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Introduction

- Internationalising housing investment and demand for housing
- Housing in centre of post-GFC global and urban political economies
- Global (re)urbanisation and global city-making
- Complexity and Inter-dependencies accross housing systems
- Cross-national housing-related monitoring
- Problematic housing-related outcome patterns (e.g. winner-loser dichotomies)
- Unequal intra-state competence and resource distribution accross geographical scales
Key Guiding Questions

- What can be said about the emerging spatial-institutional Division of Labour around urban housing policy in the European context in globalising and neoliberalising (Post-GFC) times?

- What is the rationale behind reconfiguring cross-scale urban housing policy arrangements?

- What is the link between policy actors, function, resource/competency and geographical scale?
Entry Points – International Literature

- A) Internationalising, Financialising and inequality-generating housing
- B) Cities and urban-based processes
- C) Governance, Policy and Politics
- D) Urban Policy Making
Entry Points – International Literature 1

A) Internationalising, Financialising and inequality-generating housing

- Housing Regimes and Housing Systems (e.g. Kemeny, 1981; Stephens, 2016)
- Commodification and Financialisation (Aalbers, 2016; Holm, 2008)
- Globalisation and Internationalisation (e.g. Schwartz and Seabrooke, 2008; Ley, 2017)
- Unequal property-based rentier societies (e.g. Maclennan and Miao, 2017; Standing, 2016)
B) Cities and urban-based processes

- (Re)Urbanisation (magnet cities) (e.g. Glaser, 2011; Florida, 2002)

- City-regionalism (e.g. Scott et al, 2001; Harrison, 2010)

- Role of land and property in urban development (e.g. Ryan-Collins et al, 2017; Christophers, 2016)

- Bonanza and dispair – affordability, gentrification, displacement, global rent gaps (winner – loser dichotomies) (e.g. McKinsey, 2014; Slater, 2015)
C) Governance, Policy and Politics

- From nation-state upwards and downwards (scale) (e.g. Manners, 2008; Wood et al, 2005)

- From government to governance (actors) (Kooiman, 1993; Jessop, 1998)

- Policy networks (e.g. Rhodes, 1997; Stone, 2008)

- Discursive governance, complexity and contradictions (regulatory impact) (Jessop, 2009; Wetzstein, 2007)

- Post-political governance (problem-solution framings) (Crouch, 2004; Swyngedouw, 2007)
Entry Points – International Literature 4

D) Urban Policy Making

- Global city making (e.g. Hodson and Marvin, 2007; Segbers, 2007)

- Urban entrepreneurialism, city branding (global visibility) (Harvey, 1989; Kavaratzis, 2004)

- Policy mobility and transfer, including urban models (e.g. Peck, 2011; Prince, 2011)

- Scale-sensitive accounts (e.g. MacLeod and Goodwin, 1999; Fürst, 2007)
My Methodology 1

- Presentation based on sub-set of evidence from larger comparative research project - opportunity to utilise methodology in order to assemble case studies for this study

- Project: “‘Affordable housing’ crises in national urban centres: a comparative, political-economy perspective” (Berlin, Vienna, Singapore, Sydney, Auckland, EU-perspective)

- Multi-city comparative ethnographical (MCCE)-methodology; in-depth interview-centered qualitative research strategy (105 interviews/workshops)

- Understandings of key actors such as investors, government officials, consultants, academics and journalists as reference points for critical examination

- Opportunity to participate in policy events (e.g. Habitat 3 meetings), talk to key informants in strategic sites, access quality secondary data
My Methods

- ‘Research interview/workshop’
- ‘Observation’ (Policy Events)
- ‘Media-review’
- ‘Media article response analysis’
Case Studies

- Global New Urban Agenda (UN-Habitat III)
- Europeanisation of urban housing policy
- ‘Viennese housing model’ (‘Wiener Modell’)
Case Study 1: Global New Urban Agenda

