp (In Dutch: OASES) https://www.uantwerpen.be/en/rg/oases/ .

[4] Within Flanders, several definitions and/or criteria are used to define the concept of socially vulnerable or deprived citizens. According to the Public Employment Service of Flanders (in Dutch: VDAB) for instance, socially deprived citizens are identified by means of the following criteria: nationality/language (i.e. non-native), education level (i.e. low skilled), physical/mental work ability (i.e. limited and/or absent) and age (i.e. older than 50) http://partners.vdab.be/kansengroepen.shtml. and http://www.vdab.be/english .

[5] See for instance the many projects of the Policy Research Centre of Work and Social Economy (in Dutch: het Steunpunt Werk en Sociale economie) (http://www.steunpuntwse.be/node/28) and of the Flemish Department for Labor (www.werk.be).

provincial[6] and municipal[7] initiatives to improve the economic position of socially deprived citizens, these initiatives are often poorly coordinated and geographically dispersed in nature. As such, these initiatives are scattered throughout Flanders and its many large, medium-sized and small cities. This spatial or geographical diaspora makes the road leading socially deprived citizens towards these initiatives very difficult to find. Because many of these socially deprived citizens move, live and reside in cities, a lot of Flemish urban governments are therefore confronted with the following challenge: how can socially deprived urban citizens participate economically as a provider of labor and as a consumer in a more solid i.e. sustainable and structural way? What kind of alternative policy solutions do there exist, and which of these solutions are focused on the remediation of the poorly coordinated and spatially dispersed initiatives?

Within the multi-disciplinary research setting of the Henry Van De Velde Research Group (University of Antwerp, Faculty of Design Sciences)[8], we have formulated an answer by introducing the concept of a so-called "Inclusive Economic Participation (IEP)site". In line with the ideas of Manuel Castells (Castells, 1989, 1996 and 2010; Stock, 2011), we define an IEP site as a spatially concentrated "hub" or location in cities that accommodates public, (social) profit and profit organizations who jointly strive for a (more) solid economic participation of socially deprived citizens, both as a consumer and as a provider of labor. Consequently, IEP sites may for instance accommodate providers of public services (e.g. employment, social housing and child care support), SSE-organizations (e.g. sheltered workshops, social restaurants and production co-operatives) and profit organizations (e.g. eco-design stores, recycling pop-up shops, repair cafés[9], training experts and co-working facilitators). According to us, an IEP site can fulfill several functions. Firstly, there is the basic function of facilitating collective accommodations for organizations working on the inclusive economic participation of socially deprived citizens. By sharing the same space, certain facilities within this space can be managed (more) effectively and efficiently. Secondly, there is the easy-to-spot-and-find character of a concentrated location or hub by socially deprived citizens. Thirdly, IEP sites offer opportunities for participation to socially deprived urban citizens in the development of the site itself and the organized

---

[6] See for instance the many social economy initiatives mentioned on the websites of Flemish Provinces such as www.pomwvl.be/sociale-economie or
http://www.provincieantwerpen.be/aanbod/dwep/deis/sociale-economie.html .

[7] Examples of initiatives undertaken by local urban governments are for instance the "Spiegelfabriek" in the city of Herentals, "De Punt" in the city of Ghent and "t Atelier" in the city of Mechelen.

[8] The team consists of researchers within the disciplines of public strategic management, social economy, urban planning and architecture.

[9] See: http://repaircafe.org/

6

initiatives. As such, a well-considered or affirmative architecture and an open design can give rise to the co-creation of the site itself. Finally, the physical proximity of organizations sharing the same societal objectives also stimulates collective innovation.

Given the objectives of the CIRIEC workgroup "SSE and territories", an IEP site can be (re)defined as a particular territorial network that accommodates partners who try to resolve under the environmental constraints of an urban setting, the challenge of an inclusive economic participation. In relation to the territorial governance, appropriate models, frameworks or blueprints are needed to manage these networks in an effective and efficient way. As the concept of an IEP site is however new, the detection, analysis and evaluation of already existing governance models is not self-evident. We can however find some inductive inspiration for these models in already existing IEP site "related" initiatives (see also paragraph 2: methodology). But even then, the major scientific challenge will be to construct or develop these appropriate governance models ourselves.

Based on the expertise of our multi-disciplinary research team, we will focus our construction or development efforts on a particular kind of governance model, being the so-called strategic-spatial model or blueprint for IEP sites. In an initially elaborated working definition, the strategic part of these models or blueprints is focused on (i) the strategic meaning of the IEP site i.e. the importance and relevance of an inclusive economic participation in relation to the long term challenges and priorities of the entire city and its partners, (ii) the strategic and organizational design of the IEP site i.e. the organizational network features including the strategic decision process and structure, and (iii) the strategic impact i.e. the degree in which the activities of the IEP site actually contribute to a (more) solid economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens. The spatial part of these models or blueprints is focused on (i) the spatial context i.e. the precise location of the IEP site within the city and the particular features of this location, (ii) the spatial design of the IEP site itself i.e. the composition and architectural features of the IEP site and its buildings and (iii) the spatial impact i.e. the degree in which the spatial design of the IEP site actually contributes to a (more) solid economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens.

Eventually, our final goal is to develop a set of alternative strategic-spatial models or blueprints for the installation and development of IEP sites. The alternative nature refers to the assumption that the diverse types of socially vulnerable citizens as well as the specifically needed economic participation and the particular urban setting, presumably demand for the identification of different types of IEP sites. Each alternative model or blueprint will then specify and clarify the associated and internally consistent governance-principles of that particular IEP site type. As such, the strategic-spatial blueprints can inspire and support all partners involved - and in particular the policy makers of local

governments fulfilling a "nodal" role - to make more well-considered, consistent and explicit policy decisions on their shared inclusive economic participation ambitions.

This brings us to the goal and objective of this paper. Within this publication we will report on the first set of preliminary research results realized within two explorative IEP site projects in Flanders. The preliminary character is due to the phase-wise analysis that is typical for a qualitative research methodology (see also paragraph 2: methodology). Gradually, the collected data are coded and re-coded in order to interpret and re-interpret the extensive and complex set of gathered insights. As mentioned before, the research results are obtained from two IEP site projects within Flanders. On the one hand there is the so-called STIMPRO research project financed by the University of Antwerp and focusing on (i) the (further) elaboration of the concept, (ii) an inventory or agenda of the challenges for future research and (iii) the elaboration of an appropriate methodology to design the ambitioned strategic-spatial models or blueprints (i.e. how can we develop relevant and useful blueprints? What do these blueprints need to contain or specify?). This STIMPRO research project has led to the realization of 15 inspirational quick scan case-studies focusing on Flemish SSE-initiatives that include certain aspects or features of our IEP site concept (e.g. spatially intertwined initiatives involving different partners). On the other hand there is the pilot research project realized in the former vagabond colony of Wortel-Merksplas[10] and co-financed by the University of Antwerp and the Province of Antwerp. The focus of this pilot research project concerns investigating (iii) the influence of a particular contextual setting[11] on the creation of an IEP site (i.e. what happens when different actors meet each other in a particular setting and want to jointly create an IEP-site?), and (iv) the phase-wise elaboration and evolution of an IEP site (i.e. from the initial intention, to the concept, to the model and to the final implementation). This pilot research project has led to the realization of 10 additional inspirational quick scans in Flanders.

Given the previously described objective, the following research question will be answered within this paper: what can we "inductively" learn from both explorative research projects in relation to (i) the conceptualization of an IEP site and (ii) the elaboration of strategic-spatial (governance) models or blueprints?

The structure of this paper starts with the description of the research methodology used in both explorative research projects. Then we continue with the research results and the answers to the previously defined research question. And finally, we will formulate some concluding remarks including an agenda for future research initiatives.

---

[10] Located near the city of Antwerp, Turnhout and Hoogstraten.

[11] A joint interregional ambition of two small cities and several municipalities.

2. A Grounded Theory and Interdisciplinary Research Design

As we aim for the development of a non-existent or new concept, the overall research design is clearly explorative in nature. In particular, we choose for a qualitative research design according to the principles of the so-called Grounded Theory (Straus and Corbin, 1994; Charmaz, 2006; Morse, 2009; Stern and Porr, 2011; Birks, 2011). By gradually collecting and analyzing (inspirational) field data of IEP site "related" SSE-initiatives (i.e. the so-called quick scan case-studies), we strive for the inductive development of strategic-spatial models or blueprints for IEP sites.

The identification of the inspirational population for our Grounded Theory ambition (i.e. IEP site "related" SSE-initiatives) is certainly not obvious. When looking for relevant information it becomes clear that no overall, extended and systematized inventory already exists - or has been made - in Flanders or Belgium on the variety of SSE-initiatives and their particular inclusive economic participation activities. Some lists do exist, for instance on the location of SSE-initiatives[12], but these lists consist of very few and/or relevant information for our particular research ambition (e.g. spatially intertwined and/or joint activities). Given this information-wise obstacle, we therefore have contacted several local, regional and Flemish SSE-platforms[13] as well as Flemish local governments[14] to construct such an inventory-list ourselves. Thus, a team of expert witnesses helped us to identify the population of Flemish IEP site "related" SSE-initiatives for the further realization of both our explorative research projects. This elaboration is however an on-going or continuous process. In the near future, the inventory-list will for instance be completed with some interesting SSE-initiatives found within the region of Wallonie and Brussels[15].

For the subsequent selection of the quick scan case-studies, we aim for a set of IEP site related SSE-initiatives that reflect the uncovered diversity of the population inventory-list (see before). At first sight, this uncovered diversity mainly relates to the particular type of (i) economic activity/sector (e.g. logistics, bio-agriculture), (ii) socially deprived citizens (i.e. specific socio-demographic profiles) and (iii) geographical locations (i.e. different cities, regions and provinces in Flanders). Given the manageability of both explorative research projects[16] we have selected a set of 15 SSE-initiatives within the STIMPRO research project and 10 SSE-initiatives within the pilot research project of Wortel-Merksplas. Due to the specific profile of the Wortel-Merksplas region

---

[12] See: http://www.mi-is.be/en/node/68591> and http://socialeeconomie.be/ondernemingen

[13] e.g. IN-C or the Flemish Platform for SSE-organizations, http://in-c.biz/

[14] e.g. VVSG or the Flemish Platform for Cities and Municipalities, http://www.vvsg.be/

[15] This is realized together with the University of Liège (CIRIEC Belgium)

[16] Both research projects lasted for max. 1 year and were realized by one senior and two junior researchers.

(i.e. a semi-urbanized region with numerous rural and touristic economic activities), the latter set also consists of (bio)agricultural and touristic SSE-initiatives (e.g. bio-production of fruit, vegetables and juices, horticulture and gardening, cycling and lodging, farm-tourism and children's farm initiatives).

The data-collection within the quick scan case-studies is focused on the existing strategic and spatial features of the respective SSE-initiatives. Although we have defined these features at the beginning of our research activities (i.e. see before: the initial "working" definition of a strategic-spatial model and its features), we have further specified and adjusted them during the data-collection itself. This gradual, data-induced specification of central concepts and their respective features clearly fits the overall principles of qualitative research methodologies and of the Grounded Theory methodology in particular. Thus, the continuous interaction between the initial working definitions, the subsequent inductive discoveries and the intermediate (re)conceptualizations, eventually led to a list of data-collection items related to the topics specified in the paragraph "uncovered topics of a strategic-spatial blueprint" (see later: 3.2.1).

