



City of  
Amsterdam

# Interreg ABCitiEs Action plan

Municipality of  
Amsterdam

July 2020



**ABCitiEs**  
Interreg Europe



European Union  
European Regional  
Development Fund





**'You create a safe and liveable neighborhood together.'**

From left to right: Anneke Holberda (resident), Jan Disseldorp (chairman BID), Rita Heilbron (police officer), Jessica Termaat (area agent, City of Amsterdam).



July 2020

# Letter of support

Amsterdam is an attractive city, known for being a gateway to Europe and an international business centre for over four hundred years. Moreover, Amsterdam keeps the status of an attractive destination for international talent who come to study, conduct research or start businesses.

In addition, Amsterdam has been actively promoting collaboration in all its forms. There is a high number of Business Improvement Districts in the city. These districts ensure a high degree of organization and collaboration among entrepreneurs and are essential partners of the municipality.

Last March, years of stable economic growth came to an abrupt end as a result of the necessary measures against COVID-19. These measures have hit residents of the city and local entrepreneurs hard. Our partners within the ABCitiEs project are facing this same challenge: getting entrepreneurs back to work without negative consequences for public health.

More than ever, we need creative solutions and initiatives from our entrepreneurs and business communities. I am convinced that our cooperation within the ABCitiEs project will contribute to this goal.

**Victor Everhardt , Alderman for Economic Affairs**



European Union  
European Regional  
Development Fund



# Contents

<b>Letter of support</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Contents</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part I – General information</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 Introduction	6
<b>Part II – Policy context</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Amsterdam region: Kansen voor West II 2014-2020	7
2.2 City of Amsterdam - Amsterdam Entrepreneurial Program (AOP)	8
2.3 City of Amsterdam – Policy Letter Democratization	8
2.4 Policy instrument: Funding	8
2.4.1 Learning lessons from interregional meetings	9
2.4.2 Learning lessons from the ABCitiEs case studies	10
2.5 Policy instrument: Neighborhood rights - Right to Challenge	12
2.5.1 Learning lessons from interregional meetings	13
2.5.2 Learning lessons from the ABCitiEs case studies	13
<b>Part III - Actions</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 Action 1: Servicedesk	14
3.1.1 Action details	14
3.1.2 Players involved	15
3.1.3 Timeframe	15
3.1.4 Costs and funding sources	16
3.2 Action 2: Right to Challenge	16
3.2.1 Action details	16
3.2.2 Players involved	17
3.2.3 Timeframe	18
3.2.4 Costs and funding sources	18



# Part I – General information

**Project:** Area Based Collaborative Entrepreneurship in Cities (ABCitiEs)

**Partner organisation:** City of Amsterdam

**Department:** Economic Affairs

**Other departments involved:** the Market Bureau, Chief Technology Office (CTO), Subsidies Bureau

**Country:** Netherlands

**Nuts 1:** West Nederland

**Nuts 2:** Noord - Holland

**Nuts 3:** Amsterdam and surroundings

**Contact person:** Aggie Augenbroe, Hennie Loos

**Email:** a.augenbroe@amsterdam.nl, h.loos@amsterdam.nl

**Phone number:** +31(0)6 1354 1755, +31 (0)6 8363 5516

## 1.1 Introduction

This action plan is part of the Interreg project ABCitiEs. This project aims to raise awareness for the opportunities for Area Based Collective Enterprises (ABCE) and stimulate policy makers to adapt policies to support ABCE. ABCEs are defined as “geographically delimited, networked communities of entrepreneurs (and other stakeholders) that jointly enact their business environment to pursue economic goals as well as social and/or environmental goals.”

A consortium of five European regions, Manchester, Vilnius, Varaždin-Đakovac, Athens and Amsterdam, have spent the last two years analyzing policies and a number of ABCEs cases with regard to area-based collectives in their regions. Moreover, in each region a number of ABCEs have been studied in detail to identify their main opportunities and challenges. The research has been conducted by partners from universities, in close cooperation with municipalities and local stakeholders in the case studies.

Each region draws up a different action plan, unique to their regional context and needs and based on the research and exchange during the interregional meetings in the past two years. This action plan focuses on Amsterdam and has been prepared in collaboration with local stakeholders and managing authorities of the selected policy instruments and will be implemented over the next two years.



