



Governing Urban Diversity:

Creating Social Cohesion, Social Mobility and Economic Performance in Today's Hyper-diversified Cities

Governance arrangements and initiatives in Leipzig, Germany

Work package 5:	Governance arrangements and initiatives
Deliverable nr.:	D 5.1
Lead partner:	Partner 7 (synergo)
Authors:	Katrin Grossmann, Annegret Haase, Katharina Kullmann, Christoph Hedtke, Maximilian Einert
Nature:	Report
Dissemination level:	PP
Status:	Final report
Date:	25 August 2014

This project is funded by the European Union under the 7th Framework Programme; Theme: SSH.2012.2.2.2-1; Governance of cohesion and diversity in urban contexts



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no. 319970.

To be cited as: Grossmann, K., A. Haase, K. Kullmann, C. Hedtke and M. Einert (2014). Governance arrangements and initiatives in Leipzig, Germany: UFZ-Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research.

This report has been put together by the authors, and revised on the basis of the valuable comments, suggestions, and contributions of all DIVERCITIES partners.

The views expressed in this report are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of European Commission.

Contents

1 Introduction.....4

2 Governance arrangements.....5

 2.1 *Arrangements targeting social cohesion..... 5*

 2.2 *Arrangements targeting social mobility..... 19*

 2.3 *Arrangements targeting economic performance 24*

3 Synthesis and analysis of the results29

4 Conclusions32

5 References.....35

Legal documents and policy programmes 35

Reviewed documents and sources of the selected governance arrangements 35

Bibliography..... 35

6 Appendix.....36

List of the interviewed persons 36

List of the participants of the round-table talk 36

1 Introduction

This report presents the findings of the analyses of local governance arrangements dealing with the support of social cohesion, social mobility and improving the economic performance of underprivileged social groups in the city of Leipzig. It is part of the EU-funded research project DIVERCITIES under the framework FP7. The report analyses a set of governance arrangements in order to answer the following questions:

- How is diversity conceptualised within the governance arrangements?
- Which are the main factors influencing success or failure of the governance arrangements?
- Can we identify new ideas for innovative policies and governance concepts?

A governance arrangement we define – based on Swyngedouw (2005; 1994) – as horizontal arrangement among presumptive equal participants without distinction between their public or private status. These participants cooperate through regular, iterative exchanges among a fixed set of independent but interdependent actors representing actors but not individuals.

Leipzig experienced a diversification of its urban society in the aftermath of the peaceful revolution in 1989. Immigration led to a growing ethnic mix, even though numbers of immigrants are still relatively low compared to western German cities with a longer history of foreign immigration. In demographic terms, the city underwent a wave of outmigration in the 1990s leading to accelerated ageing. In the 2000s, this was followed by a wave of in-migration bringing new young cohorts to the city. Household-types diversified, increasing the numbers of non-traditional households like patch-work arrangements, one-person-households or flat-sharers. Also, lifestyles diversified as is the case in the entire post-socialist realm. Socio-economic change brought a previously unknown scope of social inequalities to the urban society; poverty is a serious concern – at least compared to other German cities.

The previous report (Grossmann et al., 2014) analysed how this diversification is taken up in city-wide policies. It has shown that there is no single diversity policy in Leipzig and that many policies dealing with increasing diversity in the city have emerged only within the last years or are currently developing. Furthermore we showed, that an increasing recognition of multiplicity (as a fact) but not a specific policy of recognition of multiple voices of various population groups (as a consequence thereof) can be observed. Maintaining the demographic balance (between different age groups) and the stabilisation of the economic and labour market sectors are overarching goals of policies; all other issues, among them dealing with ethnic, cultural or social diversity, are subsumed to these goals. A discrepancy can be observed between branding Leipzig as a cosmopolitan and tolerant city, the official policy and city marketing, and real world life that is characterised by conflicts e.g. about a new mosque or accommodation for asylum seekers.

In this report, we examine twelve local governance arrangements that address different aspects of the described diversification and that seek to increase social cohesion, social mobility, and/or economic performance of residents. We focus on initiatives in two districts: Leipzig's inner east was built as a working class neighbourhood around the turn of the 20th century and today continues to show the highest rates of residents with a migration background. Leipzig Grünau, a large housing estate from the 1970s and 1980s, has been a hotspot of ageing and population loss and hosts contrasts in demographic and socio-economic groups. The choice of initiatives was guided by the following criteria: we chose initiatives which are relevant in terms of the research questions either at the general city or neighbourhood level. We chose initiatives of different origin, size and mode of work to see the importance of these factors for success and failure. We also chose those initiatives that show innovation potential and are typical for how in Leipzig challeng-

es of social cohesion, mobility and economic performance have been addressed within last years. From April 8, 2014, we have conducted qualitative interviews with 21 leaders, executives and members of local initiatives, participant observations, and a workshop with representatives of governance arrangements in the two districts. In addition, we have examined written and electronic documents on the aforementioned initiatives when available. The report is structured as follows. First, we will provide an analysis of the local initiatives. The section is structured according to the main objective of the initiatives: social cohesion, social mobility or economic performance. Second, we synthesise the main findings to identify ideas for innovative policies and governance concepts. In conclusion, we will identify issues for general reflection.

2 Governance arrangements

2.1 Arrangements targeting social cohesion

Initiative for Human Dignity [Initiativkreis Menschenwürdig]

Strategy, focus and organisation

The primary goal of the Initiative for Human Dignity (IKMW) is to support asylum seekers in Leipzig by lobbying for small scale, decentralised accommodation in the city. The main claim of the initiative is that procedures and accommodation options for refugees, as they were provided in the last years, lack a certain degree of human dignity. This primary goal is accompanied by other goals, e.g. to foster an open and tolerant climate in the city towards refugees and support better relations between asylum seekers and the resident population (in terms of social cohesion). The IKMW, a network of private persons and civic actors, is working pro- and reactive on democratic deliberation and social cohesion and has been honoured with the Saxon Democracy Award in November 2012.

The initiative has existed since 2012 and thus is a rather new governance arrangement. It is not institutionalised; forming an association would be an option, but is not envisioned. It was founded in reaction to the city-wide debate on decentralised accommodation concepts for asylum-seekers in Leipzig when a number of protests and racist arguments emerged in public and neighbourhood-wide debates, especially declining accommodation for refugees in one's backyard. One of our interviewees stated that *"it was the first time racism became loud out of the middle of society with a concrete addressee"* (L6). The target audience is threefold: a direct target group is asylum seekers, a secondary target group is Leipzig's urban society, and a third group is established institutions. The first action undertaken was working out a petition and collecting signatures to support the concept of decentralised accommodation in order to avoid further large-scale accommodation. The second action was the edition of a flyer with information about the accommodation of asylum seekers in Leipzig and a collection of arguments against right-wing positions. Additionally, a series of events titled For a Good Neighbourhood (Auf gute Nachbarschaft) was organised in areas of Leipzig where asylum seekers were to be accommodated. This diversity of activities is seen by the interviewees as one of the advantages of the arrangement, especially with respect to the effect on the district population.

Today, around 30 volunteers are active in specialised working groups, e.g. on debate and communication, the concept of decentralised accommodation itself and public relations support. The resources of the IKMW are the social and cultural capital of engaged participants, a permanent budget or funding does not exist. The event series mentioned above was financed by the city of Leipzig (within the framework of federally financed Local Action Plans, a budgeting scheme for small projects). The Saxon Democracy Award was endowed with the sum of € 7,000 which was spent on mobile counselling and advice for asylum seekers.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

The core values which frame the IKMW's work are humanity, dignity and tolerance. They focus on a specific group, asylum seekers, who are seen as deprived of these values. In focusing on this group, their work aims to impact the management or experience of diversity of the city's municipality and residents. The understanding of diversity by the interviewees we talked to can perhaps be illustrated by their statement that Leipzig is seen as *"white, German, heteronormative and provincial"* (L7). The initiative is also critical to using diversity categories because they implicitly describe people as differing from something, a norm, or the majority society. So, hyper-diversity including ethnic and gender diversity, seems a normative of the initiative, but judging Leipzig's reality, the interviewee concludes:

"To be honest, I don't see much diversity in Leipzig. ... It is a myth of Leipzig's identity to be the cosmopolitan, tolerant city of the peaceful revolution. Apart from being tolerant towards the artists' milieu and alternative lifestyles, not much diversity and tolerance exists" (L7).

The notion of diversity being a potential is criticised for being exploited for goals and values beyond tolerance and dignity. Especially the utilisation of diversity for economic goals is seen as problematic since it leads to a differentiation between wanted and unwanted diversity. The interviewee stated: *"Why do we need to count the value of diversity? I do not want to think like that. Human beings are to be respected in their rights"* (L7).

Main factors influencing success or failure

The IKMW has ambitious goals and the two interviewees were quite critical in their views of their own work and its impact. Thus, it does not come as a surprise that they talked more about problems and challenges than about success. From an external perspective, we would say that IKMW managed to impact the political and public debate on decentralised accommodation of refugees. The initiative was also successful in *"setting limits to what is say able"* (L7), i.e. expressions of open, clear racism that decreased within the last months. This was confirmed by a member of the municipal administration working with IKMW. Compared to the activities in 2012, today, IKMW is more sensitive on how to communicate with the district population. Furthermore, the cooperation with some departments in the administration improved and mutual respect and trust have developed. This guarantees that the city can call for immediate support when implementing the concept in other districts. In return, IKMW receives support, e.g. when applying for funding.

Many of the ideas for action experience obstacles, a lack of resources being one of them, e.g. appropriate space for an exhibition. Other obstacles are less tangible: the participation in a district festivity was declined by the organisers because political issues were not regarded appropriate. Support for IKMW, however, came from the mayor of Leipzig, who, for instance, invited them to the Round Table Asylum. The activities of the IKMW are depending on the support of one specific representative in the administration (working at the Centre for Democratic Education). Thus, the initiative is resource-wise dependent on this municipal department and other actors.