The data-collection itself has been realized by means of four complementary data-gathering techniques being (i) written or digital documents (e.g. brochures, internal policy notes and website-information), (ii) visual representations (e.g. plans, maps, photos and self-made sketches), (iii) open and/or half-structured interviews[17] and (iv) observations (e.g. visits to the SSE-initiatives by the researchers). The entire data-collection has been realized within a time-span of approximately 6 months.

During the subsequent data-analysis – of which the realization partly coincides with the previously mentioned data-collection – we have used several visualization techniques (e.g. tables, schemes and figures). These techniques have facilitated considerably the making of a comparative analysis of all quick scan case-studies involved. Especially within the pilot research project of Wortel-Merksplas we have experimented a lot with clear, easy-to-understand and survey-able or manageable representations of the collected data. This was also necessary as the data had to be understood not only by the researchers themselves, but also by the many actors and (local) policy makers involved.

Finally, the intermediate research results have been discussed profoundly within the so-called "IEP-Reference-Platforms" of each explorative research project. These platforms have been set up at the start of each research initiative to guarantee the overall quality and practical use of the inductive conceptualization of IEP sites as well as the elaborated strategic-spatial models or blueprints. On the one hand these platforms consist of academic network-partners that

---

[17] 1 to 3 interviews with mainly management representatives or directors of the SSE-initiatives.

10

safeguard the multi-disciplinary embeddedness[18]. On the other hand these IEP-Reference-Platforms also consist of partners who safeguard the added value for the "workfield". At present it concerns representatives of local urban governments, SSE-organizations and organizations representing different categories of socially deprived urban citizens.

As indicated in the title of this methodological paragraph, the research design is not only influenced by the principles of Grounded Theory, but also by an explicit interdisciplinary research focus. As the development of strategic-spatial models or blueprints requires a simultaneous input from the disciplines of (i) SSE, (ii) strategic public management and (iii) architecture & urbanism, both explorative research projects are clearly interdisciplinary in nature. Although the concept of an IEP site and the development of strategic-spatial models is new - so that an elaborated, existing state of the art literature is presently absent - we can however uncover some similarities between our particular IEP site ambitions and some specific interests, methodological traditions and ambitions existing within the different disciplines involved. Notwithstanding the fact that a more profound and elaborate description of this state of the art will be the subject of a future – and thus separate – theoretical paper, we can already mention some interesting points of attention:

- Within the discipline of SSE, there exists a growing amount of literature on (i) the increasing amount and heterogeneous profile of socially deprived and/or impoverished citizens in our global society, (ii) the evolving and unique identity of the SSE-sector, (iii) the importance of the SSE-sector for public management (e.g. how to remedy the consequences of the contemporary economic crises by SSE?) and (iv) the strategic features of social entrepreneurship (Spear et al., 2001; Moulaert and Ailenei, 2005; Certo and Miller; 2008, Monzón and Chaves, 2008; Bouchard, 2009; Conforth and Brown, 2014).

  A remarkable hiatus however exists on the particular relationship of the public interest and strategic features of SSE-initiatives on the one hand, and its facilitating spatial morphology and architectural features on the other hand (e.g. is a particular type of location and/or particular - easy accessible - form of architecture required?).

  Both the growing amount of literature and the apparent hiatus can be seen as relevant for the future elaboration of our IEP site concept.

---

[18] Amongst whom Oswald Devisch (ArcK Research Group, University of Hasselt), Hans Leinfelder (Faculty of Architecture, University of Leuven), Tinne van Regenmortel (Centre for Sociological Research, University of Leuven), Astrid Coates (University College of Heverlee, University association Leuven) and Barbara Sak, Christine Dussart and Fabienne Fecher (CIRIEC, Université de Liège).

- As far as the discipline of strategic public management is concerned, our IEP site concept as well as the strategic features within the blueprints can be related to the extensive and growing literature on so-called multi-actor and governance networks (Rhodes, 1997; Provan and Milward, 2001; Goldsmith and Eggers, 2004; Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004; O'Toole and Meier, 2004; Sorensen and Torfing, 2007; Bevir and Richards, 2009).

  Within this literature however – and in contrast with our IEP site ambitions – only a relatively small amount of publications refers explicitly to the needed or facilitating spatial features of these networks (Vallet, 2013). When considering these spatial features, they mainly focus on process- and management-related considerations, not on the spatial aspects, implications and architectural setting. As such, multiple authors within the specific literature on strategic urban planning for instance, have argued that the process of "(citizen) participation" in urban spatial development and planning offers a viable alternative to the classical top-down approach that often fails to capture the various voices and needs of all urban actors and subjects involved (Bryson and Crosby, 1993; Healy, 1996 and 1997; Innes and Booher, 1999). In more recent publications, some authors have also suggested practical guidelines to further or actually implement such participatory processes in different spatial contexts (Innes and Booher, 1999; Bryson et al., 2012). Moreover, although in a less elaborated way and sometimes named differently (e.g. as "community engagement"), other authors stemming from the specific discipline of public (interior) architecture have suggested a similar approach (Peterson, 2008; Smith et al., 2014).

  In short, both the growing amount of literature on multi-actor and governance networks and the apparent hiatus on the needed or facilitating spatial accommodations of these networks, can be related to our particular concept of IEP sites;

- Within the broad discipline of architecture & urbanism, there is a striking lack of academic work and literature on SSE-initiatives. Neither the historical development of SSE-architecture and urban planning has been described, nor has the construction of a new canon of "good practices" been undertaken.

  Nonetheless, some literature exists that might be relevant or can be at least inspiring for our particular IEP site ambitions.

  A first type of literature concerns the scientifically valid ways of architectural knowledge production, being "design research" (Bayazit, 2004), and the specific literature on "architectural research" (EAAE, 2012). Two methodological views within this literature are of particular importance for the way in which we conduct our explorative research into IEP sites: the literature on research-by-design (Bowen, 2008;

Borgdorff, 2011; Verbeke, 2013) and on the actor-network-theory (Latour and Yaneva, 2008; Yaneva, 2012). In the former, knowledge production is realized not only by means of the final design, but also, heuristically, as the *"design process forms the pathway through which new insights, knowledge, practices or products come into being."* (EAAE, 2012). In the latter, the analysis of spatial objects is done by charting or mapping the various actors that are related to the architectural object during its lifespan. Thus, our Grounded Theory research design clearly relates to an existing and evolving research tradition within the discipline of architecture & urbanism. As such, the Grounded Theory research design clearly creates a joint methodological mind-setting for the various academic disciplines involved.

A second type of relevant literature concerns recent publications on the relationship between architectural design and subjective well-being (Smith et al., 2012; Desmet and Pohlmeyer, 2013; Stevens et al., 2014; Petermans and Pohlmeyer, 2014). This new and emerging topic in architectural research is presumably relevant for our IEP site concept for two reasons. On the one hand, these publications aim to develop instruments to evaluate how and in which degree architecture contributes to the so-called subjective well-being of its users. On the other hand and based on the previously gained insights, their future goal is to identify specific design principles that allow architects to develop buildings that support or increase the subjective well-being of its users. As our IEP site concept focusses on the well-being of socially deprived urban citizens in their quest for an inclusive economic participation, this type of publications seems to be quite interesting.

A third and last type of literature concerns the publications on other hub-wise architectural typologies and relevant spatial features. Thus, there is for instance the literature on school campuses (De Langhe and Lyppens, 2012), industrial sites (Mozingo, 2011), gated communities (Lang and Danielson, 1997; Eshuis et al., 2011) and building blocks (Apostel, Pittillion, Jansen, et al. 2008). Accordingly, there is the particular literature on relevant spatial features of such hubs as for instance the so-called inclusiveness (Amin, 2002; Verschaffel, 2006), accessibility (Pasaogullari and Doratli, 2004), multi-functionality and interwoven character (Hooimeier, Kroon and Luttik, 2001). Especially these features relate rather directly to the essence of our IEP site concept.

In summary, the lack of publications on SSE-architecture on the one hand and the growing amount of literature on research-by-design, the actor-network theory, the subjective well-being of architectural design and the features of (other) hub-wise architectural typologies, can also be related to the concept and our research ambitions on IEP sites.

3. Inductively elaborating and fine-tuning the central concepts

Both explorative research projects have generated interesting insights into the essence of our research ambition, being the concept of an IEP site and the consequences for the strategic-spatial models to install and develop them. In this paragraph we will summarize the intermediate research results of our explorative research efforts: what can we learn from the realization of both explorative research projects? How can (i) the quick scan case-studies of IEP site "related" SSE-initiatives and (ii) the debates of the IEP-Reference-Platforms inspire us in the elaboration and development of our central concepts and their features (i.e. an IEP site and strategic-spatial models)?

3.1 Inductively fine-tuning the concept of an IEP site

As indicated in the introduction of this paper, we initially defined an IEP site as a spatially concentrated hub or location in cities that accommodates public, (social) profit and profit organizations that jointly strive for a (more) solid economic participation of socially deprived citizens, both as a consumer and as a provider of labor (see also before). On the basis of our inductive exploration we have gained considerable new insights into the precise meaning of "a spatially concentrated hub" and of the "joint activities and ambitions" of all partners involved. Let us give a summary of what we have learned up until now.

3.1.1 The uncovered morphological diversity of a spatially concentrated hub

On the basis of our inductive exploration we find out that our initial assumption on a spatially concentrated hub being a clear demarcated, enclosed and identifiable physical location in a city, is too simple and homogeneous an idea to fit the uncovered existing morphological diversity of IEP site related SSE-initiatives. Although we initially assumed the existence of various types of IEP sites on the basis of some "strategic" features such as for instance different types of economic activities, we did not explicitly assume a likewise variety in the "spatial" or physical form of IEP sites. On the basis of our inductive exploration we found out however that the spatial concentration of IEP site related initiatives clearly covers different and alternative morphological forms (i.e. types of spatial concentration). This discovery is certainly an added value generated by the interdisciplinary research design in which our colleague urban planners and architects made us aware of this morphological diversity.

Let us look at the precise nature of this uncovered morphological diversity and how it has influenced the further conceptualization of an IEP site.

The morphological diversity has been experienced most noticeably within the STIMPRO research project. By gradually selecting and analyzing the 15 quick scan case-studies, we learned that the IEP site related initiatives showed quite

different morphological forms and shapes. Thus, the meaning of "concentration" and "intertwined" initiatives could be associated with a location (i) within one single building or premises, (ii) within a well-defined (industrial) domain or restricted area, (iii) within a particular urban neighborhood[19] and (iv) along a spatial and/or digital "track" of permanent and mobile settlements throughout the larger territory of the entire city[20].

From a governance point of view, it is plausible that another morphological form or shape of an IEP site implies other governance challenges as well as other governance solutions elaborated in alternative strategic-spatial models. Because of these governance implications, it clearly makes sense to construct a kind of "spatial" typology of IEP sites on the basis of the uncovered morphological diversity. A first attempt to construct such a spatial typology has been made within the STIMPRO research project. The preliminary or tentative result is strongly in line with the previously mentioned meaning of "concentration" and "intertwined" activities, being (De Nys-Ketels, Vallet and Bylemans, 2015):

- The single-building IEP site: all organizations are located within one building;
- The campus IEP site: all organizations are located within a well-defined domain or restricted area;
- The neighborhood IEP site: all organizations are located within a certain neighborhood;
- The satellite IEP site: all organizations are connected by means of a spatial and/or digital "track" of settlements throughout the city.