# Part II – Policy context

## The Action Plan aims to impact:

- Investment for Growth and Jobs programme
- European Territorial Cooperation programme
- Other regional development policy instrument

## Name of the policy instrument addressed:

- Kansen voor West II 2014-2020 (Operational Programme Western Netherlands)
- City of Amsterdam, Amsterdam Entrepreneurial Program (AOP)
- City of Amsterdam, Policy Letter Democratization / Neighborhood Rights

This chapter examines the policy instruments we want to improve with the action plan. It starts with the Operational Program of the Amsterdam region (Kansen voor West) followed by the policy program for entrepreneurs of Amsterdam (Amsterdam Entrepreneurial Program) and thirdly the Policy Letter Democratization. Then we will go deeper into two parts of the policy instruments that play an important role for the actions in this action plan: Funding and Right to Challenge. We indicate which lessons we have learned from ABiEs for policy making and adjusting current policy.

## 2.1 Amsterdam region: Kansen voor West II 2014-2020

The Operational Program (OP) of the Dutch ERDF fund applicable to the Amsterdam region is called 'Kansen voor West II 2014-2020' (EFRO, 2015). It has been drawn up under the responsibility of the boards of the four provinces in West Netherlands (the P4) and the four major cities (the G-4). In total there are eight partners responsible for the OP. In preparation of the program, various consultation rounds were held in 2012 and 2013 with stakeholders, experts and potential

partners. The European Commission approved the program on 16 December 2014.

Kansen voor West II deals with the challenge of giving the regional economy of the Randstad an extra boost together with social, economic and public partners. Because despite all efforts, the Randstad is still lagging behind other metropolitan European regions. Because considerably less ERDF money is available for the Netherlands compared to the first program period, it is necessary to focus even more sharply. The main goal of *Kansen voor West II* is to monetise (valorize) available knowledge and focus on: 1) innovation in SMEs, 2) low-carbon economy, and 3) sustainable urban development.

Opportunities for ABCE initiatives are particularly found in the priority 'sustainable urban development'. In the four major cities, there are districts where bottlenecks such as high (youth) unemployment, mismatch on the urban labor market, poor housing market and substandard business location factors stand in the way of sustainable and balanced urban development. These bottlenecks demand a focused, integrated approach in which people, organizations and funds join forces. Within the priority of sustainable urban development, *Kansen voor West II* seeks to tie in with existing initiatives and focuses on:

- Employment: a reduction of the mismatch on the labor market;
- Business Climate: an increase of the number of high-quality and accessible work/ business locations;
- Business Climate: the establishment of an urban local development strategy.

In Amsterdam, there are currently three ABCE related projects funded by *Kansen voor West II*, within the priority of Sustainable Urban Development, subtheme

'Business Climate', namely Noorderpark Ondernemt, HealthTech Park (Amsterdam Health and Technology Institute in the Amstel 3 area) and Groeiplaatsen (see also <https://heesterveldbusinesshub.nl/>). The main goal of the 'Business climate' subtheme is to improve the urban business climate by supplying high-quality work and business locations to create (high skilled) employment in neighbourhoods with lower socio-economic status. The focus is primarily on investment in business locations and also on enabling entrepreneurial activity of local residents in deprived urban areas. Stimulating ABCE for firms with high economic potential is regarded as a specific incentive, to be addressed on a local level by the Amsterdam Entrepreneurial Program (AOP) (see below). Originally, our goal was to use the action plan to impact *Kansen voor West II*. Because the term of *Kansen voor West II* expires in 2020, we are now focusing on local policy.

## 2.2 City of Amsterdam - Amsterdam Entrepreneurial Program (AOP)

In 2018 in Amsterdam a new municipal council has been selected, and a new College of Mayor and Alderpersons was formed which is a coalition between green leftist party, social-liberal party (D66) and the labour party. The municipal policy was formulated in the coalition agreement "A new spring, a new sound" (Municipality of Amsterdam, May 2018) which focusses on: the Just City, the United City, the Democratic City and the Sustainable City. In the coalition agreement the municipal administration has formulated the ambition to strengthen the neighbourhood economy, in particular by means of the *Amsterdam Entrepreneurial Program* (AOP).