Integrating the target group, i.e. the asylum seekers, into the work of the initiative was described as a problem. On the one hand, they cooperated in manifestations, e.g. collection of signatures, or gave interviews to mass media. On the other hand, they rarely gave feedback to the work of the IKMW; also, the lack of appropriate space for meeting was hindering the work. The interviewees also reflected on the issue that for many asylum seekers in Leipzig, there are more urgent problems than the type and size of accommodation, even if many are not happy with the mass accommodations they live in. Other reasons of non-participation were seen in the fear of having

disadvantages for the own asylum procedure when one takes part in protests. The language barrier was identified as the most basic obstacle that caused a limited presence of asylum seekers when the initiative organised information events in the accommodations. The interviewees acknowledged that it takes much time and continuity to really get close to one another. It also often occurs that asylum seekers wanted something else than political work: *“Some of them just wanted to go to the disco and not discuss political issues”* (L7). The fact that there is poor or even no cooperation with other important actors of Leipzig’s migrant scene, such as the Commissioner for Migrants of the municipality, the Migrants’ Advisory Board or the Refugee Council, was also seen as a problem that hinders the initiative’s success.

The reasons for the previously mentioned problems are seen in a mismatch of interests of the initiative and the target group. This is especially true when looking at the interests of the initiative (political work, constructive criticism of municipal policies, knowledge-building, fight against racism) and the target group (security, recognition of asylum desire). With respect to the cooperation with the municipality, the initiative mentioned a lack of interest in their work by many representatives of the administration with a few exceptions. With respect to non-cooperation with other associations dealing with refugees’ issues, IKMW claimed e.g. another refugee association to act too paternalistic and to act more as a support organisation for the municipality than doing lobbying for the refugee or that there is a general lack of willingness to deal with critical issues.

Conclusion

The initiative is innovative in its distinct approach. IKMW has an open, not exploited idea of a tolerant and diverse society and therefore – instead of just providing assistance and counselling – it actively disputes with the standards of human dignity and the threats of racism. It explicitly addresses the contradictions between the city’s reality in dealing with asylum seekers and its self-promotion as a tolerant and cosmopolitan city (see Grossmann et al., 2014). With respect to the future, IKMW sees first and foremost a demand for exchange of opinions and opinion-building. They see a lack of exchange between the municipality and the urban society with respect to critical issues such as the accommodation of refugees. Nevertheless, IKMW is vulnerable due to a lack of resources and low level of institutionalisation; it is dependent on resources from other initiatives, associations, and institutions as well as on their cooperation. Due to this, the consolidation of the arrangement remains a challenge and it is not certain whether the work can continue. A conceptualised approach can only be followed if there is enough time and resources to set targets and identify appropriate strategies.

Intercultural Weeks [Interkulturelle Wochen]

Strategy, focus and organisation

The Intercultural Weeks (IW) represents a Germany-wide intercultural festival that was launched in the 1970s. In Leipzig, it was first organised in 1992 to celebrate cultural diversity in the city and to support cohesion and mutual tolerance and understanding between different groups of inhabitants through creating *“spaces to encounter”* (L1). The event is organised by the Department for Migration and Integration of the municipality together with the ecumenical churches of Leipzig. The municipal department was founded in 1991 as one of the first of this kind in all of Eastern Germany. The initial aim was to establish a *“platform for intercultural themes. It should be a counterpart (to xenophobia) showing that we are a cosmopolitan and intercultural city”* (L1). The Mayor agreed to take the patronage for the event and that happens not too frequently.

Target groups of the event are: a) those civic associations in Leipzig dealing with various aspects of cultural and religious diversity (offering events); and b) all residents of the city (as participants

in the events), especially children and families. The interviewee underlined that migrant associations are also actively recruited as participants in the event; the response is, however, mixed. There is a long-term cooperation with many associations, but each year, new participants appear and the department actively addresses new associations about whether they would be willing to participate with an event, presentation, cultural celebration or other things. Germany-wide, the event is organised once a year and lasts two weeks. It consists of a number of events, an intercultural festival as a full-day celebration of interculturality on one of Leipzig's central squares on the 3rd October (the day of German unity) as well as a large tent where associations and initiatives can present themselves to the public. The programme of the IW is widely distributed and announced to the public. The IW has come to play an integral part in Leipzig's calendar of festivities.

The event is organised by a person working in the administration who has a weekly budget of 16 hours for this purpose; the budget for organisational issues and presenters is limited and has not changed much since the beginning of the 1990s, it is around € 20,000. Single participants can apply for a grant of € 1,000-2,000. Additionally, there are some sponsors, but they only make small contributions. Some former sponsors such as a local bank do not support the event any longer. Additionally, the search for new sponsors was ceased by the organisers because the bureaucratic effort is too laborious. The interviewee said that bureaucratic efforts increased over the years and thus, the organisation of technical and formal issues takes more time today than in previous years. There is no fixed umbrella topic for the IW but current topics (at the moment of writing this report, for example, the debate on the decentralised accommodation of asylum seekers and the construction of a mosque in Leipzig) are always included.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

Diversity for the purpose of IW is understood in multiple ways including different dimensions – ethnic, cultural, and identity-related. But it also includes capabilities and talents of people as well as handicaps, ways of thinking, and opinions. The interviewee sees a clear added value of diversity in the variety of opinions provoking the (re-)thinking of one's own prejudices. The IW are traditionally opened by a religious service. Several years ago the service became inter-religious to meet the demands of an intercultural audience. The interviewee also addressed the relationship between racism, xenophobia, and diversity:

“We have fear of close contacts but we do not accept being called racists. Studies show that there is also something like everyday racism. The more you deal with that, the more you learn. Racism is rooted in colonialism, it is crucial to know more about it. This is what I want to do, not just confront people with their everyday racism but to show people the roots of racism and teach them to change their minds. ... Yes, in everyday life there is much racism” (L1).

Here, the IW have the role to counteract because they attract first and foremost “ordinary people” the “majority” (L1) as the interviewee underlined and can help to improve the majority's knowledge on cultural diversity.

Main factors influencing success or failure

The response to the general event is good, most of the events are well-visited. The interviewee underlines that she would like to have more time for consultation with the participating associations, but the budget is too small and so the main bulk of time goes toward organisation, publicity, and funding applications. The IW help the Department for Migration and Integration to gain publicity.

“It is the concentration of intercultural topics in Leipzig, there is an explicit and focused presentation. The main goal is to get intercultural issues to the public” (L1).

The interviewee said that she is:

“satisfied that the topic diversity is present during these two weeks. And that small associations ... [which otherwise are not visible] are also present there” (L1).

Generally, however, she said that it would be good if migrant organisations would take part more in the event, and would also engage more in organisational and preparation issues. The reasons why migrants’ organisations do not engage more are most probably variegated: lack of knowledge, lack of time, or language barriers.

A barrier for success might be that from the political scene, leftist and green politicians support the IW; conservative parties do not support the event specifically. While the former mayors, both social democrats, met the participating associations personally, the current mayor, also a social democrat, *“has no time for it”* (L1). In other words, he treats the event second-rank compared to other engagements. A continuous problem is lack of money. The interviewee said that in former years they were offered a range of support and services (e.g. rooms, consumables) for free but now, *“... with the increasing marketisation of all spheres of life this stopped being the case”* (L1). She said, however, too, that she profits from a bad situation: *“I benefit from the situation that the cultural budgets are generally decreasing; subsequently, the artists are more willing to make compromises and to accept lower payment”* (L1). A conflict she talked about was that once Muslim communities organised events to inform about their religion and used rooms in municipal buildings. Afterwards, the negative reaction by the local media blamed the department for being guilty that a ‘hate preacher’ could have spoken in a municipal room. But except issues like this, there was no reporting about larger conflicts: *“We as organisers are always learning, too, you cannot take enough care. I myself am meanwhile highly sensitised with respect to possible conflicts that may arise”* (L1). From an external perspective, it is hard to evaluate to what extent the described problems hinder or aggravate the work for IW.

Conclusion

The Intercultural Weeks do not represent an approach which was developed in Leipzig but it has been used in the city for more than 20 years now. Even though it is not a particularly innovative project, over the years it has been established as an important part of Leipzig’s festival and cultural agenda. As for the future, the interviewee sees a challenge in more cooperation between larger and smaller associations and initiatives. Generally, she is positive about the future of the event: *“... as long as this event operates well, it will be there”* (L1).

Offices for Senior Citizens [Seniorenbüros]

Strategy, focus and organisation

The arrangement Offices for Senior Citizens (OSC) is part of the reorganisation of the seniors work in Leipzig emphasising area-based, open service and meeting facilities targeted at residents of the respective district. Top-down, the city administration commissions non-profit organisations to organise and run the OSC’s dividing the city into ten boroughs served by one office per borough. The idea of this arrangement is to overcome incremental financing and a lack of conceptual approaches in services for seniors. The offices were established in 2012 up until 2017; continuation depends on further decisions by the City Council. The city-wide provision of this area-based service is a result of a general approach of equality between Leipzig’s districts adopted by the city administration (L4).

The duty of these offices is threefold: (1) the provision of meeting place activities; (2) the development of a professional network and counselling services for seniors; and (3) nursery care and guidance through institutional structures. The Senior Citizens' Advisory Board triggered the development of the new concept in order to create a basis for legal funding and better political lobbying for seniors and to truly change the living conditions of deprived old people in Leipzig, e.g. *"many of (the older people) are active and very agile, but there are many problems as well, like sickness and isolation"* (L4). The new concept appears as a 'facilitator' of spaces of interaction in order to foster social cohesion, and was officially adopted by the City Council in 2012. The organisation operating an OSC is obliged to provide spaces of interaction for the defined target group and to network with institutions taking care of the living conditions of old people as well as other social institutions in the district. For instance, the OSC West recently cooperates with initiatives for children to foster intergenerational contacts.

