

APPENDIX

The database of Co-Cities represents the culmination of a six-year-long research project seeking to investigate and experiment with new forms of collaborative city making that are pushing urban areas toward new frontiers of co-governance, inclusive economic growth, and social innovation. The case studies gathered here come from different kinds of cities located all around the world; they include groundbreaking experiments in Bologna (Italy) as well as in other Italian cities (e.g., Bologna, Milan, Naples, Reggio Emilia, Rome), and in global cities such as Seoul (South Korea), Mexico City (Mexico), New York (New York), Barcelona (Spain), and Amsterdam (Netherlands).

This appendix presents an overview of the data set from over 140 cities that we investigated and analyzed (out of the over 200 cities surveyed). The data set provides several community-based projects and public policies from the cities mapped. All the projects and public policies presented in this appendix are also published on the web platform, Commoning.city. The intention behind Commoning.city is to provide an international mapping platform for researchers, practitioners, public officials, city agencies, and policymakers interested in understanding the variety of practices and policies that embrace the kinds of urban commons that we reference in the book. The first phase of the research, whose results are summarized here, was mostly exploratory. Some case studies were explored more in depth,

including fieldwork observations and/or direct involvement in the case studies, as indicated by the data in the Exemplary Case Studies table at the end of this appendix. Our goal in creating the online dataset is chiefly to attract the interest of fellow researchers who could build on this first body of knowledge we offer here to further develop, improve, challenge, and rebuild the foundation of this line of research we humbly attempted to open up. The online dataset is open access, collaborative, and iterative. This means that we are constantly conducting further research to update the information on the projects and public policies we have surveyed so far, following their evolution. We continue to conduct research on a rolling basis to expand the dataset with new projects and public policies. Please, check the online version for updates and more information: <http://commoning.city/commons-map/>.

METHODOLOGY FOR DATA SELECTION AND DATA COLLECTION

The case studies have been extracted from different sources, including those listed here. The Co-Cities database, available on Commoning.city, indicates detailed source information for each case study. The sources include:

1. The papers presented at The City as a Commons conference in Bologna, Italy, in 2015. These papers contained many relevant cases and examples of urban commons in different geographic contexts. These papers are available in the Digital Library of the Commons or published elsewhere and thus are fully accessible;
2. Scientific journals covering the following themes: commons (e.g., *The International Journal of the Commons*) and urban studies (*CITY—Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action; Policy Studies; Urban Policy and Research; Urban, Planning and Transport Research; Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability; Journal of Urban Affairs*);
3. Academic conferences on the commons and urban commons and, in particular, involving urban research, cities, and policy studies. In addition to the City as a Commons conference in Bologna, examples include the 4th Conference on Good Economy; relevant thematic events on the commons and city-making (e.g., the New Democracy

workshops held by Pakhuis de Zwijger–Amsterdam; Sharitaly events in Italy; GSEF 2016—Forum Mondial de l'économie sociale; Urbanpromo conferences in Italy; Innovative City Development meeting in Madrid; the World Forum on urban violence and education for coexistence and peace held in Madrid; UNIVERSSE 2017—the 4th European Congress for Social Solidarity Economy held in Athens; and Verge New York City 2017 held at the New School);

4. Urban media (Shareable, Citiscope, CityLab, Cities in Transition, Guardian Cities, P2P Foundation, Remixthecommons, and OnTheCommons);
5. Direct suggestions from key experts, scholars, and practitioners: David Bollier, Silke Helfrich, Anna Davies, Marie Dellenbaugh, Fabiana Bettini, Thamy Pogrebinschi, Ezio Manzini, Eduardo Staszowski, and Martin Kornberger;
6. Deliverables produced by the EU research and funding program Horizon 2020—funded research project Open Heritage and EUARENAS;
7. In order to reach geographical areas not covered through the previously mentioned samples, we also engaged in internet data mining through established internet providers (Google and Bing) and scientific databases (Summon Discovery) using the following keywords: commons, urban commons, community land trust, Wi-Fi community network, collaborative neighborhood, collaborative district, collaborative governance, and community-managed services.

The cities that we investigated and surveyed were selected in order to provide us with a breadth of examples of different projects and policies of collectively or collaboratively managed or governend urban resources in different countries and contexts.