The AOP 'Neighbourhood Economy' is the successor to the AOP 'Space for Entrepreneurs!', which was in force from 2015-2018. The new AOP bundles the use of various municipal organizational components that contribute to the business climate. The rationale is that a strong neighbourhood economy contributes to the quality of life, safety, identity and social cohesion in the neighbourhood and creates local employment. The AOP program bundles efforts of various municipal organizational units contributing to the business climate in Amsterdam's neighbourhoods. The AOP policy document describes the current policy and includes

various policy instruments, i.e. the Agenda Markets and several subsidies.

## 2.3 City of Amsterdam – Policy Letter Democratization

In the coalition agreement "A new spring, a new sound" (Municipality of Amsterdam, May 2018) the municipal administration gives democratization a prominent place. The municipal administration wants to increase the participation of residents and entrepreneurs and improve the relationship between citizens, entrepreneurs and government. The Policy Letter Democratization (2019) describes the principles and action lines. The City of Amsterdam wants to renew and strengthen the democratic structures in the city and also wants to experiment, create new practices and learn, including by making mistakes. To collect and gain experiences and work with organizations, citizens and entrepreneurs in the city to deepen the understanding of democratization and what ownership really means. The municipality wants to investigate the obstacles the city faces in national and European legislation and try to organize lobbying and political cooperation. The Policy Letter Democratization describes various policy instruments, i.e. designing an urban participation framework, neighborhood budgets and neighborhood rights.

Two policy instruments that are important for the actions of this action plan are discussed below.

## 2.4 Policy instrument: Funding

Funding is one of the policy themes of the AOP program. The aim is to positively contribute to the policy instrument funding of the AOP and to find out at which stages ABCitiEs could further improve the policy instrument.

Amsterdam historically has various subsidies for entrepreneurship to stimulate area-oriented arrangements. Some of these subsidies are present in almost all districts, but there are also grants that focus on certain districts, with a specific goal. An overview of the most current subsidy schemes for entrepreneurs can be found on <https://www.amsterdam.nl/subsidies/subsidies-onderwerp/subsidies-ondernemen/>.



Subsidies vary from funding for retailers' associations to carry out promotional activities, subsidies for setting up a Business Improvement District (BID) to subsidies to help individual entrepreneurs refurbish their shop windows.

In 2017, the Municipality of Amsterdam started a number of subsidy schemes for collectives. Based on the experiences in 2017, (undesirable) differences per area were noted in the interpretation and implementation of the regulations. For this reason, the Municipality of Amsterdam initiated in 2018 an investigation to evaluate the functioning of the schemes and what improvements could be made. For the municipality, the starting point is an urban approach that does justice to the situation in the area and ensures equal access for entrepreneurs' collectives to the subsidy schemes.

In addition to a number of substantive tightening of the schemes, some structural and process-related points for improvement emerged from the study. The schemes have too little flexibility and too much fragmentation. Collectives develop proposals for an integrated approach but the municipality has no policy and no practical working method for this. This mainly concerns applications for support that touches multiple policy fields. Another result was that civil servants play an important role to inform collectives about the available subsidy schemes and what they can be used for. The civil servant is an important pivot in the contact between collectives and the municipality. In some areas the commitment of civil servants is insufficient. It was indicated that it is important for the Municipality of Amsterdam to investigate how this role is properly implemented in all areas and can contribute to better cooperation between collectives and the municipality. It seemed that in most municipal plans of areas in which one or more collectives are active, no mention is made on the goals or activities of the collective nor of the contribution that the collective has made to the area plan.

#### **2.4.1 Learning lessons from interregional meetings**

An important outcome from the interregional meetings is that funding is important for the formalization of collectives. During the meeting in Athens, the

characteristics of a successful collaboration were central. Here, it was concluded that both informal and formal collaboration are important. Informal tends to change at some point into formal, but this can also change again over time. It depends on the situation and the phase the collective is in. Money is an important trigger for the further formalization of collectives. Formal collaboration generally involves less risk. However, it is easier to build trust when a collective is informal. Also, informal is associated more with creativity, initiative takers and volunteers, while formal is more generally linked to control, commitment and focus. Informality is considered necessary to make a collective sustainable. Formalization provides structure to a collective.