The OSC's are highly institutionalised arrangements, tied to specific political (Senior Citizens' Advisory Board), administrative (Department for Youth, Social Issues, Health and Education), and non-governmental Stakeholders (commissioned non-profit organisations). Each OSC receives € 18,000 from the city for material resources and € 48,000 for staff per year. Plus each office receives € 1,000 for supporting small projects in their district. The OSC's have to re-apply for financing from the annual city budget every year. Furthermore, the OSC's host organisations have to provide their own resources, e.g. employees' working hours or sharing material resources. Thus, the non-governmental institutions are under control of the administration; they are obliged to report on their work and to follow the regulations. Evaluation schemes were set up. In a more horizontal fashion, a central working group was set up to coordinate the work of the ten different OSC's (RIS, 21.03.2012). This group of representatives of each OSC, the Senior Citizens' Advisory Board and city administration, the so called ZAKOS (Zentraler Arbeitskreis offene Seniorenarbeit), is a platform for discussing work-related issues, problems and societal trends with respect to seniors. Meetings are every two months, led by the municipal Department for Youth, Social Issues, Health and Education.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

The practical implementation of the OSC is in the hand of a range of rather different non-profit organisations ranging from small community organisations to large professional social service associations. Therefore, each office has its own approach to realising the given tasks, and thus, its own perception of diversity. Two examples illustrate this: The OSC East defines itself, according to their specific institutional background, as a general community organisation that took on an additional task when establishing the OSC. Therefore, diversity is seen as a 'natural' condition which is inherent in every community where people interact. This means that they do not focus on apparent target groups. Instead, they see the whole district population as audience including young people. On top, the OSC East is confronted with an ethnically mixed district population because it serves the two districts of Leipzig with the highest number of migrants (Neustadt-Neuschönefeld with 30.5% and Volkmarsdorf with 31.0% migrant population in 2012, source: Leipzig, 2013: 236). Thus, migrants are a special target group, barely familiar with public services for seniors let alone institutional procedures of applying for support. The aim of the OSC East is to provide low-threshold access to communication and to reach out to people.

In contrast, the commissioned organisation of the OSC West, the Workers Welfare Association e.V. (AWO), recurs on a 24 year long history of work in Leipzig Grünau. Among others, one of their specific competences has always been work with older people. The implementation of the OSC West is an enlargement of their former activities for seniors (providing meeting places). In this context, diversity is understood as providing help for specific cases and being a contact point

in the neighbourhood respecting the specific needs of individual persons and groups. Their audience today consists of a group of seniors who used the meeting point regularly over the years. Besides this limitation of the audience, the credo of the OSC West is: *“if someone comes in need of help, he/she sees our logo and can get help”* (LG3). This attracts walk-in customers who seek help for themselves or for their relatives. Therefore, the OSC West focuses on professional counselling for a limited target group rather than a diverse community.

In a nutshell, the overall, city-wide arrangement OSC focuses on demographic diversity in the sense of providing communication channels preventing isolation and offering help in case of need. Social cohesion is fostered by helping people to keep an autonomous lifestyle and by offering spaces for interaction and communication, whereas diversity is not used as an independent concept nor considered a starting point.

Main factors influencing success or failure

The strong tie between the individual OSC's and their respective host organisation can be evaluated as an advantage. Sharing material resources, employees and contacts to the field of work are a strong support for their work. The OSC East profits from their institutional approach of being a community organisation; innovative strategies in the outreach to people and a wide range of contacts to cultural organisations support the implementation of new objectives in working with old people. Socio-pedagogical approaches, intergenerational offers, and a broad understanding of the targeted groups exist. However, the OSC West profits from their anchoring in established work with old people and their long-standing work in the district which benefits the networking and cooperative activities (e.g. between kindergartens and seniors or information events). The ageing population in the district profits from their experience in professional counselling and guidance for individuals in need. Plus, the bonding to their host organisation provides conceptual security; the reinvention of strategies in services for seniors is not necessary. Further, the locations of the offices in the centre of the districts support the OSC's impact due to passing customers. The establishment of the OSC's – and thus the envisioned reorientation towards open services for seniors - is highly dependent on municipal financing.

Thus, the institutional platform ZAKOS turned out to be crucial for the OSC's work despite the potential conflict of interest and the hierarchy between the administration as the contracting body and the commissioned organisations as agents. This might be due to the fact that the arrangement is still in its starting phase. The interviewees underlined that there is no competition between the offices in the ZAKOS and that *“it is good that the Department¹ is asking about progress and problems”* (LG3). Therefore, common activities are planned to foster the OSC's impact; common learning effects can be achieved.

Nevertheless ZAKOS also serves as a platform to address unsolved problems that may arise, e.g. how much of the resources should be spent for each of the threefold task (counselling, networking, and provision of meeting places) or the overburdening bureaucratic procedure of the annual re-application for financing and the scarcity of the resources provided. No matter how the different OSCs distribute their resources for personnel, it is not enough to meet the high expectations of some involved actors, especially with respect to home visits for deprived old people, public relations and the integration of volunteers. Thus, there will be no increase of resources in the next years. Additionally, the OSC East mentioned a lack of neighbourhood structures in their district, language barriers, and not enough knowledge about structures of nursery care to hamper

¹ Meant is the municipal Department for Youth, Social Issues Health and Education

their work. The OSC West is confronted with a well-established audience that is barely open to integrating new people.

Finally, the OSC's desired independence from their institutional background failed. It became clear that the commissioned institutions have a very high impact on the practical work. Hence, one of the big goals of the Senior Citizens' Advisory Board could not be reached. There is no guarantee that the OSCs will explore independent and innovative strategies to hinder ongoing isolation of old people in Leipzig.

Conclusion

From a distance, the OSC's establishment is a step towards institutionally acknowledging seniors as subjects of local policies and actions. The concept serves as a basis for political lobbying and as an administrative programme frame of the reorganisation of the seniors work in Leipzig. From this initial purpose, problems appear with respect to resources and the practical shaping of each OSC. Furthermore, it is still unclear how to combine the approach that each OSC serve their audience equally with the intrinsic impact of the host organisations.

The expansion of professional counselling and guidance through the complex field of nursery care, provision of meeting places and professional networking has the potential to be innovative. The objective of this arrangement is to combine non-governmental competences with the strong leadership of the city administration. It is questionable how the remaining non-profit institutions for elderly uninformed in the OSCs survive considering the lacking in financial support from the municipality. The high degree of formalisation, scarce resources, and the lacking political and symbolic appreciation of volunteers appear to be the first obstacles. In addition, the objective of serving every borough of Leipzig with a semi-administrative OSC is rhetorical as the work conducted by these offices mainly focuses on smaller neighbourhoods and passing customers. For the future, the utilisation of the OSC's services by the targeted groups is highly decisive for the success of the OSC's. Therefore, the first tackled challenge will be to foster their recognition: *"They need to grow; it needs to be spread so that everybody knows about it"* (L4).

Godparent Programme for Asylum Seekers [Patenschaftsprogramm für Asylsuchende]

Strategy, focus and organisation

The Godparent Programme for Asylum Seekers Arriving in Leipzig started on 14 February 2014 in cooperation with the administration and the Refugees council (RC), a civic association. Its primary goal is to establish a new culture of welcoming refugees in Leipzig that is to support them in their daily lives, and to help them in making sense of bureaucracy and other formal procedures. This shall lead to an *"added value for both sides, i.e. for the refugees and the godparents"* (L5). Further aims are creating better living conditions for asylum seekers and the break-up of their isolation. In doing so, the programme supports social cohesion through creating contact and encounters between refugees and local society. The local society is supposed to get to know refugees and to abolish prejudices through the direct contact. The debate on the decentralised accommodation of asylum seekers in Leipzig was quite polarised, ranging between demonisation and idealisation of the refugees. The Refugee Council seeks to bring the issue of asylum seekers into the middle of society, away from the extreme right and left that mainly want to exploit it, according to the interviewee.

The main actors involved are the Refugee Council and the city administration. The municipality asked the Refugee Council to develop and manage the Godparent initiative. The legal basis for the initiative is the law regulating the accommodation and subsistence of asylum seekers

(Asylbewerberleistungsgesetz). This has to be fulfilled at the local level by the municipality. Since some refugees have to wait for up to 17 years until their case is decided, support in getting on with daily life in Germany is highly important. Volunteers stem mainly from the middle of society, the majority has a university degree, among them many doctors and psychologists – they want to offer their competences to help the asylum seekers. Their age spans from 18 to 83 years; a third of them have a migration background him/herself.

The Godparent programme for asylum seekers receives money from the municipality for the programme; additional resources are the support from the Department for Migration and Integration which co-finances the room rent. Apart from that, the association is financed only by sponsoring (in terms of both financial and material sponsoring), *“therefore, we are quite free in what we do”* (L5), stated the interviewee. For the Godparent programme, however, the municipality pays a sum of € 45,000 per year from which two part-time equivalents are being employed (for one year): one takes care of the organisation of the programme, the other works on the day to day affairs of the Refugee Council. Apart from that, the Refugee Council has to organise a number of events informing about migration issues and asylum seekers in the city with external contributors.

Refugees form the target group of the initiative. The contact between refugees and godparents starts with individual talks or specific meeting evenings where people can meet. Another chance to meet is at events that inform about refugee topics, e.g. legal and asylum procedure information. Especially families with children should benefit from the Godparent programme. At the moment when the interview was carried out, first contacts had already been established.

Cooperation relations exist with different departments of the municipality (Youth, Social Issues, Health and Education; Foreigner authority; Crime prevention council). Moreover, the association cooperates with actors such as the Agency for Education, Caritas or women initiatives; the precise cooperation depends on the issue and the competences of the partners. Looser contacts exist to the Migrants’ Advisory Board and to initiatives such as the Initiative for Human Dignity (IKMW); in both cases, there are also content-related and personal (with respect to the latter) differences. The interviewee criticised the Migrants’ Advisory Board as a body whose members are not elected but appointed by the municipality. With the IKMW there has only been cooperation in single cases. Here, there is a difference with respect to communication strategies targeted at xenophobic people or people fighting against asylum seekers being accommodated in their neighbourhoods. The interviewee underlined that it is crucial to speak to those who are critical since it is the only way to uphold communication and to exchange arguments: *“If you want to reach something, you have to deal with the details and discuss; you cannot just go to the street and shout around”* (L5). The Refugee Council’s principle here is *“absolute willingness to reach a consensus, willingness for dialogue and dispute”* (L5).