We identified and included a group of cities for every geographical area in order to capture diversity (although without any ambition of representativeness or statistical significance) of cultural, social, economic, legal, and institutional factors. The data collected from all cities is displayed on a map available here: <http://commoning.city/commons-map/>. For each project/public policy, a short record card has been uploaded on the commons map, including the main information collected through answers to the questionnaires and through online data mining, and through further research from scientific papers and industry specific magazines.

The record card uploaded on the website is built as follows:

City	[...]
Name of the Project/Public Policy	[...]
Date Initiated	[...]
Description of the Project/Public Policy	[...]
Urban Co-governance	[...]
Enabling State	[...]
Pooling Economies	[...]
Experimentalism	[...]
Tech Justice	[...]
Project Website	[...]
References, sources, contact person(s)	[...]

THE CO-CITIES DATA SET

The first mapping phase of the project resulted in a collection of 522 policies/projects in 201 cities in different geographical areas:

Region	Total cities	Total projects/public policies
Europe	90	306
North America	23	81
Central and Latin America	20	41
Africa	24	35
Asia	37	48
Oceania	7	11
Total	201	522

From this initial database, we more closely analyzed, through interviews with relevant stakeholders and/or more extensive desk research 140 cities with 283 projects/public policies (out of the initial 522 identified) within them. The cities that we surveyed and analyzed most closely were

selected on the basis of the existence of a project or policy relevant to creating, enabling, facilitating, or sustaining collaboratively or cooperatively shared resources utilizing the existing infrastructure of cities.

Region	Total cities	Total projects/public policies
Europe	72	147
North America	15	41
Central and Latin America	10	23
Africa	13	29
Asia	25	36
Oceania	5	7
Total	140	283

CODING CITIES

The process for collecting the data contained in this report involved gathering information from secondary sources and/or contacting and interviewing a representative for each city mapped. This report presents a summary of the results of the empirical analysis carried out on projects/public policies in 140 cities.

For this stage of analysis we did not engage in a comparison of the collected case studies, which was planned for the second phase of the research after a larger number of projects/public policies were collected (in order to have good representation of all the geographical areas). In this report, the analysis of the 140 cities is strictly descriptive. Our aim is to highlight the relevant aspects of each city and to build a classification criterion for the four dimensions captured by the data. The charts and tables below present the aggregated results of the coding at a regional level and per city. 0=absent; 1=weak; 2=moderate; 3=strong.

The coding was carried out with research assistance and was guided by an analytical tool, the Co-Cities Guidance Codebook. In the Guidance Codebook, we operationalized each design principle and highlighted its main features on the basis of the literature review outlined in chapter 4. Every design principle operationalization is accompanied by a set

of guiding empirical questions. The questions assisted coders in assigning a value to the design principle from 0 to 3. The Codebook counsels to assign values on an incremental scale, meaning that the greater the intensity of the design principle feature in the case study, the higher the value assigned. For example, the Tech Justice design principles are operationalized in 4 layers: lack of access to data/technology and/or absence of any involvement of communities in the tech management/ownership (absence); improved access to data/technology (low); collaborative management of the data/technology (moderate); cooperative ownership of the data/technology (strong).

REGIONS AND CITIES CODED AND ANALYZED

EUROPE

The European cities show on average an above-moderate score in the majority of the design principles considered in this study. With regard to Urban Co-Governance (2.3), Experimentalism (2.3), Pooling (2.2), and Enabling State (2.4), the European cities invested serious efforts in promoting public policies as well as projects. The European local authorities have been, on average, very active in promoting the urban commons and new forms of urban co-governance. The uniqueness of the European cases are the networks and frameworks in place between each city that create added value for each project. On the other hand, Tech Justice (1) is still an underdeveloped aspect of these cases, similarly to other regions, which signal the need for an expansion of the dataset to make sure it includes a wider number of cases concerned with technological, digital, data issues.

The dataset includes ninety cities with 303 projects/public policies and closely analyzed seventy-two cities and 147 projects/public policies.