Although the morphological diversity has been experienced most noticeably within the STIMPRO research project, the morphological awareness has also been triggered during the pilot research project of Wortel-Merksplas.

At the beginning it was apparent that the colony of Wortel-Merkplas was a well-defined territory or domain with clear, fence-and-wall-wise borderlines. The concentration of this particular hub was therefore strongly associated with that of a campus IEP site (see also before). When however further examining the precise features of this domain, it became clear that it actually consists of several public areas (e.g. lanes, meadows, grasslands) and buildings or premises of which not all will become a part of the intended IEP site experiment. As such, there are for instance also building blocks destined for a privately owned children's farm, a public regional building association and two federal penitentiary institutions. Additionally the colony itself is not situated within a

---

[19] E.g. the quick scan case-studies of "Zuurstof voor de Brugse poort" and "Bruggen naar Rabot" in the city of Ghent.

[20] E.g. the quick scan case-studies of "Levanto" (city of Antwerp), "WEB" (city of Turnhout), "Spiegelfabriek" (city of Herentals) and "repair cafés" (in several cities).

city, but on the territory of two rural municipalities (i.e. Merksplas and Wortel) in the surroundings of two small Flemish cities (i.e. the city of Turnhout and Hoogstraten) and one large Flemish city (i.e. the city of Antwerp). Therefore, the location is rather semi-urbanized instead of urbanized. Given these particular domain features of the colony itself and of the semi-urbanized region, the morphological complexity gradually becomes apparent which challenges once again our initial homogenous and rather simple – simplistic? – notion of spatial concentration. After all, the ambitioned IEP site within the colony of Wortel-Merksplas is simultaneously a location (i) in one domain (i.e. a campus IEP site), (ii) in several premises but not with an exclusive IEP site destination (i.e. a semi- or partial campus site?) and (iii) on the territory of two rural municipalities situated in neighborhood of three cities (i.e. a semi-urbanized campus site?).

To conclude this paragraph we can therefore say that the uncovered morphological diversity clearly emphasizes the need to differentiate the meaning of "a concentrated hub" and to identify varies types of spatial concentration that imply other governance principles within the strategic-spatial blueprints (see also later: 3.2.2).

3.1.2 The desired openness of a spatially concentrated hub

Regardless of the specific morphological form, we also find out that a successful – this means an effective and efficient – spatially concentrated hub is explicitly associated with an "open" profile. What this exactly means, does not only become clear throughout the analysis of the quick scan case-studies, but also and perhaps most apparently during the various debates of the two IEP-Reference-Platforms[21].

Let us summarize the different uncovered meanings of a so-called "desired openness" and how this has influenced the further conceptualization of an IEP site.

A first set of "openness" meanings refers explicitly to the *user side* of an IEP site:

- According to most participants of the IEP-Reference-Platforms, IEP sites may not be used or destined exclusively to socially deprived urban citizens. As such, IEP sites may not be associated with for instance (i) "gated" economic communities for deprived citizens only, (ii) "isolated fortresses" or (iii) socio-economic "ghettos". In contrast, IEP sites should be open to all urban citizens, regardless of their specific socio-economic profile. According to most participants of the IEP-Reference-Platforms, such an open accessibility will prevent an undesired stigmatization of socially deprived urban citizens, which is very likely to happen when the

---

[21] In total 6 debates have taken place (3 meetings per IEP-Reference-Platform).

word "concentration" is taken too literally. This probably also explains why some participants seem to be somewhat resentful towards the use of the words "site" and even "hub". According to them these words overemphasize the undesired exclusive and isolated nature of an IEP site.

Simultaneously, other participants however emphasize the fact that a "mixed" use may eventually scare off or even exclude socially deprived citizens as they risk not to be served, helped or supported in a proper or tailor-made way. When being or becoming a minority within the mix, chances are high that their specific needs will not be met by organizations looking for scale effects realized in serving mainly the non-deprived majority. Additionally, it is not self-evident that socially deprived urban citizens feel themselves at ease in a mixed environment, what may prevent them from coming to such a mixed IEP site. As such, mixed IEP sites risk to eventually become diluted and watered-down.

During the debates on this particular meaning of openness, many participants refer to case-studies and/or empirical research that - according to them - support their particular point of view. But, as these references are rather general and sometimes rather ambiguous, additional and more in-depth literature studies are certainly needed to substantiate and document these associated point of views (i.e. future research agenda).

- A second meaning of openness refers to a (more) dynamic, temporarily and voluntary use of IEP sites by urban citizens. This meaning of openness is suggested by many participants on the basis of a self-perceived or experienced changing profile of socially deprived urban citizens in Flemish cities associated with (i) the aftermath of the contemporary economic crises and (ii) some emerging contemporary societal trends.

When referring to the aftermath of the economic crises, participants emphasize the increasing (long term) unemployment of (also) native-speaking and relatively young urban citizens with a high instead of a low education level. Additionally, a lot of attention is paid to the increasing amount of bankrupt self-employed citizens or small businessman who have benefitted from the democratization of education during the seventies but who have no "financial safety net" created by successive generations within the family that helps them to overcome difficult times (e.g. family capital to encounter the losses of unpaid invoices in times of economic recession). Both profiles clearly do not match the (more) traditional profile of socially deprived citizens[22], but according to the

---

[22] E.g. citizens with a low or absent education level, a low income level, leading a socially isolated life, being rather old, non-native speaking, and mentally or physically disabled.

participants their economic participation is nonetheless seriously jeopardized.

When referring to important contemporary societal trends, the participants mainly focus on two phenomena. On the one hand there are the so-called work-stress related illnesses (e.g. burn-out, depression, mobbing related anxiety) that prevent a full economic participation of urban citizens as a provider of labor, but simultaneously increase their economic expenses as a consumer (e.g. increased need for medical and household support). On the other hand there are the so-called "modes of cohabitation" and family-related challenges (e.g. the care for elderly and financially deprived family-members, children with serious mental and/or health problems, the consequences of aggressive divorces and the mental and financial constraints of one-parent families). As such, also urban citizens that do not fit the more traditional profile of socially deprived urban citizens may "suddenly" and "temporarily" or even "definitely" become socially and economically deprived.

Although during the debates on this particular meaning of openness, most participants argument on the basis of their daily professional experiences, it is once again interesting to further investigate whether and how these changing profiles are actually present in our contemporary urban society. If so, this growing diversity within the population of socially deprived urban citizens clearly generates the need for a like-wise diverse set of solutions (e.g. also more temporary, tailor-made and mental coaching support). According to several participants this may be offered by IEP sites corresponding to the profile of a "creative (re)energizing spot", a "decompression zone[23]", or "a discrete, non-stigmatizing free port[24]". Additionally, these participants emphasize the desired interconnectedness of IEP sites throughout different Flemish cities. Thus, these new, often "more mobile" socially deprived urban citizens can continue to benefit from the support offered by an IEP site, also when they would move to another city. In view of the elaboration of the strategic-spatial blueprints for IEP sites, the governance implications are very important. But as these suggestions are not yet based on empirical proof, additional in-depth literature studies and/or empirical research projects are once again advisable (i.e. future research agenda).

A second set of "openness" meanings refers explicitly to the *supply side* of an IEP site:

---

[23] An idea that has been suggested in particular when it comes to the re-integration of ex-convicts as a particular type of socially deprived citizens.

[24] For some "new" or non-traditional socially deprived urban citizens it is a taboo to openly recognize their deteriorated socio-economic position within society.

- According to most participants, organizations situated on an IEP site should also be prepared to collaborate with organizations and/or partners that are not located on the IEP site itself. According to them, remediating a complex societal phenomenon like an inclusive economic participation, can only be realized by joining a lot of "mental" forces and "material" means (e.g. to jointly realize scale effects and increase the overall efficiency). Additionally, some of them find it therefore important that IEP site organizations also cooperate and/or even set-up region-wise SSE-initiatives that exceed the location and even the city itself in which the IEP site is embedded. As such, organizations active on an IEP site are explicitly associated by them with the role of region-wise "connectors" and/or "facilitators". The IEP site itself is then considered to be the "energizing hart" or "base-camp" of these region-wise SSE-initiatives.

  Given this particular meaning, the wide-range accessibility of an IEP site is then clearly of major importance. This was for instance also the reason why the limited supply of public transportation means is presently experienced as a major concern for nearly all partners and policy makers of the IEP site at the colony of Wortel-Merksplas. The explicit attention for additional logistic and mobility facilities is therefore considered to be an important item within the elaborated spatial-strategic blueprints.

  Admittedly, this particular meaning of openness is strongly related to one particular spatial or morphological form of an IEP site (see also before), being that of a spatial "track" or "route" throughout the larger territory of the entire city and even far beyond. Nonetheless it is an interesting one, as the arguments of the participants supporting this particular point of view are clearly related to the popular (theoretical) trend of (public) regional networking and strategic alliances. Additional in-depth literature studies and/or empirical research projects on the particular governance features of these networks and strategic alliances are therefore once again advisable (i.e. future research agenda).

- A lot of discussion also takes place on the particular position of SSE-organizations within an IEP site. For most participants it is quite obvious that given the working definition of an IEP site, SSE-organizations (should) hold a dominant position within an IEP site. After all, the realization of an inclusive economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens is directly related to their strategic identity, core-business and expertise. As such, all participants agree that IEP sites certainly should accommodate SSE-organizations.

  Whether this position should be dominant or even exclusive is however another matter. The arguments of participants against such a dominant or exclusive position are based on practical as well as more fundamental or principle considerations. The practical arguments are mainly referring to

(i) the overall financial feasibility and (ii) long term survival of an IEP site, which demands for a considerable cash-flow and return-on-investments that cannot be realized by SSE-organizations alone.˙ The reason for this is not only due to the fact that the dominant focus of SSE-organizations is on social goals and on the production factor of "labor" - instead of economic goals and the production factor of "capital"- but also due to recent public policy decisions made within Flanders that restrict the public (co-)financing facilities for SSE-organizations (i.e. subsidies) and urges SSE-organizations to look for "money on the free market" (i.e. specified within the future "Maatwerk" decree or legislation). The principle arguments rather relate to (i) particular ideological[25] point of views (e.g. the conviction that the economic performance of profit organizations and of a free market system is per definition superior, more dynamic and "better" than that of the SSE-sector), (ii) particular thoughts on fundamental differences of SSE-organizations (e.g. there do not exist fundamental differences between SSE-organizations and profit organizations, so the uniqueness of their added value and necessity of their presence is non-existent) and (iii) particular reflections on synergy and innovation (e.g. only mixed alliances between "regular" and SSE-organizations can generate innovative management solutions for the new concept of an IEP site).

It is interesting to see once again, that the arguments and point of views of the participants are mainly based on personal experiences and general, though vividly defended assumptions. As these assumptions have however important consequences for the construction of strategic-spatial blueprints, additional and more in-depth literature studies and empirical research projects are once again advisable to clearly substantiate and document the associated suggestions for the governance of IEP sites (i.e. future research agenda).