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

Diversity is understood with respect to the refugees, it is not used in daily work, but the interviewee underlined that the situation of refugees has to be dealt with in multiple ways considering different aspects. The term or concept is not used in a direct way; the approach of the initiative is problem-oriented (helping refugees, being a lobby for their wants and needs). The Refugee Council deals with racist opinions and tries to develop more tolerance towards refugees and their problems. Generally, the interviewee considers the lack of knowledge among people being one of the crucial problems for the conflicts. She thinks that lack of knowledge among many engaged people and activists (she mentioned IKMW here), how authorities at different levels work, and which administration level is responsible for which policies brings about many additional problems that aggravate the situation (*“... the problem with civic participation is that the people know just one*

thing: *We are the people*” (L5)). Despite no larger public advertising, the initiative got more than 240 announcements in a short time which the interviewee sees as proof for the fact that, despite many fears, the local society is not generally racist or, as she said, is not made up of “*angry citizens*” (in German *Wutbürger*, a term that emerged in recent years with respect to public protests) (L5).

Main factors influencing success or failure

The primary factor for the potential success of the programme is the high number of 400 volunteers who announced willingness to become godparents. Another factor is most probably the construction of the initiative as a programme which is financially supported by the municipality and supports voluntary engagement. According to the interviewee, the cooperation with the municipal Migrants’ Advisory Board is described as to the point and solution-oriented. The Refugee Council has an established “*pool of competences*” (L5) and volunteers. Moreover, the association is well-established in Leipzig and has a broad network of contacts and supporters. A further factor of success is surely the fact that there are many migrants or people with a migration background among those who declared willingness to support the initiative – they know best which problems concerning bureaucracy, language, and feeling at home the newly arrived refugees might have. Some godparents get involved also in the solution of other issues, e.g. doctors and psychotherapists want to push the creation of a nation-wide trauma therapy centre network forward. A problem (or factor of potential failure) of the programme could be the high demand of time for the volunteers and that the financial resources for the coordination of volunteers are limited.

The interviewee underlined that there is a lack of appreciation for the work of volunteers, all the more since “*it is a great effort ... people do not just start such an engagement*” (L5). The expense allowance of € 40 per month from the state of Saxony does not meet the expectations of the volunteers; a stronger symbolic acknowledgement by the city would be a better acknowledgement of volunteers’ efforts. Generally, the interviewee speaks critically about the bureaucratic efforts that the association has to handle for getting a little money from the municipality. The Godparent programme is planned to be a long run project, but the people of the association are only paid for one year and the association has to apply for a prolongation every year. Every year, the application has to be prepared (for formal reasons) for a new project although all people involved know that it will just be the prolongation of existing work. This is one of the reasons why the interviewee is so critical with respect to bureaucracy.

Conclusion

Although the approach of the Godparents Programme for Asylum Seekers is not generally new, it is new for Leipzig. Especially the aspect of “*easing the arrival of refugees*” seems to be innovative. A question that cannot be answered at the moment is whether the administration uses the cooperation with the Refugee Council to pass municipal tasks on to voluntary partners. According to the interviewee, the aim of the programme will be reached when “*support is not necessary anymore*”, when “*the individual godparent reached his/her goal, and the refugee says, thank you, now I can do that alone, ..., it should be a mutual enrichment of both parties*” (L5). The aim is also reached when on the side of the local population there is a change of perception with respect to the refugees, if the refugees are seen “*as persons with all their different aspects, not just as a victim that needs help*” (L5). A further aim for the future is to establish a network of trauma therapy centres in Germany including Leipzig as a location.

Guardian Houses and housing projects [HausHalten e.V.]

Strategy, focus and organisation

Guardian Houses represent a project that responds to problems of maintenance of vacant buildings in Leipzig; it originates from the period of time when Leipzig saw massive housing vacancies up to 20% of the total housing stock (Stadt Leipzig, 2008: 15). In 2004, the civic association HausHalten e.V. was founded; it introduced the idea of Guardian Houses. The aim of this tool is to save an old and probably derelict building by re-using it and therefore to prevent the building from damage through vandalism and ongoing decay. The approach creates a framework where homeowners and potential tenants sign a flexible contract to settle the conditions of the use of these vacant houses. The contract regulates the permission for temporary use of the house. The mutual agreement means that no rent has to be paid (except additional costs and a small fee for the association), but that the tenants or users have to protect, to maintain, and to renovate the rooms, the flat or the house by themselves. Apart from the Guardian House model, there are also Guardian Shops (since 2008) and low-cost refurbishment programmes for housing groups (so-called *Ausbauhäuser*) to offer also schemes for housing that are not foreseen within the Guardian House model itself. Here, the focus is on low-cost models for renovation which meets the needs of both the owners and those people who wish to get engaged in the refurbishment of their flats and pay a very low rent later on. Both models serve to strengthen social cohesion through the maintenance of liveable neighbourhoods in terms of making people stay and attracting new residents and to ease the arrival of urban pioneers in the areas.

The association has 10-12 active members and an office with one employee. The employee is being financed (0.75 fte) by the fees paid by the members of the association and the owners or users benefiting from the Guardian House scheme. There are no further financial resources; the members of the association are all volunteers. The practical work is organised via working groups. At the time when the interview was carried out, the association worked in a common project with the municipality of Leipzig within the framework of a national funding scheme (ExWoSt²) dealing with strategies of how tenants' or owner-occupants' groups and the housing economy could better cooperate. From a legal perspective, the initiative is a registered civic association. The interviewee underlined that there is no hierarchy between the members: *"We are speaking to each other on equal terms"* (LeO4). Because of the professional background of the members (architects, planners, sociologists, geographers), there is much knowledge about the subject of work.

The association provides consulting services for potential users of Guardian Houses. They set up the contact to the owner, set up tenure contracts, and call for users. At present, there are 17 Guardian Houses, 9 of them turned to other uses, 8 are still within the scheme, and 1-2 new ones are planned. The new scheme *Ausbauhäuser* for owner-occupier currently includes 7 buildings. There are different options for using the buildings once the Guardian House scheme is finished: some of the buildings are bought by the users or the building is renovated by the owner and turned into regular housing (rental or owner-occupied) again or sold to another owner. Some owners also allow the users to become regular tenants.

The association does not define a target group: *"We do not want to make any pre-selection or prioritising"* (LeO4). Those people who are interested in one of the schemes the association offers are the potential target group. The work of the association started in Leipzig's inner west; generally, there

² Experimental housing and urban development (Experimenteller Wohnungs- und Städtebau – ExWoSt)

is no spatial focus or specific target area. Recently, the association has focused more on the inner east of the city since endangered buildings appropriate for the Guardian House approach because there are fewer and fewer appropriate houses in the west.

There is good cooperation with the administration, especially the Department for Urban Regeneration and Renewal. There is also good cooperation with other civic associations in Leipzig's west and Leipzig inner east; the working group dealing with consulting has, moreover, contact to the Tenement Building Syndicate (Mietshäuseryndikat), individual owners, the municipal housing company and, depending on single projects, other partners. The best ties exist with other "*active persons dealing with similar issues*" (LeO4).

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

The primary tool of Guardian Houses is to maintain the buildings. In close relation to this, however, it seeks to maintain residential and social diversity in the neighbourhoods. Thus, diversity is indirectly addressed through the long-term vision of vibrant, diverse, and liveable urban neighbourhoods with well-maintained and used buildings. In this framework, the interviewee said that

"... we would wish that there would be more groups of people who commonly refurbish buildings but we are not those who push gentrification ... we want to save the buildings. ... We are not actively displacing people with our activities. ... Diversity means for us that people with different lifestyles and attitudes are living together within one district" (LeO4).

As a reaction to increasing criticism with respect to their role in the gentrification processes in Leipzig's inner west, the association decided to change their rules and to add that the maintenance of socio-economic diversity in the areas of their work belongs to the general aims as well. In our opinion, this criticism is a bit unfair but emotionalised with respect to the recent debates on gentrification in Leipzig so the association had to respond. Maybe they would not have added this aspect if this debate did not exist and was not as heated as it is at the moment.

Main factors influencing success or failure

Without the activities of the association, a number of buildings would not exist anymore. Success factors for the Guardian Houses are the innovative approach that created a type of "win-win" situation for both owners and users – the building is used and its value and state of maintenance kept, and for the users space is created without larger costs. The framework (high vacancies, shrinking city) was surely helpful for the persuasive power of the tool; the support from the administration, too. A good and broad cooperation network was established, also in terms of international cooperation (Switzerland, Italy, France, Spain, Netherlands). The interviewee underlined that the association, according to its own assessment, is an indispensable partner for the administration in dealing with the maintenance of derelict buildings. The response to local problems and the specific construction of cooperation between association, owner, and administration might be the reason for the fact that "*the model of Guardian Houses does really work only in Leipzig, since it stems from here and was established within the concrete conditions that we are faced with here*" (LeO4). This might be the reasons or factor behind the failure of the tool at other places.

A potential factor for failure or conflicts is that the initiative cannot really influence the relation between owners and tenants. In another case, a former Guardian House was sold at a "*very, very high price ... which is not assessed as good by the association*" (LeO4). The interviewee said that "*the priority is the maintenance of the building, yes, but if financial interests are clearly playing the main role, we do not participate in such projects*" (LeO4). As mentioned above, the association often has to deal with com-

promises and trade-offs between different interests and possibly opposing views on the development of a street or neighbourhood. This might be interpreted as success in one case, but as a failure in another. The association sees its role, too, as being the intermediate between different actors and their interests; they consider transparency and openness to be the main foundations of discussion between the involved actors. Last but not least, the reported lack of acknowledgement of the association's work through the municipality might be a potential risk for their engagement. The municipality, for instance, uses photographs of the material made/elaborated by the initiative without asking for allowance, *"the mayor benefits from our work, successes and the rise of the creative scene in Leipzig's west, therefore we get misleadingly increasing criticism with respect to the gentrification/displacement danger"* (LeO4).

Conclusion

The concept of Guardian Houses was created in Leipzig; it represents an innovative and appropriate response to high vacancies and unused buildings in residential neighbourhoods and a counteraction against the decline of the social and built environment of the affected areas. It has been copied already in other cities, even abroad. Especially the role of a bottom-up association as an intermediary between civic or private actors (private owners, owner-occupiers, housing projects) and the administration shows how civic involvement may impact on urban development.