Data aggregated per city

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Aarhus	2	3	3	3	1
Amsterdam	2	3	2	3	2
Athens	2	2	2	2	2
Barcelona	2	3	2	2	2

Data aggregated per city (continued)

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Bari	3	2	3	2	0
Battipaglia	3	3	3	2	0
Belgrade	2	3	2	3	2
Berlin	2	3	2	3	1
Bilbao	2	2	1.5	1	3
Birmingham	2	3	3	3	0
Bologna	2	3	2	2	2
Bristol	3	3	3	2	0
Brussels	3	3	2	3	1
Budapest	2	3	3	2	0
Callan	2	2	2	3	2
Caserta	3	2	2	3	1
Colombes	3	1	3	3	0
Copenhagen	2	3	1	2	1
Coruna	2	2	2	2	0
Dublin	2	1	3	2	2
Edinburgh	3	3	3	3	2
Eindhoven	3	2	2	3	3
Fidenza	3	3	2	2	1
Gdansk	3	2.5	2.5	3	1
Ghent	2	2	2	3	2
Glasgow	3	3	2	3	2
Gothenburg	3	3	3	3	2
Grenoble	2	1	1	2	2
Hamburg	2	3	2	3	0
Helsinki	2	3	3	3	2
Iasi	2	2.5	1	2	1

(continued)

Data aggregated per city (continued)

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Lille	2	1	3	3	2
Lisbon	3	3	3	3	0
Liverpool	2	2	3	2	1
London	2	1	3	3	2
Lucca	3	2	2	1	1
Lyon	3	3	3	3	0
Madrid	2	3	2	3	2
Malmö	3	3	3	2	2
Mantova	2	3	2	3	2
Maribor	2	3	2	3	0
Marseille	2	3	3	3	1
Massarosa	1	3	2	3	0
Matarò	3	3	2	2	0
Matera	2	2	3	3	2
Messina	2	3	1	2	0
Milan	2	3	2	2	2
Montpellier	2	2	3	3	0
Narni	1	3	2	3	0
Nantes	3	3	3	2	0
Naples	2	3	3	2	0
Oslo	3	2	1	-2	1
Ostrava	3	3	2	3	3
Palermo	1	2	2	1	0
Padua	3	3	2.5	2	1
Paris	2	3	2	2	1

Data aggregated per city (continued)

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Peniche	3	2	3	3	3
Presov	2	2.5	1	2	1
Reggio Emilia	3	3	2	3	1
Rome	2	2	2	3	2
Rotterdam	3	2	3	2	1
San Tamaro	2	3	3	3	0
Sarantaporo	3	1	3	1	3
Sassari	2	1	2	3	2
Turin	3	2	3	2	2
Utrecht	3	3	2	2	0
Wien	3	2	3	2	0
Valencia	2	2	2.5	2	1.5
Venice	2	3	2	3	1
Viladecans	2	3	3	3	2
Villeurbanne	1.5	2	2.5	2	0
Zaragoza	3	3	3	2	0

NORTH AMERICA

In the region (North America) the dataset includes twenty-three cities with eighty-one projects/public policies and closely analyzed fifteen cities and forty-one projects/public policies. US and Canadian cities received, overall, high scores and results across a number of dimensions, especially with regard to Pooling (2.6), Experimentalism (2.5), and Urban Cogovernance (2.5). As with the European cases, Tech Justice has an average score below the other dimensions (1.3). However, there are outliers (in New York City, for example) of projects pioneering the advancement of technological, digital, and data justice in cities flagging that expansion of the database is needed for a proper assessment.

Data aggregated per city

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Baltimore	3	2	3	2	1
Baton Rouge	2	2	3	3	0
Boston	3	3	3	3	1
Chicago	3	3	3	3	0
Cleveland	2	2	2	2	1
Detroit	3	3	3	3	0
Jackson	2	1	3	2	1
Madison	3	1	2	2	1
Miami	2	2	2	2	2
Montreal	2.7	3	2.3	2.7	2
New York City	2	2.2	2.5	2.2	1.6
Savannah	3	2	2	3	2
Seattle	2	3	2.5	3	2
Toronto	3	2	3	2	2
Washington, DC	2	1	3	3	3

CENTRAL AND LATIN AMERICA

In the region (Central and Latin America) the dataset includes twenty cities with forty-one projects/public policies mapped, and closely analyzed ten cities and twenty-three projects/public policies. The Latin American cities received high scores in Experimentalism (2.4) and Pooling (2.2), demonstrating the presence of a developed and lively urban innovation ecosystem. Latin America has also strong scores in Urban Co-governance (2.1), Enabling State (2.2), and Tech Justice (2), thus standing as further proof of the livelihood of projects and public policies in Latin American cities, although in some cases projects/public policies analyzed are not active in the long term.