A third and final meaning of "openness" refers explicitly to the *spatial & architectural side* of an IEP-site:

- According to some participants the openness of an IEP site also refers to the presence of an easy accessible location or spatial embeddedness of an IEP site within the urban surroundings. As such, an IEP site should not only be accessible by "users" and "suppliers" of an IEP-site, but also by the entire urban population and especially by the urban citizens living in the nearby neighborhoods.

To conclude this paragraph on the desired openness we can say that when it comes to specifying "a concentrated hub", the various user-, supplier-and space-

---

[25] This ideological point of view is present within most Flemish local urban governments that are still highly influenced by the aftermath of New Public Management and additionally triggered by the neo-classically inspired rationalization trend.

related meanings clearly emphasize the need to specify and elaborate associated governance principles within the strategic-spatial models or blueprints of IEP sites that actually stimulate and generate such an "open" concentrated hub (see also later: 3.2.2). Other or alternative meanings of this openness, clearly demand for other or alternative governance principles.

3.1.3 The uncovered diversity of intertwining activities and ambitions

When analyzing the 25 quick scan case-studies of both the STIMPRO research project and the pilot research project of Wortel-Merksplas, we can identify a wide range of "intertwining" activities and ambitions related to (i) the nature of the activities themselves (i.e. different types of economic participation), (ii) the beneficiaries of the intertwined activities (i.e. different types of socially deprived urban citizens) (iii) the suppliers of the intertwined activities (i.e. different types and numbers of partners involved) and the particular urban setting of the intertwined activities (i.e. type of city). Thus, the IEP site related SSE-initiatives do generate a lot of inspiration for the further specification of the abstract notion of "intertwined activities".

Let us look at this diverse nature of these uncovered intertwined activities and how this has influenced the further conceptualization of an IEP site. It is however important to emphasize first that certainly these research results will be further analyzed during a subsequent phase of analysis (i.e. future research agenda). The extent and complexity of this type of data is too high, to be analyzed all at once. And moreover, this type of data also relates to the fundamentals of the strategic part of the strategic-spatial blueprints. Therefore, a further in-depth and more detailed analysis of the uncovered research results is certainly recommended:

A first set of "diversity" meanings relates to the different types of *economic activities* of an IEP site:

- When we analyze the different types of economic activities within the 25 IEP site related initiatives, the research results uncover a very divers and rich set of interesting opportunities, including for instance the construction and maintenance industry (e.g. repair, handyman an odd-jobber services, laundry, cleaning), the (bio)agricultural and food industry (e.g. bio-production of fruit, vegetables and juices, horticulture and gardening, urban agriculture and self-harvesting initiatives), the creative industry (e.g. eco-design, recycling furniture and clothing, arts-and-craft activities, artistic and cultural initiatives, exhibition facilities), the mobility, logistics and distribution sector (e.g. bicycle hiring-repair-selling shops, packaging), the retail sector (e.g. shops specialized in recycled goods, social groceries, catering services), the consulting and education sector (e.g. job-coaching, buddy-services, training, co-working infrastructure), tourism (e.g. lodging, farm-tourism and children's farm

initiatives) and care and wellness (e.g. child-care, social restaurants, services for seniors, water- and animal-related therapy facilities).

This wide range of economic activities suggests that the intertwining nature of economic activities can result in either (i) a very specialized IEP site joining different partners within a similar sector (e.g. a creative industry IEP site, a touristic and leisure IEP site, a care and wellness IEP site), or (ii) a very heterogeneous and more generalist IEP site combining complementary sectors and offering a broad range of products and services, and (iii) a unique or tailor-made IEP site that combine particular sectors in accordance to the specific needs of a certain city or urban neighborhood.

Additionally, it is also interesting to notice that the intertwining initiatives of an IEP site can focus on (i) more traditional economic activities (e.g. maintenance, mobility, logistics and distribution) but also on (ii) rather innovative activities that have not been elaborated (yet) within the Flemish SSE sector in the past (e.g. creative industry, tourism and wellness);

- Another interesting finding is that the different types of economic activities intertwine participation facilities for consumption as well as for employment. Thus, the supposed or suggested combination of both types of economic participation within an IEP site is on the basis of the collected data presumably feasible. We should however emphasize that the presence of this complementary combination is not always the result of a deliberate strategy, but often of rather a "fortunate" coincidence (see also later: 3.1.4);

A second set of "diversity" meanings relates to the beneficiaries of the intertwined activities, being the different types of *socially deprived urban citizens*:

- In accordance with the many (theoretical) criteria used to describe and define the concept of socially deprived urban citizens, the analysis of the IEP site related initiatives also uncover the many ways in which socially deprived urban citizens are actually categorized and (re)grouped. In general and notwithstanding this categorization exercise, few intertwined activities focus however on only one particular group and thus exclude other socially deprived urban citizens from their consumer and employment activities. Instead, they usually try to stimulate the economic participation of different and more than one category of socially deprived urban citizens. Nonetheless and based on this particular research finding, we could make a distinction between (i) a single versus (ii) a multi-target group related IEP site.

When reflecting on this particular research result we notice also that categorizations and "priorities" are most often used by the public partners involved. In view of the realization of particular policy goals (i.e. target-group related electoral ambitions), they can be most sensitive in "choosing" and favoring particular groups or profiles of socially deprived urban citizens above others;

- When categorizing, the (combined) criteria of (i) age, (ii) physical and mental state and (iii) income position are used most often within the IEP site related initiatives. In the "age" category much attention is paid to children, youngsters and senior citizens (i.e. + 65). In the "physical and mental state" category, an – increased?! - attention is paid to citizens enduring addiction, developmental disorders (e.g. autism) and work-, burn-out or anxiety related problems. In the "income" position category, a lot of attention is paid to poor urban citizens, low-educated unemployed citizens, seasonal unemployed workers and the reintegration of ex-prisoners. The focus on these particular categorization modes can be influenced by the selected cases themselves, but it could also point to efforts made by the partners involved to make actually experienced societal challenges (more) visible;

- Another interesting finding is that not all intertwined activities are solely focused on and thus destined for socially deprived urban citizens alone (see also before when discussing on the "desired openness"). This is mainly true for the consumption-related economic activities, less for the employment-related activities that still focus predominantly on socially deprived urban citizens;

A third set of "diversity" meanings refers to the suppliers of the intertwined activities, being the amount and different types of *organizations* or *partners* involved:

- As far as the amount of partners is concerned, we notice a variation within the IEP site related initiatives between 2 or 3 up until 5 organizations. At present, a higher number of intertwined partners is not that commonly found. In the margin of this particular finding it is also interesting to mention that some initiatives are even solely organized by only 1 partner who has however chosen for a diversification strategy in which different activities are associated with different divisions located in separate buildings on the site (e.g. the WEB site in the city of Turnhout encompassing for instance a cleaning service, a social restaurant, a recycle shop, an eco-design center and a clothing and textile repair studio). When reflecting on these research results, the relatively limited amount of partners involved could relate to (i) the experimental phase in which these initiatives presently reside (… so that the joint initiative is still growing) or (ii) the high competitive institutional context in which mainly SSE-

organizations have to operate that moderates their initial enthusiasm to eventually join forces (i.e. they rather prefer a diversification strategy of their own than to cooperate with "rivalry" partners);

- When considering the different roles and profiles of the partners involved, it is clear that in most IEP site related initiatives a public partner is involved who financially (i.e. by means of subsidies or financial investments) or spatially (i.e. by means of the disposal and/or rent of a public domain, location or building) facilitates and stimulates the joint SSE-initiative. This however does not mean that the public partner is still present "once the stimulation job is done" or that its stimulation is realized in an active, dominant or even tangible way. Furthermore, the identity of the public actor is mainly local (i.e. urban local government), but also combinations or consortia with different public agents on various policy levels occur (e.g. the province, the Flemish community, the federal state or European funding agencies). Thus, the public facilitation role can become rather complex and multi-layered.

  In some cases there is no public actor involved, and the initiative can therefore be considered to be fully grass-rooted. In these particular cases most diversification strategies of one partner can be situated (see before). As such, the identity of the IEP site becomes a bit virtual as it actually concerns the intertwined activities of only one partner. Nonetheless, as these various activities are organized and offered throughout the different premises or spaces of the site, visitors will presumably perceive the site as a joint initiative of many partners instead of only one organization.

  As such, and based on the previously described role differences, we could identify (i) a planned versus (ii) a grass-routed and even (iii) a virtual IEP site.

- Beside the public actor or single partner there is also the dominant presence of SSE-organizations (see also before) and some other social profit or even profit organization. When reflecting on these research results it is however important to emphasize that the limited presence of profit organizations may be influenced by the way in which we have reconstructed the population (see also before). In mainly consulting the SSE-sector to uncover the population of IEP site related initiatives, it may be that collaborations with profit and regular organizations are missed out.

  Thus, we intend to conclude that certainly the precise nature of the profiles and roles of partners involved should be more elaborated in-depth as they are very important within the construction of governance models. This will be done by means of subsequent and future research projects in which we will focus also more intensively on the specific way in which the collaboration between the partners is structured and organized by means of specific governance models (i.e. future research agenda).

A fourth set of "diversity" meanings refers to the particular types of *urban setting* of the intertwined activities:

- Throughout the IEP site related initiatives, we notice that the profiles of the cities involved are quite different, not only in size (i.e. small, medium-sized or big city), but also in "historical tissue" including some socio-economic and/or target group-related "traditions" (e.g. textile industry, non-native blue collar workers). This is for instance most obvious within the pilot research project of Wortel-Merksplas. The former identity of the location (i.e. a former vagabond colony in which domestic shelter and employment facilities were offered within an agricultural and handicraft setting) in combination with the historical heritage of most buildings and public spaces (i.e. UNESCO heritage), the semi-urbanized character of the region and the dominance of agricultural and touristic economic activities, have clear implications for the specific and sometimes rather (re)strict(ed) profile of an IEP site that, according to the public actors involved, should fit this particular contextual setting as much as possible. Other examples are for instance the location of a former industrial site (e.g. the UCO-site in the city of Ghent that used to be the settlement of a very important company active within the textile industry) and the peripheral belt of a growing and expanding small city (e.g. the Spiegelfabriek in the city of Herentals).

  When reflecting on these particular research findings, it is important to investigate why and how the profile of the IEP site should – or should not – respect a certain "historic tissue" or contextual setting? Certainly from the perspective of the public partners involved, this can or could be an important issue. Thus the creation of a so-called "historically embedded" or "heritage" IEP site comes into our minds;

To conclude this paragraph we can say that from a governance point of view, all previously described "diversity" meanings can have their implications on the concept and design of an IEP site. After all it is plausible that another type - or combination of - intertwined activities implies other governance challenges as well as other governance solutions elaborated in alternative strategic-spatial models that stimulate, facilitate and support the actual realization of these diversity choices (see also later: 3.2.2). Because of these governance implications, it also makes sense to identify for instance different diversity-related types of IEP sites. As such, we can for instance identify (i) a specialized IEP site, (ii) a heterogeneous and more generalist IEP site, (iii) a unique or tailor-made IEP site, (iv) a traditional IEP site, (v) an innovative IEP site, (vi)(vii) a single versus a multi-target group IEP site, (viii) a planned versus (ix) a grass-routed IEP site, (x) a virtual IEP site and (xi) a historically embedded or heritage IEP site. The elaboration of these alternative types will certainly be the subject of subsequent research papers and future research projects (i.e. future research agenda).