Forum Leipzig East [Forum Leipziger Osten]

Strategy, focus and organisation

The Forum Leipzig East (FLE) was established in 2000 as a discussion and exchange platform accompanying the restructuring process in Leipzig's inner east. Its normative approach is to be a public meeting point for all kinds of stakeholders in the area. It forms part of the general funding scheme for this area which includes different projects and fields of activities ranging from support of social cohesion, the local economy, and employment as well as participation and public space. FLE is supposed to foster communication between inhabitants, stakeholders and the municipal administration. The idea behind it is that improving life quality in Leipzig's inner east will be most successful if all available resources are used in order to find the best way to implement or initiate projects. As a hub where all the different developments in the quarter come together, FLE has different tasks: communication between the actors/participants and informing stakeholders and the public about and coordinating on-going as well as future activities or projects.

In frequent meetings (2 to 4 times per year; lately just once a year), a large number of participants (on average around 100 people) discuss predetermined issues such as new municipal development strategies, health, culture, previous developments, education and family, new funding schemes, employment, social issues and integration, changes of the built environment, security and order. The FLE is financed with help of EU (EFRD programme) and national (Social City – Soziale Stadt) funding. FLE does not make decisions – its main purpose is exchange and debate. The decision-making power lies in the hands of the municipality. The majority of participants come from the administration or politics, 30% are paid professionals and only the remaining (smaller share of people) are ordinary citizens without any function (FOCO, 2014). This "overbalance of officials and professionals" in participative events is not only seen in the case of FLE but is also often seen as a general structural problem of urban development discussion platforms in Leipzig.

Depending on the respective topic, social cohesion and economic performance are two of the main fields which are addressed at FLE's meetings. At the same time, FLE offers itself a space for encounters of different people – inhabitants, retailers, stakeholders – from the area as several

interviewees confirmed. One interviewee, a representative of local retail, even acknowledged FLE as being a place where he could openly say his opinion and – if necessary – “vent, ..., [his] anger” (LeO5).

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

The term diversity itself is not directly addressed within the activities of FLE. Leipzig’s inner east is said to be an ‘arriving place for international migrants’ (Heinrich Böll Stiftung, 2014) resulting from the highest number of people with a migration background in the entire city (Neustadt-Neuschönefeld with 30.5% and Volkmarisdorf with 31.0% migrant population in 2012, see Stadt Leipzig, 2013: 236) and a quite diverse, small-scale local economy. Therefore, FLE could theoretically respond to very different population groups but there is a lack of participation by migrants which represents one of FLE’s problems.

A change with respect on how to deal with diversity can be observed when looking at the latest efforts to not just work with but even foster diversity: a new grammar school was planned to be opened, and there have been endeavours to offer cheap places or shops for artists (within the framework of the Guardian Houses project) in order to maintain abandoned houses and to create a pioneer scene that could trigger further developments. These processes try to make the area’s population more diverse and (socially) mixed.

Main factors influencing success or failure

The success behind the large numbers of participating people most likely results in 1) from the format itself – a platform for exchange, debate or just information – and 2) the fact that, first and foremost at the beginning, such a platform was completely new. Factors leading to decreasing participation and less frequent organisation of FLE mean that real participation was not always possible, decisions often could only be discussed or explained but not changed, and some groups of residents (e.g. migrants) could not be sufficiently reached by the offer of such a space of encounter. Debates and information have been given exclusively in German language which makes it additionally difficult for some migrants to take part. For retailers, operating hours (e.g. at Friday 2.30 pm) are simply incompatible with their regular working schedules. But still, despite all those negative factors, many people appreciate the FLE as a “useful establishment, because problems can be discussed and you can tell people that they cannot continue like this” (LeO5).

There are also some other factors that limit the success of FLE: a large discussion platform such as FLE is not able to go deep into solving problems and, as an interviewee claimed, is not the right place for resolving detailed or specific problems. In many cases, people do not go somewhere when they have problems, instead: “Going there [to those affected] and talk to them is often necessary” (LeO3). So, there is a mismatch between the idea of the role of FLE and the reality of problems and demand by people needing support. A reason why people do not attend or do not feel attracted might also be the fact that topics often are set (top-down) and the lack of space/time where emerging issues can be discussed (ibid.).

As the latest discussions about a new grammar school in Leipzig’s inner east showed, a major problem is that FLE has no direct power to implement suggestions. This can hamper voluntary engagement since it can be very frustrating for the participants who feel that they have no real power on a decision. At the same time, it shows that FLE is not in real competition with the elected City Council and has clear limits set by the administration itself. Thus, it appears as a channel to gather and distribute information to the public. All in all, FLE serves its initial aim to be a participative space of encounter and exchange but it does not offer (enough) space for emergent topics and operates as a platform that directly impacts what happens in the area: “The

protagonists show little or no interest in developing alternative structures, which could have led to more engagement by the residents” (FOCO, 2014).

Conclusion

FLE represents a somewhat typical approach in Leipzig to counteract the physical and social decline of urban areas around the year 2000: The Forum was, therefore, innovative when it was set up as a broad platform bringing together different groups of the population from Leipzig’s inner east for exchanging their opinions, meeting each other, and discussing the further development of the district. It formed part of a comprehensive scheme of support and funding for the area including actions and projects fostering social cohesion, local employment, and economy as well as participation. FLE has contributed much to the discussion of issues and exchanging opinions among the area’s population; it has given a floor to stakeholders and policymakers to present their ideas, projects and plans and to get feedback by the inhabitants. Since FLE depends on the national and EU funding schemes mentioned above, it also suffers from recent cuts; moreover, the erosion of support structures in Leipzig’s inner east within the last years seem to also decrease the willingness of the involved actors to continue the exchange in this intense way.

2.2 Arrangements targeting social mobility

Working Committee Youth

Strategy, focus and organisation

The Working Committee Youth (AK Jugend) is an area-based network of professionals engaged in street work with deprived teenagers in the large housing estate Leipzig Grünau and aims at strengthening both social cohesion and social mobility. The working committee enables its members to network amongst each other in order to better accompany and support socially deprived teenagers by way of regular exchange (monthly meetings) and common projects and events. Once a year, a celebration for youngsters is organised. The committee has a network structure with a flat hierarchy; the legal status is a registered association. Members are different educational or street work related institutions dealing with Grünau’s deprived youth – only professional groups are allowed considering that assistance from lay persons is not possible. Membership is a matter of interest; new institutions or EU-funded projects are welcome to participate. A web-platform was launched to inform the district’s youth about what the institutions offers.

The speaker of the group claims that the network works autonomously and in a direct democratic fashion, meaning that hierarchies do not exist and decisions are made collectively. Representatives of the city’s administration, who would automatically act both as professional colleagues and as public authority and commissioner, are allowed to participate in meetings on invitation only.

The association was founded in 1993 and thus represents a long-grown, stable body of cooperation among the researched governance arrangements in Leipzig. Street work in the area began in 1992; early problems were racist attacks carried out by right-wing oriented teenagers and neo-Nazi groups. Partnership among different educational and social work professionals was discovered to work most effectively: *“Street work, mobile youth work can only flourish along with partners”* (LG4). The network was formed and established in a time when organisational structures concerning the topic were still unstable and in transition after the political change of systems in 1989/90. The network survived budget cuts, difficult times and conflicts of interest. It also acted as a lobby group for stable working environments and against cuts in the budget of institutions working with deprived teenagers in the area. This fight against budget cuts produced a feeling of solidarity and community among the members.

Concerning resources, there are no extra resources for the network apart from financial support for events. The members have their own funds which come from mainly the city of Leipzig and other external funding (e.g. EU). The network *“lives on the time and energy of its members”* (LG4). What is more, they share the scarce resources they have, e.g. a bus for mobile street work.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

Diversity is not an explicit issue of the network; it is primarily concerned with deprived youth. When asked about the composition of the target groups, a shift in age-groups was reported. Whereas in the 1990s the target group were older teenagers, right-wing, neo-Nazi groups, later on drug-problems became a major issue. Today, it is actually kids under 14 years of age they deal with, some of them being in fact the children of their former clients. Thus, they report about intergenerational deepening of deprivation and poverty-carriers. A loss of social and emotional competencies is observed: *“The younger they are, the less interest they have in anything”* (LG4). The estate sees an influx of migrant families, but until now this does not seem to be an issue of concern.

Main factors influencing success or failure

The long-time existence of the network (in a post-socialist context) is a sign of the success of this arrangement. The network has joined forces to support their target group, preserved their work in times of severe budget cuts, and mutually supported each other in a demanding field of social work: *“If everyone would work on their own, we’d teeter on a knife edge”* (LG4). Factors contributing to this are the stability of membership, the exclusion of hierarchies, and the long-term commitment of individuals. Interestingly, network structures around community issues in this district in general are rather strong and stable. There are several reasons for this. Interviewees mention the longevity of stakeholders’ and residents’ engagement with the district (*“In Grünau, many colleagues have been engaged for a long time.”* (LG4)). From a governance perspective, certainly the presence of a vital district management since 2007 with operational capacities is a factor for stability. The local district management provides open space for communication and management resources. Thus, the emergence of cooperation is partly due to (and dependent on) their work. Plus, the network has a reliable, long-term, engaged speaker who is the backbone of the network. Budgets are of course a crucial issue for street work. Cuts lead to a reduction in working hours which cut into the more strategic capacities of the network: *“With 30 working hours left, it is hard to focus on conceptual issues like neglect or squalidness, no time for collaboration on concepts and trends”* (LG4).

A second field of difficulties is the cooperation with the city administration. On the one hand, administrative partners are colleagues; on the other hand, they are the contracting body and the principal. Thus, it’s both a flat and hierarchical relation. For years, city administration was kept out of the network to avoid conflict of interests. A recent shift in the organisation is that the city administration established a new system in youth planning which enforces area-based cooperation in seven planning areas of the city, coordinated by the city. This new administrative network works parallel to the existing network, producing an extra work-load while still maintaining similar aims and goals. The difference however is that the level of trust is much lower in the new arrangement. Distrust in administrative structures was articulated. There is a high turnover rate in employees with young new-comers being in administrative positions of substantial responsibility without having much professional experience in the field: *“The question is always: how sustainable is what is imposed top down?”* (LG4). While this new network structure might be an improvement in places that had no such coordination and mutual support structures before, in this district it might destroy the existing structure due to simple matters of time restrictions and continuous work-overload. Again, budget cuts play a role here.