Context

- Deliberation about the adequate response to many opportunities and challenges of the global urban age
- A high-level policy blue-print, ‘New Urban Agenda’ provides the normative, intellectual, policy and political leadership needed to successfully manage 21st century urbanization
- Importance of defining and agreeing on a global urban agenda more accepted now than ever before, and global policy on urban and regional issues has evolved (Parnell, 2016)
- Call for urban paradigm shift and deep-seated transformation that promises victory in the battle for sustainable development
- Yet Habitat III met in less confident times than previous meetings (Buckley and Simet, 2016), skeptical scrutiny is warranted when he asks whether Habitat III will actually be generating needed action (Satterthwaite, 2016)
- Focus still more on developing and emerging countries, but advances economies becoming more important (social problems)
Case Study 1: 
Global New Urban Agenda

Three key functions

1. Agenda-Setting: policy reference point, political pressure, goal-setting
   - UN-agenda for Sustainable Development 2030 and the Paris Climate Change Commitments are expected to receive new implementation impulses through the NUA
   - 3 intervention foci: state-governmental approach emphasizing decentralization, strategic and integrated urban territorial planning, emphasis on sound financing, state-private sector partnership and stakeholder inclusion.
   - Models of influence: best practices and successful pilot projects (influencing by good examples), benchmarking (influencing by comparison) as well as cooperation and partnerships such as Public-Private Partnerships (influencing through negotiation)
Case Study 1: Global New Urban Agenda

Three key functions

2. Engagement and Communication Process: enrolment of actors, inclusiveness, relationships/trust

- Intense dialogue between member states, a wide variety of stakeholders such as local authorities, non-profit organizations or new social movements as well as the public
- Generation of buy-in, good will and a compromise attitude amongst these actors
- Multi-faceted communication process has been the organization of informal hearings with local authority organizations; an event that allowed for the first time in history mayors to directly address UN member states
Case Study 1: Global New Urban Agenda

Three key functions

3. Knowledge and policy stock-take: legitimacy, intervention rationales, problem-solution framings

- 6 areas: liveable cities, urban frameworks, spatial development, urban economy, urban ecology and environment as well as urban housing and basic services

- 22 issue papers by task teams comprised from UN-organizations such as UNESCO and UN-Habitat or other global entities such as the World Bank and the World Health Organization addressed particular research areas, highlight general findings and identify important research needs

- 10 policy units; groupings of twenty experts from a variety of fields including academia, government and civil society

All three areas address nation-state policy making by generating/building influence, competence and relational power.
Case Study 1: Global New Urban Agenda

One stakeholder vision

...urbanization more than just territorial planning
...integrated vision for all that serve their residents equally and improve quality of life for all
...by leveraging their power, cities can command a more central role in national decision-making

Case Study 1: Global New Urban Agenda

Politics of Scale

- One of the key obstacles to implementing the agreement is a disconnect between national commitments and local action.

- National governments still do not fully understand their role in urbanization — continuing to consider it something of a “natural disaster” rather than a social and economic trend to be leveraged for progress. (Joan Clos, Habitat 3 leader)

- Importance of transfer mechanism (Good practice in Germany: Länderfinanzausgleich)

- Ein großes Hindernis bleibt, dass es immer noch die Nationalstaaten sind, die die New Urban Agenda verabschieden. Es ist nicht so wahrscheinlich, dass Staaten ihren Städten mehr Mitbestimmungsrechte geben, selbst wenn die New Urban Agenda nur eine nicht-bindende Vereinbarung ist.

Case Study 2: Europeanisation of urban housing policy

EU-role on housing (academic interpretation)

- The EU does not have an official mandate on housing and the provision of affordable and social housing is primarily a concern of national and local policies. However the Commission has an important role on housing through different means (Cziscke, 2014), such as the regulation of competition policies related to the concept of “Services of General Economic Interest” (SGEI) and controversial application of state aid rules in different contexts (Tasan-Kok et al, 2013; Kadi and Musterd, 2015), the regulatory provisions allowing to use European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) on energy efficiency improvement on housing for marginal groups, and more.
Case Study 2: Europeanisation of urban housing policy

Post-GFC: housing policy – member state role

“Homelessness and housing are member-state competencies”. (Policy Analyst 1/Europ. Commission, pers. comm., 9 Nov 2016)

“Housing is national policy – not EU-policy”. (Public Sector Leader/Europ. Advocacy, pers. comm., 23 Nov 2016)