3.1.4 *The uncovered coincidence and casualness of intertwined activities*

Another important aspect of the intertwined activities concerns the explicit awareness, ambition and modelling of these intertwined activities. After all, an IEP site is focused on the realization of deliberate and joint efforts focusing on the inclusive economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens.

Admittedly, these features could also have been treated in the previous paragraph (3.1.3). But, because of their crucial and fundamental role within the concept of an IEP site, we have decided to treat them in a separate section or paragraph. Thus the questions within this section are: to what extent and in what way do the partners actually share a joint ambition? In what way do they actually undertake joint initiatives and do they look for synergetic effects? And what are possible threats and opportunities for identifying and realizing these explicit joint ambitions and efforts?

To answer these questions, we have collected different types of data. The data of the quick scan case-studies give us a first impression of the mere existence of joint ambitions and efforts. The data of the IEP-Reference-Platforms provide us however with additional and more in-depth information on the joint ambitions and efforts, as well as on the reasons why they are present or not (cfr. threats and opportunities)? And the data on the decision making process of the pilot research project of Wortel-Merksplas provide us with supplementary information on the so-called threats and opportunities. In this particular research project we have experienced how potential partners of an IEP site under construction negotiate and consequently raise "objections against" and "support in favor of" this joint initiative.

Let us summarize the most interesting findings that we have uncovered up until now:

- According to the preliminary research results of the 25 quick scan case-studies, it becomes apparent that the precise nature of most existing intertwined activities is the result of a "coincidence", rather than of a well-elaborated and carefully negotiated decision process amongst all partners involved. Indirectly and implicitly, most partners – and especially the SSE-organizations – do share a common concern for an inclusive economic participation, but they have not deliberately chosen for each other and negotiated or elaborated for instance a complementary or mutually reinforcing set of activities. Thus, most partners are located "next to each other" without consciously and deliberately developing joint projects or initiatives.

  We also find out that the most deliberate consideration is often that of the local public actor involved, who puts a (public or semi-public) spatial territory and building at the disposal of organizations that "fit" and support the realization of particular socio-economic policy targets,

amongst which a (more) inclusive economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens. The development of joint and synergetic initiatives or alliances is however seldom a specified precondition or explicit demand of the local public actor.

In short, the intertwining nature of the investigated IEP site related initiatives is often the result of (i) a coincidental joint spatial location and (ii) a general, underlying ambition of the local public actor involved to "accommodate" organizations that support "in some kind of way" a SSE-related policy ambition;

- The previously uncovered casual nature of intertwined activities is indirectly confirmed during the debates of the IEP-Reference-Platforms. When discussing on the "pro's" and "cons" of the IEP site concept, most participants clearly recognize the importance of joint, synergetic initiatives that are however presently lacking within most IEP site related initiatives. That is also what they themselves experience when analyzing these initiatives and reflecting also on their own "spatial" collaboration experiences.

When however reflecting on the causes of this particular research finding, some participants explain this situation by emphasizing the influence of the specific nature of SSE-organizations themselves.

As such, they suggest for instance that the casual nature of intertwined activities is caused by (i) the minor and at least subordinate attention for – mainly economic? – strategic goals in favor of the – mainly societal? – operational goals in SSE-organizations, (ii) the day-to-day survival of most SSE-organization[26] and (iii) the use of a narrow-scale and individual instead of a large-scale and organization exceeding focus[27]. Other participants however emphasize the influence of recent and future policy measures taken by the Flemish government to (i) increase the internal competition between SSE-organizations (e.g. by means of public tendering) and to simultaneously (ii) limit and change the public financial resources (e.g. a decrease of subsidies and the obligation and constraint to seek their financial resources via the free market). Thus, SSE-organizations consider themselves rather as "mutual competitors to be avoided within their neighboring territory or region", than as "partners to be joined in an intertwined, win-win cooperation". A few participants make the additional remark that the internal competition within the SSE-sector is presently much higher than generally assumed by "outsiders". Therefore strategic alliances are certainly not self-evident;

---

[26] As profit-margins are rather small, daily cash-flow concerns overrule inevitably the more strategic thinking of most SSE-organizations.

[27] This small-scale focus is related to the dominant individual focus on each socially deprived "client" separately.

- Within the particular pilot research project of Wortel-Merksplas, additional opportunities and threats for joint ambitions and efforts can be identified. In general we mainly encounter potential threats, as the initial enthusiasm of the public initiator (i.e. the province of Antwerp and their local partner Kempens Landschap) supporting the creation of an IEP site is quickly "questioned" by the other partners involved, being especially the representatives of both local governments. Let us summarize the major challenges and difficulties identified during the coming about of a clear and deliberate joint decision on creating an IEP site.

A first important challenge is the complexity of the public actor scenery (see also before) in which at least three public partners are involved being the Province of Antwerp, the two rural municipalities of Wortel and Merksplas and the small city of Hoogstraten (administratively connected to Wortel).

On itself, this "triple" identity does not necessarily have to result in difficulties for defining consciously joint ambitions and efforts. But, during several debates at the IEP-Reference platform, it becomes clear that all three public actors - and mainly the political and not so much the administrative representatives - have different and sometimes quite opposite (political) ambitions with the destination of the former Wortel-Merksplas colony and the presence itself of an IEP site. As such, there are for instance the opposite points of views in relation to fundamental questions like: do we actually want to install an IEP site on the local territories of the former colony? Will it fit the dominant already chosen functions of tourism, leisure and agriculture? Will we not disrupt the existing economic tissue of our region and local communities? Are we actually interested in SSE-organizations and are they not similar to regular organizations (why make a difference)? Will we not attract (extra) socially vulnerable citizens to our region by offering support (i.e. a "magnet" function)? Are we willing to focus on particular "dubious" deprived citizens like the large amount of ex-prisoners or convicts coming from the three neighboring penitentiary institutions? Matching all of these points of views (i.e. in accordance with their political priorities and policy goals) and matching these desires subsequently with alternative formulas or blueprints for an IEP site is therefore a very difficult exercise. And it soon becomes clear that the IEP site debate is constantly "drawn" and "gorged" into a much wider and tense political debate with difficult to master trade-offs between the public partners involved. In short, the IEP site concept is embedded in a "complex", this means a rather turbulent and sometimes quite hostile (political) setting, which seriously jeopardizes the eventual identification of a committed and deliberate joint IEP site ambition.

A second challenge or difficulty is that the destination of the former colony, its functions, buildings and spaces had (partly) already been determined before the IEP site idea came into the picture (i.e. a RUP[28] and masterplan). As such, the IEP site concept is seen by some partners as a sudden or unexpected "intruder" or even an "unwanted guest" in the midst of an ongoing process. This leads to rather intense and vivid debates – with also opposite point of views – on what was already determined and "fixed" and what was still "changeable" and available for an IEP site?

This unclear setting results in a third challenge or difficulty, being that of an ever-changing context for the elaboration of the strategic-spatial blueprint. Sometimes buildings and spaces are free or available for the IEP site, and on later occasions they are not anymore … or vice versa. Sometimes we are free as researchers in specifying interesting alternative SSE-functions for these buildings and spaces in view of an IEP site, and on later occasions we are not anymore … or vice versa. In short, the IEP site concept is embedded in an unclear and ever-changing setting, which also hampers the elaboration of a clear and well-defined joint ambition. Eventually the IEP site concept is "tolerated", but cannot be the only one let alone be the dominant destination of the former colony site. Thus, the presence of the IEP site *within* the former colony site "should be a bit invisible" and certainly not "disturbing" for the other site partners, inhabitants and visitors. That is the result of the (political) compromise.

As a result of these three challenges and difficulties, the joint ambitions of the IEP site "under construction" in Wortel-Merksplas will be coincidental in so far that they will have to match the negotiated result and strict frameworks within an ongoing project (e.g. the desire of several partners to be self-sufficient, more focused on traditional and existing economic activities, respecting the cultural heritage, being not too visible, co-existing with other functions and partners not involved in the IEP site but located on the colony site), instead of consciously looking for synergetic effects.

To conclude this paragraph we can say that from a governance point of view, the coincidental and casual nature of the intertwined activities as well as the possible threats and challenges for the conscious identification of a joint ambition, can have its implications on the concept and design of an IEP site. It is clear that the strategic-spatial blueprints should stimulate and support more actively the identification and awareness of joint ambitions, efforts and synergetic effects amongst all partners involved (see also later: 3.2.2). Given the present research results, this is however not self-evident. Simultaneously we can also say that the blueprints should facilitate the process of agreement or

---

[28] RUP stand for (in Dutch) "ruimtelijk uitvoeringsplan", which is a formally approved plan in which the various functional destinations of a spatial territory are specified.

consensus-building on itself, as numerous threats occur (see also later: 3.2.2). Additionally and in view of future research projects it would also be advisable to investigate in more detail the precise nature of these process-wise opportunities and threats (i.e. future research agenda). Thus, the specific experiences of the pilot research project of Wortel-Merksplas can be further explored within other IEP site related initiatives.

3.2 Inductively elaborating strategic-spatial models or blueprints for an IEP-site

As indicated in the introduction of this paper, the central research question is not only focused on what we can learn inductively for the fine-tuning of the concept of an IEP site (see 3.1), but also for the elaboration of the strategic-spatial blueprints of IEP sites?

It is clear that the nature of these blueprints is closely related to the previously described concept of an IEP site. After all, the blueprints are needed for the further specification, operationalization and governance of an IEP site. As such, the conceptual features have their implications on (i) subjects or topics that should be present within a blueprint, (ii) specific points of attention for each topic, and (iii) (alternative) specifications, meanings and/or implications of each point of attention. On the basis of both explorative research projects, we have gained interesting insights into (i) the topics (see 3.2.1) and (ii) the points of attention (see 3.2.2). As far as the (alternative) specifications, meanings and/or implications are concerned, these will be the subject of future papers in which the research findings of all the quick scan cases will have to be analyzed in full detail.

3.2.1 Uncovered topics of a strategic-spatial blueprint

As far as the topics of a strategic-spatial blueprint are concerned, the data-collection of the quick-scan cases and the continuous interaction between inductive discovery and intermediate mental (re)conceptualization, has led to the identification of the following relevant subjects or topics.