In Athens, we concluded that funding is important for the formalization of collectives, and partnerships with municipalities are important for shared ambitions like safety, social cohesion and livability, etc. Unfortunately, in all regions access to funding appears to be a problem. In Amsterdam and Manchester, funding is available, but difficult to access either because it is fragmented or not well sign posted which makes it difficult for collectives (time and effort) to apply for it. Manchester City Council, therefore, has provided limited funds to assist in bidding for grants. Vilnius and Varaždin – Đakovec mainly use European funding for such initiatives, which also require much time and effort to apply for and monitor. In Athens, the liquidity problem is so large, that they do not even have funding to apply for funding. Thus, action is needed to improve access to funding in the different regions.

In Varaždin, the case Reguliersdwarsstreet was presented. This collective (and BID) indicated that subsidies are now often used ad hoc for one-off initiatives. For BID's in Amsterdam there is a possibility to apply for a subsidy for countless cases from different domains. The BID has a plan, looks at which part of it can be subsidized, makes a request and then it sometimes takes weeks or months to get a response. It often remains uncertain up to the last minute. This makes it difficult to make a long-term financial planning. It also emerged that it is unclear to what extent the subsidies actually contribute to

the economic development of the areas which is an important aim of the schemes. In Varaždin also the case of Withington, Manchester, was presented. In Withington it also has been indicated that efforts must be made on strategic ambitions. The key to the further revitalisation of Withington will be the nurturing and development of this existing network, to develop local capacity further, and to enable invested local stakeholders to begin to tackle more strategic goals and ambitions. Could a more strategic approach and further professionalization of an entrepreneurial collective be encouraged with funding? How can funding be used to achieve common goals and ambitions?

#### **2.4.2 Learning lessons from the ABCitiEs case studies**

ABCitiEs provided an opportunity to analyse a number of cases to find out what they need to improve their collaboration or impact through the support by governmental organisations. It emerged that funding is an important theme for collectives of entrepreneurs.

*Geef om de Jan Eef (I care about the Jan Eef)*

This case study gives an impression of a group of residents initiating collective regeneration of a shopping street and analyses the proceedings in terms of collaborative governance for the urban commons. The municipality was an important financial partner of the initiative and created a sound basis for attracting complementary budgets. Many of the activities were also made possible by the municipality through granting permission even though, and especially in cases where, the correct procedures were not followed (mostly because these don't allow short-term planning). Learning lessons from this case in terms of funding:

##### **a. Joint process and rhythm**

The necessity to develop joint processes and rhythm between initiative and municipality. As an example, when an initiative becomes dependent on subsidies, it does not only bring along insecurity in terms of sustainability, it also loses part of its capacity to plan according to its own rhythm and thus the needs and desires of its audience. Moreover, funding through subsidies does not seem

to acknowledge the inherent joint ambitions of the initiative and the municipality, nor the recognition of the interdependency in realizing these ambitions. The logic of subsidies creates a dichotomy between societal initiatives and governmental organisations and their respective fields of work and responsibilities. It separates them in distinct worlds and devaluates their relations to be just instrumental, while they are intrinsically connected and mutually profit from a joint approach.

##### **b. Co-creating**

Co-creating relations, processes and protocols, for example for agenda setting or a financial structure, is the backbone of an effective and sustainable form of collaborative governance. Within the context of the Amsterdam and Dutch quest for more space for the participative democracy it is essential to explore and develop new structures and ways of working on a systemic level.

#### **Noorderpark Onderneemt (Noorderpark undertakes)**

Amsterdam's local government organized a competition to redesign two separate green spaces into a lively city park, the Noorderpark. Funds for the renovation would be provided by the national government as part of a social policy agenda that focused on disadvantaged neighborhoods. The focus on a single pavilion and a cultural program meant that a lot of these initiatives could not be facilitated. This led to the formation of a complementary organization with wider social objectives, i.e. sports, wellbeing and greening. Inspired by community trusts in the UK, the organization was named 'Noorderpark Trust'.