Data aggregated per city

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Buenos Aires	2	1	3	3	0.5
Cochabamba	1	2	1	1	3
Medellin	1.5	2	2	1.5	2
Mexico City	1.5	3	2	3	3
Quito	2	3	3	3	2
San José	3	3	2	3	3
San Juan	3	2	3	3	1
Santiago de Chile	2	3	2	3	3
Sao Paolo	1	1	2	1	2
Valparaiso	3	2	3	2	1

AFRICA

In the region (Africa) the dataset includes twenty-four cities with thirty-five projects/public policies, and investigated and/or closely analyzed thirteen cities and twenty-nine projects/public policies. The case studies analyzed on the African continent are characterized by a high level of Experimentalism (2.38) and Urban Co-Governance (2.31) and a more moderate score for Pooling (2.08). African cities have the potential, in our view, to become breeding grounds for urban experimentalism and social innovation initiatives. On the other hand, cities have low scores on the dimension of the Enabling State (1.58) signaling that expansion of the database is needed for a proper assessment.

Data aggregated per city

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Accra	1	2	1	3	1
Bamako	3	1	2	3	1

(continued)

Data aggregated per city (continued)

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Bergrivier	3	3	2	2	2
Cape Town	3	2	2	2	2
Casablanca	2	1	2	3	2
Dakar	1	1	2	2	1
Johannesburg	2	2	3	3	2
Kigali	3	2	1	2	2
Kinshasa	3	1	3	3	1
Lagos	3	1	2	3	0
Lomé	2	2	3	2	3
Mombasa	2	1	2	1	1
Nairobi	3	2.5	2.5	2	0

ASIA

In the region (Asia) the dataset includes thirty-seven cities with forty-eight projects/public policies and closely analyzed twenty-five cities and thirty-six projects/public policies. Cities reported a high average score (2.2) across all the dimensions. They present a relatively moderate score for Pooling (2.2) and Experimentalism (2.2), showing noteworthy results in one of the most populated areas of the world. Tech Justice (1.4) and Enabling State (1.8) perform slightly below the average (although with notable exceptions) meaning that in these areas we may foresee scope for evolution for some of the cities included in the table below as well as the overall dataset.

Data aggregated per city

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Ashdod	2	2	1	2	1
Bandung	2	2	2	3	3
Bangalore	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	2

Data aggregated per city (continued)

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Banjarmasin	3	3	3	3	1
Barangay	2	2	2	3	1
Beirut	2	1	2.5	2.5	1
Chengdu	2	3	2	1.5	1
Guangzhou	2	2	2.5	2	1
Holon	3	2	1	3	1
Hong Kong	2	2	2	2	1
Jerusalem	2	2	2	3	1
Karachi	2	1	1	3	2
Kathamandu	3	1	3	3	1
Koregaoni	3	2	2	1	1
Kyoto	2	1	3	2	1
Lahore (area)	1	1	2	3	3
Mumbai	3	2	2	2	3
Pune	3	3	2	1	1
Seoul	1	2	2	2	2
Shenyang	2	2	2	1	1
Shenzhen	2	1.5	2.5	2	1
Tokyo (area)	2	1	3	1.5	3
Yogiakarta	1	2	3	2	1

OCEANIA

In the region (Oceania) the dataset includes six cities with eleven projects/public policies and closely analyzed five cities and seven projects/public policies. The following table presents the aggregated results for the region and the aggregated results per city. In Oceania, the case studies scored highly on the dimension of Pooling (2.40). They scored more moderately on Experimentalism (2.00) and lower on Urban Cogovernance (1.60), Enabling State (1.20), and Tech Justice (1.40).