The uncovered *strategic* topics of an IEP site blueprint are:

- The particular <u>urban societal challenge(s)</u> that lead(s) to the creation of the IEP site (i.e. inductive elaboration of "strategic meaning");

- The <u>type of (economic) activities</u> that will be undertaken or realized by the different partners of the IEP site (i.e. inductive elaboration of "strategic meaning");

- The (particular) <u>target group(s)</u> that will benefit from the activities at the IEP site (i.e. inductive elaboration of "strategic meaning");

- The <u>identity</u> and <u>particular role</u> of each <u>partner</u> involved (i.e. inductive elaboration of "strategic and organizational design");

- The <u>strategic ambitions</u> (e.g. mission, goals, actions) of each individual partner and of their collaboration at the IEP site (i.e. inductive elaboration of "strategic and organizational design");

- The <u>structure</u> and <u>organizational features</u> of each individual partner and of their collaboration at the IEP site (i.e. inductive elaboration of "strategic and organizational design");

- The <u>synergetic ambitions</u> and/or <u>effects</u> of the collaboration between the partners and with other partners "outside" of the IEP site (i.e. inductive elaboration of "strategic and organizational design");

- The <u>financial construction</u> or features of the collaboration at the IEP site (i.e. inductive elaboration of "strategic and organizational design");

- The <u>(effective) realization</u> of the <u>strategic ambitions</u> of each individual partner and their collaboration and its direct and/or indirect effects on the urban societal challenge … and thus the realization of a more solid economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens (i.e. inductive elaboration of "strategic impact");

The uncovered *spatial* topics of an IEP site blueprint are:

- The <u>precise location</u> of the IEP site <u>within the urban territory</u> and its particular features (i.e. inductive elaboration of "spatial context");

- The <u>phase-wise</u> or historic <u>coming into existence</u> of the IEP site within the urban territory (i.e. inductive elaboration of "spatial context");

- The <u>spatial lay-out</u> and <u>plan</u> of the IEP site, including the footprints of all buildings and spaces involved as well as lay-out related changes or evolutions (i.e. inductive elaboration of "spatial design");

- The <u>façade</u> and <u>architectural identity</u> and/or <u>communication</u> of the IEP site (i.e. representation within the streetscape), as well as façade related changes or evolutions (i.e. inductive elaboration of "spatial design");

- The <u>nature</u> of the <u>buildings</u> (e.g. newly built, renovated, a combination) as well as nature related changes or evolutions (i.e. inductive elaboration of "spatial design");

- The degree of <u>(easy) accessibility</u> and <u>(inter)connectedness</u> of the IEP site with the <u>urban territory</u> (e.g. a low threshold for the surrounding neighborhood and all of its citizens), as well as related changes or evolutions (i.e. inductive elaboration of "spatial design");

- The <u>contribution</u> of the <u>spatial design</u> to the <u>realization</u> of the <u>strategic ambitions</u> at the IEP site … or the realization of a more solid economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens (i.e. inductive elaboration of "spatial impact");

3.2.2 *Uncovered points of attention for the topics of a strategic-spatial blueprint*

When we subsequently identify particular points of attention for each uncovered strategic and spatial topic, we find a lot of inspiration in the previously described inductive elaboration of the IEP site concept (see 3.1). But there is more. We also find inspiration in some additional and more directly blueprint-related research findings throughout both research projects.

3.2.2.1 *Inspiration from the conceptual fine-tuning of an IEP site*

Let us first summarize the inspiration from the inductive elaboration of the IEP site concept or answer to the question: what relevant points of attention for the strategic and spatial topics emerge when we reconsider the conceptual research findings on the morphological diversity, the desired openness, the intertwining activities and the coincidence or casualness of this intertwining nature (see 3.1)?

The relevant points of attention for the *strategic* topics of an IEP site blueprint are:

- From a governance perspective, the various meanings of desired openness (see also 3.1.2) clearly emphasize the need to specify governance principles within the blueprints that safeguard this openness. The ingredients for these specifications are the following points of attention: (i) an IEP site may not be exclusive for socially deprived urban citizens alone, but should nonetheless guarantee that socially deprived urban citizens are and remain the principle target group of the site (related strategic topic: <u>target group</u>), (ii) an IEP site should respond to the flexible, dynamic and temporarily needs of "new" socially deprived urban citizens (related strategic topic: <u>target group</u>), (iii) an IEP site should be the "energizing hart" or "base-camp" of a region-wise action-radius (related strategic topics: <u>strategic ambitions</u> and <u>structure)</u>, and (iv) an IEP site is not only formed or run by SSE-organizations, but the presence of SSE-organizations is vital and necessary for an IEP site to exist (related strategic topic: <u>identity</u> of <u>partners</u> involved);

- From a governance perspective, the various meanings of intertwined activities (see also 3.1.3) clearly emphasize the need to recognize different types of IEP sites within the blueprints. On the one hand, these types can be considered to form a kind of overall typology in which each type will have mutually distinctive features on each strategic and spatial topic of the blueprints. On the other hand, these types can also be considered to represent alternative meanings or particular points of attention for one or more strategic topics: (i) an IEP site can be *specialized* in one particular sector like for instance the creative industry, or tourism and leisure, or care and wellness (related strategic topic: <u>economic activities</u>), (ii) an IEP

site can also have a more *general* profile offering a broad range of products and services and combining complementary sectors (related strategic topic: economic activities), (iii) an IEP site can be *unique* or *tailor-made* when combining a particular selection of sectors in accordance to the specific needs of a certain city or urban neighborhood (related strategic topic: economic activities), (iv) an IEP site can be *traditional* when focusing on traditional Flemish SSE-activities like for instance maintenance, catering and distribution/packaging (related strategic topic: economic activities), (v) an IEP site can be *innovative* when focusing on new SSE-activities like for instance creative craftsmanship, tourism and wellness (related strategic topic: economic activities), (vi) an IEP site can be *single* versus *multi-target group* focused (related strategic topic: target group), (vii) an IEP site can be *publically or formally initiated* versus *grass-routed* (related strategic topic: structure and organizational features), (viii) an IEP site can be *virtual* when managed by one organization (related strategic topic: identity partners) and (ix) an IEP site can be explicitly embedded in the "*historical tissue*" of the city including some economic and/or target group-related "traditions" (related strategic topics: economic activities and target groups);

- When considering once again the intertwined activities and in particular the findings in relation to the target group(s) that will benefit from the activities at the IEP site, additional points of attention can be identified: (i) the use of target group categorizations and "priorities" for an IEP site are most often used by the public partners involved. Because of political engagements they can be most sensitive in "choosing" and favoring particular groups or profiles of socially deprived urban citizens above others. These political engagements stem from particular electoral ambitions and target-group related policy goals (related strategic topics: target group and identity partners). Additionally, (ii) an IEP site may be more exclusive or solely focused on socially deprived urban citizens in relation to the employment-related activities, but less or not in relation to the consumption-related economic activities that are at the disposal of all urban citizens (related strategic topics: target group and economic activities);

- When considering once again the intertwined activities and in particular the findings in relation to the partners involved, additional points of attention can be identified: (i) a relatively limited amount of partners involved in an IEP site may reflect a deliberate strategy. After an initial (experimental) phase an organic and/or consciously growth phase will

follow (related strategic topics: <u>identity partners</u> and <u>strategic ambitions</u>) and (ii) in prospecting the possibilities and options for a joint consortium of partners it is important to be aware of potential obstructions (i.e. threats) and facilities (i.e. opportunities) created by the institutional context and legislative frameworks. As such, the high competitive institutional framework in which Flemish SSE-organizations have to operate today and in the near future, clearly seems to moderate their (initial) enthusiasm to eventually join forces. Flemish SSE-organizations may prefer a diversification strategy and a site of their own (i.e. a virtual IEP site), rather than to cooperate with rivalry partners (related strategic topics: <u>identity partners</u> and <u>structure</u>). As such, governance principles should try to "counter" or remedy the possible obstructive effects of these overall institutional framework;

- From a governance perspective, the coincidence and casualness of intertwined activities (see also 3.1.4) clearly emphasizes the need to specify governance principles that safeguard a more conscious and deliberate joint ambition of the partners involved. The ingredients for these specifications are the following points of attention: (i) in an IEP site, the nodal role of the public actor may be more than just "accommodating" organizations that support "in some kind of way" a SSE-related policy ambition. A more explicit stimulation and facilitation is recommendable (related strategic topics: <u>identity partners</u>, <u>synergetic ambitions</u> and <u>strategic ambitions</u>), (ii) in an IEP site, it is important that SSE-organizations do not only focus on operational or "survival oriented" goals, but also on joint strategic ambitions (related strategic topics: <u>identity partners</u>, <u>synergetic ambitions</u>, <u>strategic ambitions</u> and <u>financial construction</u>), and (iii) in prospecting the options for a more conscious and deliberate consortium of partners it is important to be once again aware of potential obstructions (i.e. threats) and facilities (i.e. opportunities) created by the institutional context and legislative frameworks. As such, the competitive and financially changing institutional context in which Flemish SSE-organizations have to operate emphasizes the individual need for operational survival (related strategic topics: <u>identity partners</u> and <u>structure</u>). As such, governance principles should try to "counter" or remedy these obstructive institutional effects;

- When considering once again the coincidence and casualness of intertwined activities and in particular the research findings within the pilot research project of Wortel-Merksplas, two additional points of attention can be identified. Firstly, (i) a turbulent and sometimes quite hostile political setting demands for governance principles that explicitly

stimulate consensus-building on the central concept of an IEP site (related strategic topics: identity partner, synergetic ambitions and structure). This hostile political setting is characterized by the presence of many public actors with many different and sometimes quite opposite ambitions. Matching all of their points of views (i.e. in accordance with their political priorities and policy goals) and matching these points of views subsequently with alternative formulas or blueprints for an IEP site is therefore a very difficult exercise. The IEP site debate risks to be constantly "drawn" and "gorged" into a much wider and tense political debate with difficult to master trade-offs between the public partners involved. Secondly, (ii) the installation of an IEP site within an already existing and/or "destined" location, may demand for a more flexible, less explicit and "to be tolerated" blueprint of an IEP site by the other residential partners (related strategic topics: strategic and synergetic ambitions).

The relevant points of attention for the *spatial* topics of an IEP site blueprint are:

- From a governance perspective, the uncovered morphological diversity (see also 3.1.1) clearly emphasizes the need to recognize different types of IEP sites within the blueprints. On the one hand, these types can be considered to form a kind of overall typology in which each type will have mutually distinctive features on each strategic and spatial topic of the blueprints. On the other hand, these types can also be considered to represent alternative meanings or particular points of attention within two *spatial* topics: (i) an IEP site can take the morphological form of a single-building, of a campus, of a neighborhood or of a satellite (related spatial topics: location and spatial lay-out);

- From a governance perspective, the various meanings of desired openness (see also 3.1.2) clearly emphasize the need to specify governance principles within the blueprints that safeguard and guarantee the spatial meaning(s) of openness. The ingredients for these specifications are the following points of attention: (i) the entire set of buildings and spaces of an IEP site, should be easy accessible for citizens from the (entire) urban surroundings (related spatial topics: (easy) accessibility, (inter)connectedness with the urban territory and façade and architectural identity), and (ii) an IEP site should pay explicit attention to (additional) logistics and mobility facilities (incl. public transportation means) that connect the IEP site to a larger region or territory (related spatial topics (easy) accessibility and (inter)connectedness with the urban territory);

- From a governance perspective, the various meanings of intertwined activities (see also 3.1.3) also emphasize the need to recognize different *spatial* types of IEP sites within the blueprints. On the one hand, these spatial types can once again be considered to form a kind of overall typology in which each type will have mutually distinctive features on each strategic and spatial topic of the blueprints. On the other hand, these spatial types can once again be considered to represent alternative meanings or particular points of attention: (i) an (historic) IEP site can be accommodated explicitly within the socio-economic "heritage" or historical tissue of a city. As such, an IEP site can for instance be located within a former industrial domain or brownfield, a desolated factory building or a re-destined public domain (related spatial topics: precise location and spatial lay-out), and (ii) It is important to investigate why and how an IEP site should – or should not – respect a certain "historic tissue" or contextual setting. Certainly from the perspective of the public partners involved, this can be an important issue for the (re)destination and renovation of certain buildings and spaces (related spatial topic: precise location and nature of the buildings);

3.2.2.2 *Additional inspiration from blueprint-related findings*

Beside the inspiration of the conceptual elaboration of an IEP site (see also 3.1.), there is also the inspiration of additional and more directly blueprint-related research findings. Although this inspiration is described in much more detail within another paper (De Nys-Ketels, Vallet and Bylemans, 2015), we will summarize the two most relevant research findings for this publication.