“Each country has a specific way of producing housing, a specific legal system, culture, institutions”. (Public Sector Leader/Europ. Advocacy, pers. comm., 23 Nov 2016)

“In housing there are 28 different systems. Housing problems need to be solved on national and local levels”. (Policy Analyst 2/Europ. Commission, pers. comm., 23 Nov 2016)
Case Study 2: Europeanisation of urban housing policy

Post-GFC: some EU-role on housing

“Since 2009 Europeanisation of housing policies has accelerated but no legislative power is given to this scale. Before there was no role on housing, afterwards there was the European recovery plan including structural funds on housing and renovation of social housing” (Policy Analyst/Europ. Advocacy, pers. comm., 7 Nov 2016)

“There is a feeling that the EU should do something in housing”. (Public Sector Leader/Europ. Advocacy, pers. comm., 23 Nov 2016)

“EU has some role in housing – but no competence” (Policy Analyst 2/Europ. Commission, pers. comm., 23 Nov 2016)

“Overall the EU follows a soft power approach to housing – ideas, pilots and some money here and there. The EU new urban partnership with Vienna and Slovakia is a good test how far one can go. (Policy Analyst 2/Europ. Commission, pers. comm., 23 Nov 2016)
Case Study 2: Europeanisation of urban housing policy

Experimenting/ Pilots/ Best practice facilitation

- EU Urban Agenda: Under guidance of the Dutch Ministry during its EU presidency, 4 pilots partnerships including representatives from European, national and local authorities, international organisations and NGO’s have been established, covering 4 of the 11 themes currently selected
- The revision of the existing knowledge on affordable housing

Expert opinion

- Sharing of partners’ proposals around the opportunities for revising of State Aid rules, and social housing rules
- study the match and mismatch between EU and national policies on housing also in relation to energy efficiency measures
- Better use of funding, considering that (European Funds for Strategic Investments) EFSI and other EU funds can be used on housing

Case Study 2: Europeanisation of urban housing policy

Channels of influence/levels of engagement

European Agency Engagement
- Housing Europe (Advocacy group social/public/non-profit housing sectors)
- FEANTSA (European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless)
- European Investment Bank

'Bubble-risk' project
- Nation-state centred
- Post-GFC trajectory
- Social crisis monitoring and coordination

Experimenting/Pilots
- Opportunity/temporary/projects
- Cites/sectors/actors

...contested and contingent re-working Division of Labour around housing policy
Case Study 3:
‘Viennese housing model’ (‘Wiener Modell’)
Case Study 3: ‘Viennese housing model’ (‘Wiener Modell’)

Strategic model creation, circulation and branding

„Das ’Wiener Modell‘ ist ein Schatz, eine Quelle von Selbstbewußtsein. Es war ein Experiment in Zeiten der wachsenden Stadt“. (Academic/Vienna, pers. comm., 7 Dec 2016)


Case Study 3: ‘Viennese housing model’ (‘Wiener Modell’)

Packaging, Selling, Branding…and Policy Transfer


„Das ‘Wiener Modell’ ist schwer zu kopieren – wir nehmen wirklich Geld in die Hand.“ (Civic Administration Leader 2/Vienna, pers. comm., 7 Dec 2016)

“*The global Mercer Quality of life ranking is used to justify the ‘Wiener Model’.*” (Civic Administration Leader 1/Vienna, pers. comm., 9 Dec 2016)
Case Study 3:

‘Viennese housing model’ (‘Wiener Modell’)

Soft power and advocacy

Das Wiener Modell: Wohnbau für die Stadt des 21. Jahrhunderts“ (Buch)


Mit "The Vienna Model - Housing in the 21st Century City" auf US-Tournee


http://www.mvd.org/prj/the-vienna-model/
Case Study 3:
‘Viennese housing model’ (Wiener Modell)

Soft power and advocacy

- Treffen der EU-Städtepartnerschaft zum Thema „Wohnen“ in Wien: 30 hochrangige ExpertInnen diskutieren Wege zum leistbaren Wohnen in Europa