Data aggregated per city

City	Urban co-governance	Enabling state	Pooling economies	Experimentalism	Tech justice
Adelaide	1	1	2	1	1
Christchurch	2	2	1	2	2
Melbourne	2	1	3	2	2
Sidney	1	1	3	2	1
Wellington	2	1	3	3	1

EXEMPLARY CASE STUDIES

Among the entire universe of collected and analyzed case studies in the first phase of this investigation, we identified the following exemplary case studies. These cases are, by no means, the only best practices our of the dataset. These are the case studies that best demonstrate and illustrate the Co-Cities principles, although they are very diverse in how they do so. They are discussed throughout the book. Our goal in the phase of the investigation that will follow the publication of this book is to identify a set of projects/public policies that is representative of different systemic variables. The case studies are the following:

City	Project/policy	Country
Amsterdam	Amsterdam Sharing City	Netherlands
Athens	SynAthina	Greece
Barcelona	Citizen Asset Regulation and Community Balance	Spain
Barcelona	Decidim	Spain
Baton Rouge	Build Baton Rouge/Co-City Baton Rouge	USA
Bangalore	Urban commons institutions for the urban lakes in Bengaluru	India
Bologna	Regulation on the collaboration between city residents and the city in the care and regeneration of the urban commons and Co-Bologna	Italy
Bologna	Iperbole Community institutional platform for the commons	Italy
Bologna	Incredibil: Bologna's creative innovation	Italy

City	Project/policy	Country
Bologna	Co-Bologna (fieldwork and experimentation)	Italy
Boston	Dudley Street	USA
Lomé	Woelab	Togo
Madrid	Ordinance on public social cooperation	Spain
Milan	Deliberation on the criteria for use and concession of use of city-owned buildings for projects aimed at social, cultural, economic development.	Italy
Mexico City	Laboratorio para la ciudad	Mexico
Mexico City	Ciudad Propuesta CDMX—Proposed City CDMX	Mexico
Naples	Deputy Mayor for the Commons	Italy
Naples	Agency for the Water as a Commons (ABC Naples)	Italy
Naples	Principles for the governance of the urban commons and Urban Civic Uses Recognition	Italy
Naples	Ex Asilo Filangieri	Italy
Naples	Civic eState URBACT transfer network (Co-City experimentation)	Italy
New York City	MOCTO/NYCx Co-Lab	USA
New York City	Silicon Harlem	USA
New York City	Red Hook Wi-Fi	USA
Reggio Emilia	Neighborhood as a commons	Italy
Reggio Emilia	Coviolo Wireless	Italy
Reggio Emilia	Collaboratorio Reggio (fieldwork and experimentation)	Italy
Rome	Agenda Tevere	Italy
Rome	Co-Roma social partnership (fieldwork and experimentation)	Italy
San Juan	Community Land Trust	Puerto Rico
Seoul	Municipal Ordinance for the Sharing Economy	Korea
Turin	Co-City Torino	Italy
Turin	New Turin Regulation for Governing the Urban Commons	Italy
Turin	Neighborhood houses network	Italy
Turin	Co-City (UIA project) (fieldwork)	Italy

This is a section of [doi:10.7551/mitpress/11702.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11702.001.0001)

Co-Cities

Innovative Transitions toward Just and Self-Sustaining Communities

By: Sheila R. Foster, Christian Iaione

Citation:

Co-Cities: Innovative Transitions toward Just and Self-Sustaining Communities

By: Sheila R. Foster, Christian Iaione

DOI: [10.7551/mitpress/11702.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11702.001.0001)

ISBN (electronic): 9780262369930

Publisher: The MIT Press

Published: 2022

The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding and support from MIT Libraries



The MIT Press

© 2022 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC-BY-ND license.
Subject to such license, all rights are reserved.



The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding from the MIT Libraries.

The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in Stone Serif and Avenir by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Foster, Sheila R., 1963– author. | Iaione, Christian, author.

Title: Co-cities : innovative transitions toward just and self-sustaining communities / Sheila R. Foster and Christian Iaione.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2022] | Series: Urban and industrial environments | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021062248 (print) | LCCN 2021062249 (ebook) | ISBN 9780262539982 (paperback) | ISBN 9780262361910 (epub) | ISBN 9780262369930 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: City planning. | Civic improvement. | Commons. | Municipal government. | Infrastructure (Economics) | Public-private sector cooperation.

Classification: LCC HT166 .F675 2022 (print) | LCC HT166 (ebook) | DDC 307.1/216—dc23/eng/20220519

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021062248>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021062249>