The organization is completely funded by subsidies. Gaining and keeping access to funding has been a continuous struggle for the Noorderpark trust, but a struggle it has successfully overcome on different occasions. Eventually, the trust managed to receive structural funding from a tailor-made policy experiment. In 2017, Noorderpark Trust was awarded a triennial umbrella subsidy of € 135,000 a year for the costs for the services and activities in the Noorderpark by the municipality of Amsterdam. To make it easier and





**'If you are organized, you can participate.'**

From left to right: Maarten van Riel (secretary BIZ Beukenplein), Dafne van den Boom (BIZ Beukenplein), Erik Heinen (owner Erik's Deli), Jochem Douwes (treasurer BIZ Beukenplein)



cheaper for residents and organizations to develop small-scale events in the Noorderpark: the umbrella permit, also known as the trust permit, was granted for 3 years in close coordination with the Permits, Supervision and Enforcement Department (Afdeling Vergunningen, Toezicht en Handhaving) of the municipality of Amsterdam, as a result of which the trust did not have to apply for subsidies through various separate subsidy schemes and associated procedures. Unfortunately, the experiment did not get a regular follow-up. Providing money and mandate for a longer period of time proved to be a bridge too far for the different municipal departments involved.

When the experiment ended, new structural funds were found from a European EFRO subsidy. The subsidy was awarded within the Business Climate pillar of the Dutch EFRO program. This resulted in a stronger focus on real estate development and on entrepreneurship development. This assignment formed the inspiration to start a collective of local (prospective) entrepreneurs. The strength of the organization seems to lie in its strong, professional leadership and close ties to the local government. They have specialized in gaining access to funds and mediating between local residents and policymakers. This has opened up a lot of opportunities to organize local activities. For the entrepreneurs, however, it has not managed to create a sense of ownership or commitment to the park in itself. The entrepreneur collective has definitely been a very positive network that assisted local entrepreneurs, but it seems a collective in name rather than in practice.

## 2.5 Policy instrument: Neighborhood rights - Right to Challenge

New tools are needed for Amsterdam and our partner regions to strengthen the position of entrepreneurial collectives. An important instrument that can help is the introduction of neighborhood rights. Neighborhood rights is one of the policy themes of the Policy Letter Democratization. The City of Amsterdam wants to establish and experiment on neighborhood rights. It is a powerful tool for the municipality to facilitate residents and entrepreneurs who come up with solutions for problems in the city. The preconditions to take initiative are laid down in neighborhood rights.

A common form of neighborhood rights is Right to Challenge: At the Right to Challenge, initiators make an offer to the municipality to organize a public task in a different way. As it were, they take over (part of) this task from the municipality in a neighborhood and thereby request cooperation and expertise from the municipality. This involves tailor-made solutions in a specific area and often focuses on specific target groups. It is a democratic instrument that provides a handle for cooperation between initiatives and the municipality. They develop innovative, appropriate solutions for different kind of issues and deliver impact and value to the city.

The municipality wants to use Right to Challenge to work better with local initiatives and to make more use of local knowledge and capacities. Increasing ownership in the neighborhoods creates greater involvement and residents and entrepreneurs become more active. Entrepreneurs and residents want to be more involved in the challenges in their environment and want to take initiative. They have knowledge of the challenges in their neighborhood or city and are part of it. They know the local networks and can reach people who are difficult to reach for the municipality. But as a municipality how do you let go of control, transferring responsibility and give entrepreneurs the right to take over tasks from the municipality? By means of a practical instrument, it is not only to create space in existing policy and regulations, but also gradually to realize a culture change and movement in the municipal organization. This requires time and patience and the will to learn continuously.

In practice we see that area based collaborative enterprises (ABCE) often feel frustrated with local government and existing rules and regulations which are not designed to facilitate their activities. On the other hand, municipalities aiming to stimulate collaborative initiatives, are in search of effective policies to support ABCE with the legal, financial, political and technical challenges they face. Collaborative initiatives and authorities are both looking for new knowledge and methods to empower the initiatives. Right to Challenge is an instrument that suits this well.