…gestern, Donnerstag und heute, Freitag tagten die Mitglieder der EU-Städtepartnerschaft zum Thema Wohnen, dieses Mal auf Einladung der Stadt Wien, im Wiener Rathaus. Baudirektorin Brigitte Jilka begrüßte die TeilnehmerInnen zu Beginn der zweitägigen Arbeitssitzung und hob hervor, wie wichtig es sei, die Erfahrungen von Städten, gerade im Bereich des Planens, Bauens und Wohnens einzubringen:

- Arbeitssitzung in Wien mit Schwerpunkt Beihilfen und Finanzierung


Case Study 3:
‘Viennese housing model’ (‘Wiener Modell’)

Influencing policy environment

- Network: Eurocities – influence EU
- Branding: IBA/exhibition – influence discursive policy environment
- Policy-transfer: city-2-city – influence other cities
- Partnership: Vienna-Bratislava – influence key partner


“Wir machen Lobbyarbeit für sozial gerechtes Europa, sozialen Wohnbau, Subsidiaritätsprinzip.“ (Policy Analyst/Vienna, pers. comm., 7 Dec 2016)
Discussion and Reflections 1

Cities in European housing policy making

- Actors in networks (Euro-Cities)
- Partner in partnerships (e.g. Vienna – Bratislava)
- City-2-city influencing
- City-branding
- Site of knowledge creation and social monitoring
- Experimental actors
- Object of national and supra-national policy-making
Discussion and Reflections 2

Changing Division of Labour - Urban Policy Making (housing)

- Division of Labour reflects complexity and interdependencies around housing
- Division of Labour concerns changing multi-actor networks spanning sites and scales
- Crucial goal to influence actors, strategies and polices on other geographical scales and in other jurisdictions - ongoing wrestling over spheres of influence
- Cities are becoming more important as arena for calculation, strategy and policy – but resources to influence processes are unevenly distributed across all scales and diverse actor groups
- More instances of by-passing nation state in post-GFC environment – but nation state still important in all aspects of developing and implementing urban housing policies
- Importance of intra-state politics, relationships and ability to partner
- Division of Labour – emerging, evolving, contingent, contentious – re-configuration outcomes cannot be predicted
Discussion and Reflections 3

Revisiting Literatures 1

- **Internationalising, Financialising and inequality-generating housing**
  - Truly internationalising policy regimes around urban housing
  - Access to, and authority over, finance important policy imperative and contentious issue
  - Urban housing regimes instead of national ones?

- **Cities and urban-based processes**
  - Role of land critical in housing – but undertheorised and empirically weak
  - Urban housing-related processes still little understood, conceptualised and quantified
  - Global gentrification machine through ‘wall of money’ – regulatory sites?
Revisiting Literatures 2

- **Governance, Policy and Politics**
  - Actor configurations, processes and influence channels reflect complexity and emergence rather than clear-cut patterns
  - Can policies change outcomes – enormous weight on policy?
  - Upgrading policy network literature based on these findings

- **Urban Policy Making / Housing**
  - ‘Wiener Modell‘ shows widespread demand for social/de-commodified construction of housing
  - Urban entrepreneurialism as experimental, cross-scale search process for affecting/influencing policy settings
  - Empirical richness of urban policy mobility (Vienna) – further conceptualisation and comparison needed
Discussion and Reflections 5

Future Research Directions (Suggestions)

- Possibilities and limits of partnership development across geographical scales in response to serious housing-related urban challenges (e.g. affordable housing, homelessness, kex worker problem)
- Prospects for city and city-regional governance, capacities and authority around housing policy and implementation
- Influence of new social movements (e.g. right to city, local initiatives) on social and spatial division of labour around housing
- Politics of housing policy as intellectual agenda
- Nation-state based housing policy in the urban age??
- Role of the academy/relational academic in contributing to problem-solution framings around urban housing
Concluding Thoughts

- Remaking governance across scales does not mean at all that housing outcomes for people, communities and cities are improved.

- My wider project highlights ongoing pressure and crisis-conditions (issues, tensions, contradictions).

- Dilemma of regulating housing has become central to governing expansionary capitalist processes.

- Need to explore in more depth what I call ‘policy-outcome gaps’ in different places under contemporary conditions.
Key Selected References 1
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