Before answering however the question "what relevant points of attention for the strategic and spatial topics emerge when considering these additional research findings?", we will first describe the particular nature of both research findings.

A first finding concerns additional coincidental, non-systematic and partial features of the IEP site related initiatives. Thus, the blueprint-related data within the 25 quick scan case-studies reveal that the coincidental and casual nature of the IEP site related SSE-initiatives also apply to the strategic-spatial blueprints of these initiatives. Especially the spatial topics of the blueprint are seldom deliberately or consciously taken into consideration, in the way that the SSE-organizations do not prospect and evaluate actively or systematically "suitable" locations in the urban environment. Most often they try to make the best out of a given and offered spatial opportunity by others, for instance the public actor(s) involved. Additionally, SSE-organizations seldom evaluate the strengths and weaknesses - or particular points of attention - of a spatial opportunity. Instead their conscious attention is more focussed on policy- and target group-wise ambitions, albeit that these ambitions are not necessarily strategic but rather

operational in nature (also see before). As such, not all previously mentioned strategic topics of a blueprint are systematically taken into consideration;

A second finding is less or more related to the previous one. When analyzing the SSE-initiatives, we also find out that most partners of these initiatives seldom reflect consciously on how the spatial features of a location (e.g. the buildings, the spaces, the architectural design) interact and may facilitate the realization of their policy- and target-wise ambitions, and vice versa. Thus, it is not at all self-evident that the SSE-organizations and/or public actors involved automatically reflect in terms of strategic-spatial blueprints and identify relevant points of attention for spatial and strategic topics. Admittedly, we have to emphasize that the precise nature of the interaction or synergy on itself is not yet clear from even a theoretical point of view, but nonetheless very plausible and theoretically relevant to be investigated. During the debates of the IEP-reference-platforms, this was also perceived and confirmed as such by the representatives of the "workfield". By discussing and elaborating the concept of an IEP site as well as the nature of the strategic-spatial blueprints, most participants suddenly became aware of the existence of possible interactive effects (i.e. a kind of aha-erlebnis). When reflecting upon these sudden new insights throughout both research projects, this is actually not that surprisingly as SSE-organizations are no experts in architecture nor urban planning. It is therefore quite understandable that they do not take the spatial topics, let alone the interaction of these topics with the strategic topics automatically and self-evidently into consideration. Nonetheless, they found these interaction effects very relevant, interesting and also necessary for the installation or creation of an IEP site.

Both additional research findings have interesting implications for our lessons learned, albeit that these implications concern the entire blueprint or both types of topics simultaneously.

Thus, the additional points of attention for the *strategic* and *spatial* topics of an IEP site blueprint are:

- From a governance perspective, the coincidental*,* non-systematic and rather partial way in which most partners involved reflect on the spatial and strategic topics of the blueprints and on the interaction or relationship between both of them, emphasizes the need to specify governance principles that raise or build a spatial-strategic awareness of all partners involved.

  After all, this awareness is given their professional expertise that is seldom related to architecture and/or urban planning, and their highly operational focus that sometimes overshadows a more strategic point of view, not self-evident. Debates and discussions however indicate that the (potential) partners involved do perceive these strategic-spatial blueprints as very relevant, interesting and necessary for the installation of an IEP site.

The ingredients for these governance principles are the following points of attention: (i) all partners of an IEP site should actively discuss, negotiate and agree upon the particular spatial and strategic identity of their IEP site (related strategic and spatial topics: all topics), (ii) the partners of an IEP site should seek in a (more) conscious, systematic and integral way for a positive or reinforcing "fit" between the strategic and spatial features of a (potential) IEP site (related strategic and spatial topics: all topics), (iii) to improve this fit, additional choices, changes and/or investments may be needed in order to optimize the ambitioned impact of the IEP site (e.g. in order to obtain the strategic ambition, another location might be needed, or given the spatial opportunities another strategic ambition should be elaborated) (related strategic and spatial topics: all topics);

4.   Conclusion … and agenda for future research

In relation to the scientific investigation of urban territories, our attention is drawn by one particular challenge that manifests itself within many Flemish cities: the considerable high and expanding amount of socially deprived urban citizens.

In order to remedy their weak and insecure economic position, both on the production side as a provider of labor and on the consumption side as a consumer of goods and services, we have launched the concept of a so-called "Inclusive Economic Participation (IEP)site". Given the objectives of the CIRIEC workgroup "SSE and territories", an IEP site can be (re)defined as a particular territorial network that accommodates partners who try to resolve under the environmental constraints of an urban setting, the challenge of an inclusive economic participation. In relation to the territorial governance, appropriate models, frameworks or blueprints are needed to manage these networks in an effective and efficient way. As the concept of an IEP site is however new, the detection, analysis and evaluation of already existing governance models is not self-evident. We can however find some inductive inspiration for these models in already existing IEP site "related" SSE-initiatives. These SSE-initiatives are explored in two qualitative research projects realized within Flanders.

This paper reports on the first research findings of both research projects. On the one hand, there are the inductive lessons learned on the conceptualization of an IEP site. As such, attention is paid to (i) the uncovered morphological diversity, (ii) the various meanings of the desired openness, (iii) the uncovered diversity of "intertwining" activities and ambitions, and (iv) the uncovered coincidence and casualness of intertwined activities. On the other hand there are the lessons learned on the elaboration of so-called strategic-spatial (governance) models or blueprints for the implementation and management of IEP sites. Here, attention

is paid to (i) the relevant subjects or topics of a strategic-spatial blueprint, and (ii) the uncovered points of attention for these respective strategic and spatial topics.

As indicated in the introduction of this paper, our concluding remarks also reflect on the development of a research agenda for the future. It is clear that the nature of this agenda is directly related to the lessons learned. Although we have mentioned the specific suggestions for future research throughput the paper itself (see: "i.e. future research agenda"), we would like to summarize the three major headlines in the conclusion. It concerns (i) the further identification of (alternative) types of IEP sites, (ii) the further elaboration or formulation of governance principles within the strategic-spatial blueprints, and (iii) a well-considered consultation of published research reports and literature studies that inspires the ongoing exploration.

As far as the identification of (alternative) types of IEP sites is concerned, we can say that during the elaboration of the IEP site concept and the blueprints, we have found several features that can lead to the identification of (alternative) types of IEP sites. There is for instance the morphological diversity that leads to various *spatial* types of IEP sites (see also 3.1.1), and the diversity of intertwined activities that leads to various *strategic* types of IEP sites (see also 3.1.3). The implications of these (alternative) types for the elaboration of strategic-spatial blueprints is twofold (see also 3.2). On the one hand, these types can form a specific typology within one particular strategic or spatial topic of the blueprint (see also 3.2.2). On the other hand, these types can also form a kind of "overall" IEP site typology in which each type will have mutually distinctive features on all strategic and spatial topics of the blueprints. Although some initial attempts to (re)construct such overall IEP site typologies have been undertaken within one of the two research projects (De Nys-Ketels, Vallet and Bylemans, 2015), additional efforts within future research initiatives are still highly recommendable. As the identification of IEP site typologies can have considerable consequences for a better understanding, implementation and management of IEP sites, it is therefore advisable to undertake additional research efforts that further elaborate and improve the inductive typology-making of IEP sites. Sometimes, such an elaboration demands for a preceding elaboration of a suited research methodology. As such, the morphological diversity for instance calls for a mapping[29]-and-modeling method to incorporate the uncovered morphological or spatial types of IEP sites. In particular it concerns a method in which the various morphological forms and shapes of IEP site "related" SSE-initiatives are detected and visualized in a more rigorous and systematic way.

---

[29] Mapping is understood as a process of gathering and representing various forms of interdisciplinary information through various visualisation methods (Abrams and Hall, 2006, Harley, 1992).

When considering the further elaboration of governance principles within the strategic-spatial blueprints, we can say that during the elaboration of the IEP site concept and the blueprints, we have found several features that demand for governance principles that (should) safeguard or guarantee the presence of these particular features. There are for instance the various meanings of desired openness (see also 3.1.2), the specific demands and conditions of the intertwined activities (see also 3.1.3) and the undesired coincidence and casualness of the joint ambitions (see also 3.1.4). The specific nature of these governance principles should be elaborated within the strategic-spatial blueprints. On the basis of the present research results we have already identified some interesting points of attention (see also 3.2.2). But, additional research efforts are once again highly recommendable. On the one hand, a further in-depth and more detailed analysis of the first set of existing research data is necessary to uncover mainly the (alternative) specifications, meanings and/or implications of each previously identified point of attention. The extent and complexity of the existing data is too high, to be analyzed all at once. On the other hand, also new data and case-studies are needed as they generate an even more rich set of inductive inspiration. As the elaboration of governance principles can have considerable consequences for a better understanding, implementation and management of IEP sites, it is therefore advisable to undertake additional research efforts that further stimulate and improve the inductive formulation of these governance principles. The present - albeit preliminary - format of the strategic spatial blueprints (see also 3.2) offers a useful and hands-on methodology, that can however be improved when combined with the previously described mapping-and-modelling methodology.

As far as the well-considered consultation of published research reports and literature is concerned, we can say that during the elaboration of the IEP site concept and blueprints, we have registered several assumptions, point of views, conditions and supposed (causal) relationships. There are for instance the perceived threats and opportunities concerning the desired openness (see also 3.1.2), the desired intertwined activities (see also 3.1.3) and a more conscious and deliberate collaboration (see also 3.1.4). As these assumptions, points of views, conditions and supposed (causal) relationships can have considerable consequences for a better understanding, implementation and management of IEP sites, it is therefore once again advisable to undertake additional research efforts that further substantiate these preliminary findings in more detail. On the one hand this implies additional empirical efforts and on the other hand additional theoretical or literature study efforts (i.e. models and theories). In view of the present research results, the focus of the latter is clearly specified and inspirational.

Taken together, all of the these future research initiatives will hopefully generate a more in-depth and complete image of the essence of an IEP site, its alternative

forms (i.e. typology) and the way in which these alternative IEP sites can be (successfully) implemented and managed.

References

Abrams, J. and Hall, P. (eds.), *Else/Where: Mapping New Cartographies of Networks and Territories*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2006.

Amin, A., "Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity", *Environment and Planning*, 2002, 34(6), pp. 959-980.

Apostel, K., Janssen, D., Pittillion, F. (eds.), *Bouwblokkenboek: over het bouwblokkenweefsel in Antwerpen, theorie en praktijk*, Antwerpen, University Press Antwerp, 2008.

Bayazit, N., "Investigating Design: A Review of Forty Years of Design Research", *Design Issues*, 2004, 20(1), pp. 16-29.

Bevir, M. and Richards, D., "Decentring policy networks: a theoretical agenda", *Public Administration*, 2009, 87(1), pp. 3-14.

Birks, M., *Grounded Theory, a Practical Guide*, Los Angeles, Sage, 2011.

Borgdorff, H., "The Production of Knowledge in Artistic Research, In: Biggs, M., Karlsson, H. (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*, London, Routledge, 2011, pp. 44-63.