Conclusion

The future of the Working Committee Youth in Grünau is very unclear. After years of stability, the parallel network structure installed by the city administration seems to develop into a risk for the further existence of the original network due to diminishing resources while tasks grow in difficulty and complexity. The members feel forced to save time and energy for their core work. The administrative network is obligatory, so the time can only be saved in the voluntary, older network. A crucial decision seems to emerge on the horizon.

The network appears rather traditional but very effective. The efforts can be combined quickly to work with specific teenagers and groups causing public attention. Institutions bring together knowledge and resources to work preventively and on urgent cases. The mode of exchange also has a traditional form: meetings, trainings, exchange. The stability of the network has its roots in both the longevity of personal engagement and in leadership qualities. It profits from state programmes but is not dependent on them. Nevertheless, the network is vulnerable, because of long-term, incremental cuts in budgets. The (rather innovative) shift in planning structures of administrative youth work towards area-based networks might turn out to create a tipping point in work overload that endangers the existence of the network more than anything previously.

Campus Grünau

Strategy, focus and organisation

Campus Grünau is a rather unique platform of exchange and common activities for all educational institutions in the district Leipzig Grünau (the only one of its kind in Leipzig). Today, it serves as the connecting point for all educational institutions: kindergartens, primary, secondary, and tertiary schools including public, community-based, and private institutions. It also connects the growing landscape of alternative and experimental schools to institutions for professional training (Berufsausbildung) and community college (Volkshochschule). Even the municipal Department for Youth, Social Issues, Health and Education is involved. The members cooperate to utilise the – literally – short distances between the institutions to create smooth educational paths for the target group, mainly the children and youth of Grünau, and to increase their educational and thus their future life chances. The novelty is to combine institutional forces for the less privileged pupils in the area rather than for the clients of one school or institution.

The goal of this platform today differs from its starting point. Initially, it was founded to prevent school closures in a demographically shrinking neighbourhood. From this initial purpose, today the platform Campus Grünau still provides a lobby-platform for schools in Grünau today, engaging in image and publicity work, and fighting for resources and investment. The platform lobbies for investment in the refurbishment of public schools and for stability in working conditions, e.g. for a long term contract for the Independent School of Leipzig, a private school with alternative concepts. *“That’s something where you simply gain more recognition if you show up together”* (LG2).

The platform has two main modes of work: regular meetings and a common annual event. In the meetings, exchange of information, common training on sensitive social issues like abuse, exchange on work with parents, and further education of the teachers on issues concerning education is on the agendas. *“To network means to profit and to engage, to see what the others are doing”* (LG2). Social cohesion and social mobility developed to be of specific concern for the platform. Second, a regular festival of learning serves as an event to connect and to demonstrate the variety and quality of educational institutions in Grünau.

The network would not have been initialised nor would it further exist without the support of the district management. The district managers provide meeting space and coordinate the network. Also, through the district management, funding is available from the national urban development fund Social City (Soziale Stadt) to finance events like the festival of learning. Support also comes from a local shopping mall which provides the space for the festivals as well as financial support. In return, the mall gains in reputation and visibility.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

The interviewees rather speak about target groups (pupils, parents) and about problem groups than the potential of a socially diverse population. Within the parents as a target-group, migrants have become a subgroup of concern. Due to the specific socio-demographic mix in Grünau (old residents with social stability and younger in-migrants bringing large families of lower social status groups), Grünau has a growing share of underprivileged children from families with a lower social status. In-migration of foreigners just recently became a topic, but it first became visible in the kindergartens and schools because the households tend to have higher numbers of children. For the speaker of the platform, this also has positive aspects, for instance an *“appreciative clientele”* (LG2). The social mix in Grünau is *“a challenge for all who work with it”* (LG2). Therefore, the common trainings are of great value. However, the platform creates cooperation across social milieus and contacts between schools of very different social backgrounds. Here diversity refers to the (full) diversity of educational institutions and the socially diverse clientele they serve.

Main factors influencing success or failure

The platform appears as a dependent arrangement which exists as long as supporting resources exist. Mainly, it depends on the resources of the national funding programme Social City; once this programme ends, *“I do not know whether someone will continue this work, it is not possible to do this on the side”* (LG2). So, not only money, but also time and man-power can be seen as scarce resources. This has been evident already in most other arrangements in Leipzig. Networking is also a form of sharing resources; for example because all institutions profit from the yearly festival and it is less costly than organising independent events. Also, further training possibilities can be organised cost-efficiently. As with the Working Committee Youth, it profits from the stability of civic actor networks present in Grünau in general, including private actors, e.g. the director of the central shopping mall or housing companies providing space and equipment for events. The platform has been established out of a common perception of neglect of educational institutions in the district and the struggle to survive in times of population losses. At present, the population is growing and schools are needed. What remains is the notion of being a stepchild among the city’s school districts: *“We want to be heard as a district and that also here, action is taken”* (LG2).

Conclusion

The common experience of being at risk created a window for identifying common interests and working for synergies where educational institutions within such an area usually work independently or even in competition with each other. This is a clear novelty within the landscape of educational institutions in Leipzig. The platform appears fragile: whereas the members clearly see the advantages, the motivation to form such a platform was not intrinsic. It came from the district management instead which initialised, financed, supported and inspired the platform’s work. If this *“facilitator”* (LG2), who itself is dependent on external funding, withers, it is rather questionable whether the network will survive. On the other hand, the network of actors in the district council, which includes the administration, discusses the establishment of an *“educational tower”* (LG2), a light house building which would host educational institutions and serve as a material

centre for activities. If this is realised the idea of the Campus would be materialised and thus stabilised further.

Network of Community Organisations [AG Soziokultur]

Strategy, focus and organisation

Leipzig's Network of Community Organisations (NoCO) is a city-wide, loose alliance of the seven largest socio-cultural community centres. These are centres, literally houses, which host a variety of groups, associations and volunteers and provide spaces for them to follow their interests, to create rooms for interaction and social life. The network of these centres is a platform for communication and exchange about common concerns, e.g. regulations of funding (federal and local regulations, different sources of funding, regulations for application etc.), societal development and political and administrative processes influencing the work of the community centres. Also, it undertakes concrete lobby activities to pursue common goals and secure the existence and resources of community centres as facilitators of spaces of interaction (e.g. a campaign against the reduction of funding or a common webpage for supporting the approaches of community organisations as a part of Leipzig's culture). The targeted audience is, foremost, the political and administrative sphere of Leipzig. Therefore, the NoCO is at the same time advocating for the groups they host in their centres.

The NoCO is a barely institutionalised arrangement. Monthly meetings between the managing directors of those centres are the basis for stable contact and for common activities. A clear moment of initialisation cannot be identified, rather, cooperation and routines developed gradually over time. The interviewee stated that *"the establishment of the monthly meetings was a long-term process, beginning before 2000"* (L3). The group consists mainly of people with an administrative function for community centres, stakeholders are rarely involved. New centres can join the initiative in case of interest. The NoCO has no own resources. In case of activities, they combine forces; e.g. work of employees, connections to policy makers, rooms or material for posters.

Today, the NoCO appears to be in an advanced stage of arrangement. Some of the involved community centres have existed already for more than 20 years. The NoCO can look back on a successful development. This includes the joint fight against reduction of funding and the increased appreciation of community organisations in Leipzig. Now, there is a council decision to increase the funding of the independent cultural scene up to 5% (RIS, 2008: 13). Their work is fostering both social mobility and social cohesion. The main aim is to secure spaces where people can train their social abilities far away from public and institutional pressure. The community centres are offering educational, sportive, and cultural activities as well as places for meeting and leisure time. Most of these activities are organised by smaller initiatives or volunteer citizens. The community centres appear as trustful and stable host-institutions for a diverse range of associations and individuals.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

As indicated, diversity is not clearly defined; the organisation's work reaches out to people of different ages, ethnicities, and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, it is not used as an explicit concept. Rather, it is an inherent part of everyday work. The interviewee stated:

"The centres are places of a low-threshold access to social life; they are points where people can participate ... For me, diversity is normal, it is the most normal thing. To talk about diversity is to produce differentiations; to produce the problem. You don't need to sort people in a community" (L3).

The aim of this approach is to put human beings at the centre of cultural activities. Therefore, culture becomes a method to work across categories such as gender, age, and ethnicity.

Main factors influencing success or failure

The stability of the arrangement is rooted in its human resources: the engagement and motivation of involved individuals and the long-time relationships between people working in community organisations. The existence of the network is independent from any external influence and resources. Stable communication guarantees the identification of common problems and goals. In addition, connections to political decision makers are crucial. The low formalisation of the arrangement appears to be an advantage. Even though the community organisations depend on the same sources of funding, the interviewee stated that there is no competition. Nevertheless, community centres are confronted with precarious conditions of funding. The interviewee stated that he has to “*fight for every Euro every year*” (L3). The annual budget is hardly secure or accountable; long-term planning and personal security is hampered. Additionally, the uncertainty about the amount of financing and bureaucratic effort of applications and handling of funds are stumbling blocks in everyday work affairs.

Conclusion

The innovative approach of this arrangement is to combine forces and resources to achieve a more powerful voice than one single institution can have alone. The NoCO is a bottom-up arrangement; a horizontal network formed around common problems and activities, e.g. the struggle for funding and recognition. Over the years, the stable activity of the NoCO has proven its positive impact on higher recognition of community organisations in Leipzig. Political bodies are the main addressee of actions and thus the “*common enemy*” (L3). A milestone achieved here was the long-term increase of the municipal budget for community centres.

2.3 Arrangements targeting economic performance

EastWORKS [ostWERK]: Coordinator Economy, Factory East, and Labour Shop East

Strategy, focus and organisation

Different from initiatives and arrangements targeting social cohesion and mobility, the initiatives described in the following section have a common history and belong to common funding and project structures, the EastWORKS. The most innovative of them, Coordinator Economy, is a reaction to the problems faced by other initiatives targeting the economic performance of individuals. It represents a higher level arrangement which – on top of counselling work – cooperates with the administration to launch projects and attract funding. We introduce this arrangement first and then describe two other projects.