### 2.5.1 Learning lessons from interregional meetings

The case Withington, Manchester, gave us inspiration. The threatened closure of the local swimming baths revealed a high level of community action. This provoked local residents to form a community enterprise, and they took over the management of the baths. This group is restoring the historic building, adding co-working space, and developing plans to transform the site into a community hub. This success prompted the formation of the Withington Regeneration Partnership, which brought together stakeholders from the public, private and community sectors, to focus on resolving problems in the Village Centre. The partnership initiated small-scale interventions to improve the appearance, including a pocket park and shutter-art scheme to improve storefronts. An example of how ownership in the neighborhoods creates greater involvement and stakeholders become more active.

Athens also involves joint effort. Field-work during the ABCitiEs survey found very strong relations of trust and collaboration among business owners albeit at limited geographical scales. In both case study areas, they have allocated numerous instances of collaboration among two or three neighbouring business owners. Although on a small scale, it may be very promising. Incidents of embryonic collaborations that showed strong bonding capital among business owners with similar socio-cultural characteristics, business plans and values. Several businesses are committed in their area. They show a care and responsibility in the maintenance and upgrading of their immediate public space (keeping clean and tidy pavements, maintaining flower pots with plants, maintaining the outdated sewing system, offering information to consumers on the supplementary products they can find in neighbouring SMEs, etc.) They could blossom to more permanent and stable relations of co-operations if they grow in a supportive environment. Increasing ownership in the neighborhood makes aware of the possibilities to improve the environment. Collective responsibility is also important for the sustainability of the collective.

### 2.5.2 Learning lessons from the ABCitiEs case studies

ABCitiEs provided the opportunity to analyse the case Plein '40-'45, a square in the borough New West in the city of Amsterdam. New West is a borough composed of multiple city expansion projects, with a total of roughly 150.000 residents. The square itself is used five days a week for a street market. This is one of the busiest markets in Amsterdam and it draws its public not only from the directly surrounding neighbourhoods, but also from the rest of the city and other cities and villages around Amsterdam and even further away. The market vendors of Plein '40-'45 want to play an active role in determining and creating the future of their market. The market has challenges and problems that need to be solved and, moreover, changes are imminent in the coming years. The entrepreneurs want to tackle these issues collectively, in collaboration with the municipality and other stakeholders. However, the current state of affairs is often that making plans and implementing changes is done top-down by the municipality. Market entrepreneurs therefore challenge the municipality under the Right to Challenge to give more room to self-organization and, above all, to tackle problems and challenges in cooperation. Working on this specific case we have encountered two important lessons, which we think are more generally applicable for other ABCEs as well and offer a rich starting point for the development of supportive policies. We have seen that:

1. ABCEs like the market vendors of Plein '40-'45 need support to actually become and/or act as a collective;
2. (Collaborating with) ABCEs confront a municipality with (a) the contradiction between self-organisation, i.e. working towards contextualized solutions and renouncing authority, and the centralising systems logic of a bureaucratic organisation and (b) the internal struggle that arises in this discrepancy.

Also from the case 'Care about the Jan Eef' we learned that co-creating relations, processes and protocols, for example for agenda setting or a financial structure, are the backbone of an effective and sustainable form of collaborative governance.

# Part III - Actions

## 3.1 Action 1: Servicedesk

### Action 1

**Setting up a Servicedesk for entrepreneurial collectives to make funding more accessible, less fragmented and more strategic.**

#### 3.1.1 Action details

As we saw in chapter two, funding differs per region. In some regions, funding mechanisms are almost entirely lacking. In other regions, the funding landscape is very fragmented, which makes it difficult to apply. Amsterdam is one of the cities where fragmentation is a bottleneck. The situation and experiences in the different regions inspired us to develop this action for improving funding for collectives.

In the pilot in Amsterdam we set up a Servicedesk for collectives to simplify access to funding. We use a different working method in which collectives and the municipality cooperate more closely and strategically and invest together in an area to achieve shared goals. The municipality or district has now a wait-and-see attitude (on applications for subsidy) instead of proactively acting towards collectives. We want to apply the lessons from the Noorderpark, I care about the Jan Eef and Reguliersdwarstreet. Temporary solutions are occasionally devised but this is not a structural solution to the underlying problem, namely funding for initiatives that affect many policy areas and municipal areas. The Servicedesk answers questions that collectives run into such as: Can agreements be made for subsidies or budgets for longer periods? Can the municipality clarify the available resources at an early stage? Can a method be developed in which a collective and the municipality invest together and

make financial resources available? What types of funding are available for collectives within the different departments of the municipality? How can we bundle different types of funding, and thus make them easier accessible? Could a more strategic way of working and further professionalization of collectives be encouraged with funding?