Bouchard, M. J. (ed.), *The Worth of the Social Economy. An International Perspective*, Brussels, PIE Peter Lang, CIRIEC collection Social Economy and Public Economy, 2009.

Bowen, G., "Grounded Theory and Sensitizing Concepts", *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2008, 5(3), pp. 12-23.

Bryson, J. M., and Crosby, B. C., "Policy Planning and the Design and Use of Forums, Arenas, and Courts", *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 1993, 20, pp. 175-194.

Bryson, J. M., Quick, K. S., Slotterback, C. S., Crosby, B. C., "Designing Public Participation Processes. Theory to Practice", *Public Administration Review*, 2012, 73(1), pp. 23-34.

Castells, M., *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring and the Urban-regional Process*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Castells, M., *The Rise of the Network Society*, Malden, Blackwell, 1996.

Castells, M., "Globalisation, Networking, Urbanization: Reflections on the Spatial Dynamics of the Information Age", *Urban Studies*, 2010, 47(13), pp. 2737-2745.

Charmaz, K., *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*, London, Sage, 2006.

Coene, J., Dierckx, D., Vrancken, J. and Van Haarlem, A., "De relatie tussen armoede en arbeid", In: *Over.Werk Tijdschrift van het Steunpunt WSE*, 2011, 21(2), pp. 86-90.

Coene, J., "Arbeid in tijden van crisis", *Armoede en sociale uitsluiting, Jaarboek 2012*, Dierckx, D. et al. (eds.), Leuven, Acco, 2012, pp. 129-147.

Coene, J., "Is er ruimte voor kansengroepen op de arbeidsmarkt?", *Armoede en sociale uitsluiting, Jaarboek 2013*, Dierckx, D. et al. (eds.) Leuven, Acco, 2013, pp. 105-122.

Conforth, C. and Brown, W.A. (ed.), *Non-profit Governance, Innovative Perspectives and Approaches*, New York, Routledge, 2014.

Certo, S. T. and Miller, T., "Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts", *Business Horizons*, 2008, 51, pp. 267-271.

De Langhe, K. and Lyppens, G., "De paradox van de stedelijke campus", *School in de stad in de school*, In: Apostel K. et al. (eds.), Antwerpen, University Press Antwerp, 2012, pp. 43-58.

De Nys-Ketels, S., Vallet, N. and Bylemans, M., *Development of Strategic-spatial Blueprints for Different types of IEP sites, Social Economy Organizations in Synergistic Networks*, Paper CIRIEC conference, 15-18 July 2015, Lisboa (Portugal), 2015, pp. 30.

Desmet, P.M.A. and Pohlmeyer, A. E., "Positive Design: An Introduction to Design for Subjective Well-being", *International Journal of Design*, 2013, 7(3), pp. 5-19.

EAAE (European Association for Architectural Education), EAAE Charter on Architectural Research, 2012. Retrieved 20 August 2014, from http://www.eaae.be/wp/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/2012-09-03_EAAE-Charter-on-Architectural-Research.pdf.

Eshuis, J. et al., "Privaat beheerde woondomeinen: beloftevol of beangstigend fenomeen?", *Beleid en Maatschappij*, 2011, 38, pp. 30-46.

Goldsmith, S. and Eggers, W. D., *Governing by networks. The new shape of the public sector*, Washington DC, Brookings Institution Press, 2004.

Harley, J., "Deconstructing the Map", In: Barnes, T. J. and Duncan, J. S. (eds), *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape*, London and New York, Routledge, 1992, pp. 231-247.

Healy, P., "The communicative turn in planning theory and its implications for spatial strategy formation", *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 1996, 23, pp. 217-234.

Healey, P., *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*, Vancouver Canada, University of British Columbia Press, 1997.

Hooimeijer, P., Kroon, H. and Luttik, J., *Kwaliteit in meervoud*, Gouda, Habiforum: Expertisenetwerk Meervoudig Ruimtegebruik, 2001.

Innes, J. E and Booher, D. E, "Consensus Building and Complex Adaptive Systems. A Framework for Evaluating Collaborative Planning", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 1999, 65(4), pp. 412-423.

Koppenjan, J. F. M. and Klijn, E.H., *Managing Uncertainty in Networks*, London, Routledge, 2004.

Lang, R. E., Danielsen, K. A., "Gated Communities in America: Walling out the World?", *Housing Policy Debate*, 1997, 8(4), pp. 867-877.

Latour, B., and Yaneva, A., "Give me a Gun and I will make all buildings move: an ANT's view of architecture", In: R. Geiser (Ed.), *Explorations in Architecture - Teaching Design Research*, Basel Boston Berlin, Birkhäuser, 2008, pp. 80-89.

Leloup, F., Moyart, L., Pecqueur, B., « La gouvernance territoriale comme nouveau mode de coordination territoriale ? », *Géographie, Economie, Société*, 2005, 7(4), pp. 321-332.

Mozingo, L. A., *Pastoral Capitalism, a History of Suburban Corporate Landscapes*, Cambridge (MA), MIT Press, 2011.

Monzón, J. L. and Chaves, R., "The European Social Economy: concept and dimensions of the third sector", *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 2008, 79(3), pp. 549-577.

Morse, J. M., *Developing Grounded Theory, the Second Generation*, Wallnut Creeck, Calif., Left Coast Press, 2009.

Moulaert, F. and Ailenei, O., "Social Economy, Third Sector and Solidarity Relations: A Conceptual Synthesis from History to Present", *Urban Studies*, 2005, 42, 11, pp. 2037-2053.

O'Toole, L. J. and Meier, K. J., "Desperately seeking Selznick: cooptation and the dark side of public management in networks", *Public Administration Review*, 2004, 64 (6), pp. 681-93.

Pasaogullari, N. and Doratli, N., "Measuring accessibility and utilization of public spaces in Famagusta, Cities", 2004, 21, 3, pp. 225-232.

Pecqueur, B., Itçaina, X., « Economie sociale et solidaire et territoires : un couple allant de soi ? », *RECMA – Revue internationale de l'économie sociale*, 2012, 325, pp. 48-64.

Petermans, A. and Pohlmeyer, A.E., *Design for subjective well-being in interior architecture*, Proceedings of the 6th Annual Architectural Research Symposium in Finland 2014: Designing and Planning the Built Environment for Human Well-being, 2014, pp. 206-218.

Peterson, J., "Mobilising Mainstream Professionals to Work for the Public Good", In: Bell B. and Wakeford K. (eds), *Expanding Architecture: Design as activism*, New York, Metropolis Books, 2008, pp. 84-89.

Provan, K. G. and Milward, H. B., "Do Networks really work? A Framework for Evaluating Public-Sector Organizational Networks", *Public Administration Review*, 2001, 61, 4, pp. 414-423.

Rhodes, R. A. W., *Understanding Governance*, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1997.

Smith, D., Metcalfe, P., Lommerse, M., "Interior architecture as an agent of wellbeing", *Journal of the HEIA*, 2012, 19(3), pp. 2-9.

Smith, D., Lommerse, M. and Metcalfe, P. (eds), *Perspectives on Social Sustainability and Interior Architecture*, Singapore, Springer, 2014.

Sorensen, E. and Torfing, J. (ed.), *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Spear, R., Defourny, J., Favreau, L. and Laville, J. L.. (ed), *Tackling social exclusion in Europe. The contribution of Social Economy*, Ashgate, Aldershot, 2001.

Stern, P. N. and Porr, C. J., *Essentials of accessible Grounded Theory*, Wallnut Creeck, Calif., Left Coast Press, 2011.

Stevens, R., Petermans, A., Vanrie, J., *Converting happiness theory into (interior) architectural design missions*, Proceedings of the 6th Annual Architectural Research Symposium in Finland 2014: Designing and Planning the Built Environment for Human Well-being, 2014, pp. 15.

Stock, W. G., "Informational Cities: Analysis and Construction of Cities in the Knowledge Society", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 2011, 62, 5, pp. 963-986.

Strauss, A. L. and Corbin, J., *Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*, London, Sage, 1994.

Termote, H., "Arbeid, een kwetsbaar sociaal goed in de strijd tegen armoede", In: *Over.Werk Tijdschrift van het Steunpunt WAV*, 2006, 4, pp. 163-180.

Termote H. and Galand, S., "Deeltijds leren en werken: een opstap naar de arbeidsmarkt voor maatschappelijk kwetsbare jongeren?", In: *Over.Werk Tijdschrift van het steunpunt WSE*, 2012, 3, pp. 52-60.

Vallet, N., "Becoming Partners in Urban Development. A Case-study Research on the Strategic Roles of Flemish and Dutch Public Libraries in the Future Development of Cities", *Library Management*, 2013, 34(8/9), pp. 650-63.

Verbeke, J., "This is Research by Design", In: Fraser, M. (Ed.), *Design Research in Architecture: An overview*, Farnham, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013.

Verschaffel, B., *Van Hermes en Hestia: teksten over architectuur*, Gent, A&S books, 2010.

Yaneva, A., *Mapping Controversies in Architecture*, Burlington, Ashgate Pub. Co., 2012

Publications

2017/01   Pupils' cooperatives and the acquisition of competences for sustainable development
Nicole GÖLER von RAVENSBURG

2017/02   Clap along if you know what happiness is to you! Wealth, Trust and Subjective Well-being
Anne MUSSON & Damien ROUSSELIÈRE

2017/03   Les assureurs mutualistes actifs sur le marché de l'assurance municipale en Europe
Francis KADENDE

2017/04   The Design of IEP Sites: Aiming for an Inclusive Economic Participation of Urban Citizens in Flanders
Nathalie VALLET, Simon DE NYS-KETELS & Michelle BYLEMANS

CIRIEC (International Centre of Research and Information on the Public, Social and Cooperative Economy) is a non-governmental international scientific organization.

Its objectives are to undertake and promote the collection of information, scientific research, and the publication of works on economic sectors and activities oriented towards the service of the general and collective interest: action by the State and the local and regional public authorities in economic fields (economic policy, regulation); public utilities; public and mixed enterprises at the national, regional and municipal levels; the so-called "social economy" (not-for-profit economy, cooperatives, mutuals, and non-profit organizations; etc.).

In these fields CIRIEC seeks to offer information and opportunities for mutual enrichment to practitioners and academics and for promoting international action. It develops activities of interest for both managers and researchers.

Le CIRIEC (Centre International de Recherches et d'Information sur l'Economie Publique, Sociale et Coopérative) est une organisation scientifique internationale non gouvernementale.

Ses objectifs sont d'assurer et de promouvoir la collecte d'informations, la recherche scientifique et la publication de travaux concernant les secteurs économiques et les activités orientés vers le service de l'intérêt général et collectif : l'action de l'Etat et des pouvoirs publics régionaux et locaux dans les domaines économiques (politique économique, régulation) ; les services publics ; les entreprises publiques et mixtes aux niveaux national, régional et local ; « l'économie sociale » : coopératives, mutuelles et associations sans but lucratif ; etc.

Le CIRIEC a pour but de mettre à la disposition des praticiens et des scientifiques des informations concernant ces différents domaines, de leur fournir des occasions d'enrichissement mutuel et de promouvoir une action et une réflexion internationales. Il développe des activités qui intéressent tant les gestionnaires que les chercheurs scientifiques.