The Coordinator Economy was set up in 2002 in order to strategically coordinate measures, undertaken to improve the local labour market, and to work on employment issues for less privileged residents primarily within the area of Leipzig’s inner east. Leipzig’s inner east has been a focus area of funding and regeneration policies for years. From 2002 onwards, a number of smaller and time-restricted projects were carried out; all financed short term from external resources (state: XENOS, BIWAQ; EU: EFRD). Examples are the Factory East, running from 2009 to 2012, and its successor Labour Shop East running from April 2012 to October 2014. Both support local small enterprises and job-seeking residents. To avoid the loss of personnel and established competences when starting anew, a small core group of actors formed an umbrella arrangement which coordinates funding activities in such a way that continuity could be

achieved. A person was commissioned by the city administration to function as coordinator. This person is an intermediary who was engaged in a lot of restructuring projects in the district already; he runs a small consulting enterprise. Together with the representative of the city administration responsible for this area, a continuity of personnel working with the small local entrepreneurs was aimed for by a continuous attraction of funding from national and EU-sources.

The coordinator's tasks were to build up a network and to ensure follow-up projects for the support of unemployed and small private entrepreneurs. The Department of Urban Renewal and Restructuring of the city administration and the consulting office provides the resources for this overarching structure: it pays for the work and office space. The coordinator's office was located in the office of the local district management to also enable cooperation with other associations and to make use of synergy effects. The administration steers the continuous follow-up of different projects, organises the overlap, and prepares applications for money. Because of the continuing engagement of these actors, the process was perceived as a continuous stream of work by residents although it is in fact achieved by a number of projects within specific time constraints. As an interviewee of the coordination team expressed, the work of these actors guaranteed that *"there was no break, no gap that was noticeable"* (LeO1). The main focus of all the projects was to encourage people to search for a job, to improve their job application strategies, to start their own small business, to improve their own retail shops or businesses through micro credits, etc. The central strategy is to go to the people, to contact them in their shops, to encourage them to come to the offices and speak to the staff of the projects. Although the approach combines economic with social cohesion and mobility targets, the priority was always on the support of local economic development and – in the projects Factory East and Labour Shop East – advice for job-seeking residents. These two projects will be described below.

The Factory East dealt with supporting small and medium-sized enterprises and job-seeking individuals. Therefore, there was a huge range of targeted groups, e.g. migrant and German population, unemployed, local entrepreneurs, and associated intermediates. It was the explicit aim of the project to improve the job and employment situation of newcomers to Leipzig's inner east, thus, the project supports social cohesion, social mobility, as well as the improvement of economic performance of people living in the area. The project is a follow up-project of previous projects which 1) collected basic data and offered life coaching and 2) undertook fieldwork investigating the specific needs of less privileged inhabitants of Leipzig's inner east. The Factory East then engaged in working with local entrepreneurs and inhabitants as well as working on networking aspects. Five thematic permanent offices were set up, focusing on consulting and qualification of local SME (small and medium enterprises), consulting for disadvantaged persons (employees), support for the job situation in the area, e.g. through the integration of job and economy-related measures into the general framework of district renewal. This includes the presentation of the strategic ideas within the Forum Leipzig East (see above), a communication forum for the area. Additionally, cooperation with the district's associations, participation at local festivities and public information were aspects of the work. The Factory East is financed through ESF funding, which the administration of Leipzig applied for. The administration commissioned their long term partner DAA (German Academy of Employees) which brings in the locations and rooms. Apart from the head of the team (the interviewee), there were four employees with a migration background working in the project. They provided language knowledge in Russian, Vietnamese, Arabic, and Kurdish. When the project was finished in 2012, these people became unemployed.

The project Labour Shop East in Leipzig's inner east started in April 2012 and will finish in October 2014. It represents a follow-up project of the Factory East (see above), but had a more narrow thematic focus: the support for small and medium-sized enterprises and the job search of unemployed residents of the district. Again, the DAA was commissioned to carry out the project.

The finance was again provided by the ESF, but this time within the framework of the BIWAQ programme. The administration designed the project and assigned the Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography in Leipzig (IfL) for an assessment of activities and for possibilities of knowledge transfer. The project has four employees dealing with the work for the target group, organisational issues, networking, etc. The project has about 90 networking partners; most importantly the job agency and the International Chamber of Commerce Leipzig. Further partners stem from the local creative industries and local civic associations. The Labour Shop is a street-level office visited by approximately 20-30 people per day. The interviewee highlights that this is “*a good number, more than we originally expected*” (LeO3). Like its predecessor, the project focuses on Leipzig’s inner east because of the manifold problems concerning employment and local businesses. The project therefore has a clear spatial perspective – people and businesses that are not located in the area cannot be served. Target group is small enterprises (max. 5-6 employees) including quite a few entrepreneurs with a migration background. The project provides consulting and helps people to either become more successful in applying for jobs, getting a new job or helps local SME’s to improve their business (e.g. helping them to find new employees, apply and receive micro-credits).

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

The described arrangements were the first to provide low-threshold access to services of counselling for entrepreneurs and job-seeking inhabitants from a variety of ethnic backgrounds and social milieus in Leipzig’s inner east. Especially the awareness of a multi-ethnic target group – and the difficulties in reaching out to them – was a prominent topic of the interviews conducted (LeO1, LeO3). They use a strong personal approach reaching out to groups that are outside the focus of larger institutions for economic development like the Chamber of Commerce or the local Job Centres. Respecting the multi-layer problems of inhabitants of Leipzig’s inner east, both the Factory East and the Labour Shop East provide independent support for job-seekers no matter which ethnic, demographic, socio-economic or gender background they have. Therefore, it must be underlined again that diversity is not used as an independent concept or initial approach, even though it is part of the project’s daily work.

Main factors influencing success or failure

The proactive strategy of reaching out to people is the main success factor of the arrangements. This enables an independent and conscientious handling of the unemployed in need of help and allows the organisation to address local entrepreneurs personally by visiting them in their businesses:

“... one has to go to the people, because the offers of consulting were not requested very much up to present. It is most important to just go to the people and talk to them. For small enterprises with only 1 or 2 persons working there it is impossible to take part in offers by the International Chamber of Commerce due to their own working hours” (LeO 3).

Another advantage are the longer-term learning effects from different projects of the DAA, e.g. the Labour Shop East could profit from the knowledge of former projects in Leipzig’s inner east. Nevertheless, many of the developed competences are lost at the turn of succeeding projects, e.g. the bilingual personnel, parts of their knowledge about the local economy, or aspects of public relations like the degree of reputation worked out by former projects. Also, difficulties to reach out to migrants and older deprived Germans in Leipzig’s inner east remain. Language barriers are a factor here; young people with bilingual competencies have better chances on the job-market than older Germans with a low level of education.

As for many other such projects, the mismatch between the short project duration and the patience and perseverance needed for the work is an evident barrier to success. The interviewee highlighted that it is hard work to build up relationships with migrants, to win trust, to make them aware of counselling offers and win their participation (LeO3). Continuity of staff, office spaces and long-term offers are crucial here. Given a project duration of just three years, when the project ends, contacts to participants, raised levels of awareness, and synergies with other initiatives in the district will be lost. Thereby, an almost continuous stream of projects was achieved. Currently, major national and EU-funding schemes were cut or restructured in such a way that the continuity can no longer be achieved; the project Labour Shop East ends in autumn 2014 and its work will stop just as it was getting well-established. The municipality, however, after two decades of budget scarcity, still depends on external money for such projects and is not able to pay for them from its own budget. In addition, the general condition of the labour market appears as crucial for the project's success. The interviewee highlighted "*the issues of temporary employment and bad wages, ... there is a lack of opportunities to get seed capital with relative ease*" (LeO3).

Conclusion

The projects described form part of the efforts of neighbourhood renewal and support for the local community. Over the years, work targeting the economic performance of small enterprises and residents has gradually built up capacities and recognition of the needs of a small-scale and precarious ethnic economy, even a multi-ethnic economy. For Leipzig, the projects represent novel approaches in working toward a better economic performance of less-privileged residents. The Coordinator Economy, therefore, represents an innovation in coordinating local economy. The most striking result points to a mismatch between timely limited projects and necessary long-term engagement with the target groups. The achievements of learning processes are continuously at risk of getting lost at the end of a funding period. This is even more important because, in most of the cases, German specialists are working for the initiatives designed by German decision-makers whereas an important target group are people with a migration background. An exception was the Factory East where people with migration backgrounds were explicitly employed because of their language skills and cultural background. Thus, the question of trust between the offered support schemes and those who should benefit from it is an issue, too. It is, however, not limited to the relation between the German project staff and people with migration background; to reach the long-term unemployed and people with poor experiences in the labour market also remains a continuous challenge for such initiatives.

Labour Shop Grünau [Arbeitsladen Grünau]

Strategy, focus and organisation

The Labour Shop Grünau is a parallel project to the Labour Shop East. The goals and organisational structure are basically the same, funding comes from the same source (BIWAQ programme of the ESF), and the project also runs from April 2012 to October 2014. A different civic association called Work and Life (Arbeit und Leben e.V.) has been commissioned to operate the Labour Shop Grünau. The city administration is the leading partner with additional partners in the Job Centre, the district management, and the DAA. It is the first project in that area targeting economic performance. Work and focus differ from that of the Labour Shop East due to the different situation in the area. Given that Grünau is a classic post-war housing estate, it is a predominantly residential district with some services and infrastructure. The estate has a population of around 45,000 but with only ca. 340 local businesses, plus another 100 entrepreneurs who live in the area but work elsewhere. When being approached by the staff of the Labour Shop, entrepreneurs at first did not even consider the district's scale as an appropriate frame of networking. Also, the entrepreneurs tend to focus on sub centres of the housing complex instead of the dis-

trict as a whole. Thus, the first steps were very arduous and it felt artificial to top-down implement a support for the local economy.