The new Servicedesk makes it possible to experiment with special budgets for collectives and subsidy schemes to adjust the municipal subsidy policy. In addition civil servants who are experienced in the field of subsidies will be connected to the Servicedesk. These civil servants will act as linking pin. Subsidies become more accessible and usable and thus it strengthens the competitiveness and competences of collectives.

The new Servicedesk:

- provides more clarity at an early stage so that collectives can make a financial planning in the long run
- diminishes the administrative burden for applicants
- makes the process more flexible, less fragmented and easier to apply for
- works in both directions: helps to achieve the objectives of both the collective and the area/municipality
- creates more synergy and stimulates a joined ambition between collective and municipality
- stimulates a co-creation relationship.

We carry out the pilot in three areas:

- BID Reguliersdwarstraat
- BID Utrechtsestraat
- BID Oud West



### 3.1.2 Players involved

- BID/ SME collectives
- City of Amsterdam: Economic Affairs (project leadership), program team Democratization, Municipal Districts, Subsidy Office
- Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences

### 3.1.3 Timeframe

#### *Preparation (March – June 2020)*

- Gain support from management within the municipality for pilot implementation (achieved)
- Selection of cases/areas (achieved)
- Set up a project team and a steering committee with representatives from the various departments of the municipality, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and collectives (achieved).
- Meetings with the project team and stakeholders to develop, reflect and adapt the action (achieved).

#### *Implementation in pilot areas (July 2020 – January 2022)*

##### **Step 1**

Make an inventory of all municipal subsidies available for collectives. Develop and design a new funding process for the Servicedesk together with collectives, civil servants and project team ABCitiEs. Select specially designated civil servants who will support the applicants.

##### **Step 2**

Testing the new process in the three pilot areas. Discuss lessons learned with collectives, civil servants and project team ABCitiEs. Translate findings in refinement and improvement of the functioning of the Servicedesk also for wider usages.

##### **Step 3**

Present and promote the Servicedesk both at city- and city district level.

##### **Step 4**

Monitor usage of the Servicedesk by collectives to improve the working method.



### 3.1.4 Costs and funding sources

The action Servicedesk focuses on the policy instrument funding. The policy instrument is part of the Amsterdam Entrepreneurial Program (AOP) 'Neighbourhood Economy'. The AOP bundles the use of various municipal organizational components to strengthen the business climate in Amsterdam. Staff costs for the implementation of the action are covered from the budget of the AOP.

The project team consists of eight people and meets once every six weeks. It is estimated that the project members spend approximately 4 to 6 hours per month on the project. The project is managed by two members of the project team. These two team members each spend approximately 8 hours per week on the project. The steering committee is for overall direction and decision making and meets once every four months.

Staff costs for the monitoring and evaluation are calculated within ABCitiEs in semester 6, 7 and 8

(conducted by the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences).

## 3.2 Action 2: Right to Challenge

### Action 2

**Develop a toolkit to help and inspire entrepreneurial collectives and civil servants using the Right to Challenge in a practical and accessible way.**

#### 3.2.1 Action details

In this pilot we are going to test the instrument Right to Challenge. What is needed to facilitate collectives to collaborate with the municipality on addressing neighborhood challenges as partners rather than in a more top-down manner. At present, no pilots Right to Challenge are being conducted in Amsterdam with entrepreneurial collectives. The current pilots are mainly with residents. In this pilot we apply the instrument for entrepreneurial collectives.

At Plein 40 -'45 there are entrepreneurs who want to





take an active role and want to use the instrument Right to Challenge. On the square and in a wide area around it, you find large amounts of plastic bags and other garbage knock about and littering public space. The market vendors on Plein '40-'45 want to take responsibility for the waste problem on the market. They want to tackle this in a circular and sustainable manner and increase awareness of market sustainability among market vendors and visitors. The entrepreneurs want to take the initiative to self-organise a waste processing system that is fit to the local context and aim at minimising dissipation and maximising recycling and re-use. Their ambition is to achieve this goal in collaboration with the municipality and other organisations. The municipality is open to a different way of working and collaboration. The City of Amsterdam will therefore work on an experimental and learning environment to investigate what it means to respond to this challenge by doing it in practice. The challenge requires change and renewal. Persons and departments within the municipality that are

already involved will partly have to fulfil their duties and responsibilities in a different way. To achieve that, new roles and processes may also have to be developed. The challenge also requires knowledge and expertise on the part of the entrepreneurs who cannot necessarily be regarded as given. The entrepreneurs of Plein '40-'45 have summarized their ideas in a concrete plan: the Zero Waste Lab. The project Zero Waste Lab is briefly described in the box below.

This action has the objective to make it easier for collectives to propose ideas for improving their neighborhood to the municipality. By launching this toolkit, the municipality hopes that more collectives will come up with solutions for problems in their neighborhood.

### 3.2.2 Players involved

- Entrepreneurial Collective Plein '40-'45
- City of Amsterdam: Program Team Democratization (project leadership), Economic Affairs, Market Bureau,



Municipal District New West

- Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences

### 3.2.3 Timeframe

*Preparation (March – June 2020)*

- Gain support from management within the municipality for pilot implementation (achieved).
- Set up a project taking into account goals, capacity and possibilities of each party (achieved).
- Set up a project team with representatives from the various departments of the municipality, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and collectives (achieved).
- Market entrepreneurs make a concrete plan with their ambitions and ideas (achieved).
- Meetings with the project team and stakeholders to develop, reflect and adapt the action (achieved).

*Implementation (July 2020 – January 2022)*

#### Step 1

Develop and test the Right to Challenge on Plein '40- '45 (working title: Zero Waste Lab) to facilitate participation processes and empower collaborative entrepreneurship in a neighbourhood. Involve local communities and professionals working together to further develop and design the instrument Right to Challenge for collaborative entrepreneurship. We make an approach for solving recurring issues and bottlenecks and we organize exchange with other initiatives in Amsterdam and other cities.

#### Step 2

Develop a toolkit for collectives so that they know how to use the instrument Right to Challenge. The toolkit contains a practical method especially for collectives. Collectives feel invited to take over tasks and they know what is being asked of them. We make the toolkit web based to prepare wider usages by local collectives and area based local professionals.

#### Step 3

Promote and present the toolkit both at city- and city district level to the target group. Share the toolkit with other stakeholders working on democratization and collaborative entrepreneurship.

#### Step 4

Monitor usage of the toolkit Right to Challenge by collectives to improve the working method.

### 3.2.4 Costs and funding sources

The action Right to Challenge focuses on the policy instrument Right to Challenge. This policy instrument is part of the Policy Letter Democratization. Zero Waste Lab received € 90.000 from the neighborhood budgets of the city district New West to start their plan. Staff costs for preparation and implementation are covered from the budget of the City of Amsterdam.

The project team consists of nine people and meets once every six weeks. It is estimated that the project members spend approximately 4 to 6 hours per month on the project. The project is managed by two members of the project team. These two team members each spend approximately 8 hours per week on the project.

Staff costs for the monitoring and evaluation are calculated within ABCitiEs in semester 6, 7 and 8 (conducted by the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences).

## Zero Waste Lab

A number of market traders on Plein 40-45 have joined forces. They believe that they themselves should take more responsibility for the waste problem on the market. They have developed a number of ideas and worked them out together with different stakeholders as New Metropolis, the public library, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, the Mundus college and the municipality of Amsterdam (New West district).

They want to reduce 65% of the waste by:

- Transforming the Waste Island on the market into a Resource Hub. A place where the market waste is brought separately or where the market waste is separated on the spot.
- Conduct research into the possibilities of giving the raw materials a new destination, preferably locally (circular solution).
- In addition to the Resource Hub, to set up a physical stall on the market as a recycle and information point for market visitors, local residents and market traders. Here it is made visible what happens to the waste (raw material), how much is separated (monitoring) and with which entrepreneurs are cooperated who reuse waste.
- Collaboration with local artisans who can use pure raw materials (plastic, cardboard).

With this, they challenge the municipality to take over waste processing on the market.







**ABCitiEs**  
Interreg Europe



European Union  
European Regional  
Development Fund