Today, the Labour Shop Grünau focuses on two issues: 1) forming a network of existing entrepreneurs to stimulate exchange and provide support – rather than supporting start-ups – and 2) supporting job-seeker through counselling and training. A lot of pioneering work was done by previous projects, that is: a) conduct a survey on local entrepreneurs to learn what the size and scope of the local economy is, and b) establish contacts with the entrepreneurs and organise a regular round-table of entrepreneurs residing in Grünau. The Labour Shop Grünau created good contacts with the entrepreneurs by first introducing tools of networking (roundtable, newsletter) and by starting to offer counselling and further trainings: *“Today, around 20 people come to take part in evening trainings, for me, this is a real success”* (LG1). The work with the long-term unemployed filled a gap. Within two years, 588 inhabitants came to seek support, out of those, 355 took part in a training programme organised by the staff, and a third, most of them formerly long-term unemployed, found a job afterwards in the primary job market. Actors involved in the project are the association Work and Life (Arbeit und Leben e.V.), the city administration, the Job Centre, the district management, and the DAA.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

Diversity is not a topic for the interviewees. They look at their clearly defined target groups consisting of entrepreneurs and job-seekers, mainly older Germans. Ageing is a topic for both SME and job-seekers. The employment seekers were more often women than men and mostly belonging to the 50+ generation. Also, entrepreneurs were often already 50+ or 60+; one of the problems they share is inheritance (who will continue the business?). This was identified as a main field of support. Thus, migrants play a minor role in the district, but the project’s workers are aware that with the existing structures, migrants will not be attracted.

Main factors influencing success or failure

Time and resources are again the main factors hindering a long-term engagement and success. *“For a project, this may be a long duration, but in a district like this, for serious work with local entrepreneurs, you need 7-8 years”* (LG1). As it stands, the project will not be continued due to the restructuring of funding at the EU level. This means that the structures – and the trust established among the local community – will be lost. Whether this can be re-established with new programmes (and very likely new people on the job), is uncertain. The character of the district – which proved to be an advantage for work on education and social cohesion – is a disadvantage for fostering the local economy. Also, the residents seeking employment do not match the qualifications needed by employees so that the synergies which were hoped for with this programme cannot succeed. The success of bringing a larger number of unemployed residents back into work is mainly reliant on the competencies of the employees and the organisation commissioned for the project.

Conclusion

The Labour Shop Grünau is a pioneering initiative to foster the local economy in this district. The two different targets, supporting job-seekers and working with entrepreneurs, face different challenges. Support for job-seekers found a good response by residents despite the fact that they had to find the way to the office themselves. Support for the local entrepreneurs, let alone actively fostering a local economy and start-ups, was hindered by the structure of the district itself. Large housing estates are first and foremost places of residence rather than economic activity. As with the other arrangements in Leipzig’s inner east, the patience and perseverance needed is thwarted by the short-term duration and funding of the project.

3 Synthesis and analysis of the results

Synthesis of the investigated governance arrangements

The analysis of governance arrangements shows once more that local policies and initiatives are organised around classic target group approaches and around specific problems and policy fields. As already stressed in Grossmann et al. (2014), diversity in Leipzig is a term that has only just recently emerged in the local discourse. Another characteristic of Leipzig is the importance of area-based policies and urban renewal strategies. The districts under investigation have experienced manifold attention and municipal steering. A strong role of the administration, in the city and especially in these districts, influences the work of the arrangements under investigation.

Table 1 shows the main focus of the activities of the analysed arrangements with respect to the three analytical dimensions social cohesion, social mobility, and economic performance. Most of them address at least two of the dimensions with one dimension being the main focus.

Table 1: Contribution of the governance arrangements towards the three main objectives

Governance arrangements	Social cohesion	Social mobility	Economic performance
Initiative for Human Dignity	***		
Intercultural Weeks	***		
Offices for Senior Citizens	***		
Forum Leipzig East	***		**
Working Committee Youth	**	***	
Campus Grünau		***	
Network of Community Organisations	**	***	
Godparent Programme for Asylum Seekers	***	**	
EastWORKS (Coordinator Economy, Factory East / Labour Shop East)		***	***
Labour Shop Grünau		***	***
Guardian Houses and housing projects	**		***

*** = high contribution; ** = medium contribution

Arrangements contributing (first and foremost) to social cohesion

Initiatives supporting social cohesion have different target groups. Some focus on migrants and asylum seekers, others on seniors and a third group addresses all citizens. Accordingly, also the goals of the initiatives vary: initiatives focusing on asylum seekers concentrate on support activities for daily life, the asylum procedure, and the debate and conflicts around arriving foreigners. The Offices for Senior Citizens focus on the wants and needs of seniors of different ages and in different circumstances and their integration in and contribution to social life in their district. The Intercultural Weeks aim to foster social cohesion between different citizen groups via organising cross-cultural activities as an event. Thus, different aspects of social cohesion are addressed by the initiatives.

Arrangements contributing (first and foremost) to social mobility

Initiatives with a main focus on social mobility are mostly horizontal networks of organisations or professionals, which join forces to better achieve their targets, such as the Working Commit-

tee Youth, the Campus Grünau, or the Network of Community Organisations. The three networks are bottom-up alliances of different institutions with the same interests or field of work that fight in the political sphere for secure resources for their work. At the same time, they use the arrangements to exchange knowledge, to grasp existing societal trends, and work conceptually as well as to elaborate on strategies of acquiring resources from different sources of funding. They combine forces to strengthen their position, increase recognition for their work, and to confront decision makers. Social mobility is also an important target of the arrangements focusing on economic performance of less privileged groups, like the projects of the Labour Shops. Often a specific target group such as unemployed residents, small enterprises, young people or children is the main focus of work in this category.

Arrangements contributing (first and foremost) to the economic performance of less-privileged groups

All of the initiatives analysed here form part of a coordinated action by the administration using different funding schemes in an incremental way over a longer period of time. They focus on the support for job-seeking people and local small and medium-sized enterprises. The distinctiveness of the approach is that a general coordination of the activities was established to enable spill-over effects and a certain continuity of the established networks and knowledge. The projects are strictly area-based, focusing on neighbourhoods with a large funding history and many social and economic challenges. Besides the local economy, they also support also social mobility of less-privileged groups as well as the long-term unemployed.

Conceptualisation of diversity

Diversity is tackled or addressed from many different angles, e.g. ethnic/migration, demographic, socio-economic. But, for a large number of the initiatives, diversity is not a distinct issue because they focus on either societal problems, specific target groups and their demands, or certain neighbourhoods. A second, smaller group of arrangements – or interviewees – critically looks at the term diversity and claim that diversity is “just there” (L3) and should not be seen or treated as an asset. They criticise that diversity is used as a “fig leaf” (L1) in order to pragmatically benefit from others’ potential. A third group of initiatives sees the diversity context as a suitable framework for their work supporting city-wide acceptance for different groups of the population, different lifestyles, and different cultural, religious, etc. backgrounds. From different perspectives (i.e. those who were more positive or critical towards the diversity term itself), the importance of dealing with diversity in order to counteract (everyday) racism, which is present in Leipzig’s urban society, was underlined.

Localisation of the main factors influencing success or failure

Arrangements can build on the human capital of involved actors, on available – but precarious – funding schemes to finance their work, and on a generally well-networked spectrum of professionals, intermediaries, and volunteers engaged in social issues. Especially in the two districts under investigation, an extensive assemblage of institutions, policies, networks, and cooperation has emerged over the years. For networks, a common goal or problem is crucial for their success. Age, educational background, language skills and personal experiences of people involved are crucial for how the target group can be addressed or how their real needs can be understood and tackled by the arrangements. It became clear that the work and engagement of volunteers is a necessity for the success of many initiatives and has to be more accordingly appreciated e.g. by the municipality but also by general project and funding frameworks.

Single persons are often decisive for the work of an initiative and the continuity of arrangements due to their political influence, networks, or long-term engagement. The quality of the feedback

by target groups often depends on the long-term duration and reliability of the initiatives or persons representing it. Also, the stability of locations and places is an important success factor – once target groups know where to go and whom to address, progress can be made; here is a clear relation to the issue that many (funded) activities are project-based and NOT long-term, it is underestimated that most projects need a ‘starting phase’ to establish themselves.

Generally, the short-term supportive character of many projects impact their way of working. Ensuring continuity under these circumstances is difficult if not impossible. Thus, the arrangements also show how the policy landscape in Leipzig reacts to this difficulty. Overarching levels of coordination and networking are established by the administration in order to fight against budget cuts, to secure hook-up of funding, and to keep up personnel and relations in the field as is the case with the labour market support initiatives in Leipzig’s inner east. Additionally, especially during past several years, the impact of austerity policies and cuts in funding affect the work of many analysed initiatives. This endangers continuity and trust. Sometimes, however, long-term structures may hinder innovation. Thus, short-term projects have advantages: they have a quite good financial support for a limited period of time and can initiate many things. A further major problem for initiatives is bureaucracy which causes people to give up or hinders that certain things happen at all.

What we found striking in our analyses is the ambivalent role of the municipality in the arrangements investigated. For the organisations, the municipality is both a collaborator and a principal whom they depend on resource wise. On the one hand, they may benefit from the close cooperation with the city administration for the realisation of their interests and goals; on the other hand, the cooperation implies the risk of becoming too dependent on the administration and being exploited by it. Many intermediates (see below) find themselves in this tricky situation.

Identification of new ideas for innovative policies and governance concepts

In Leipzig, within the last years, new, innovative approaches such as the Guardian House concept or the Godparent Programme for Asylum Seekers have been developed. Other approaches, e.g. the reorganisation of the seniors work, were updated and adapted to diversifying demands by the target groups. A mismatch often exists between innovative ideas and the available resources to realise them according to the aspirations formulated in the concepts. We see the establishment of the Coordinator Economy as an innovative approach since it shows how the dependence on short-term, external funding can be overcome at least formally with an institution that coordinates aligned projects and assures a minimum of continuity. Generally, according to the interviewees, innovation brings about positive and negative sides: negatively considered were e.g. the lack of control, the issue that different approaches have to be brought together, and that there is a wide scope for interpretation of what should be done. Positive sides are more space for varied offers of support, a broad and explicit networking approach that should shape better linkages between initiatives working in the same or a similar field, and a comprehensive understanding of an issue (e.g. support for older people) that considers various dimensions such as help, consulting, leisure offers, and life-long learning.

Generally, and this was emphasised by various interviewees, Leipzig is said to be a ‘forerunner’ in many respects. Projects such as the Offices for Senior Citizens, the Godparents Programme for Asylum Seekers or the Guardian House approach were explicitly mentioned as innovative. Sometimes the interviewed initiatives see themselves as forerunners as well. To what extent this label is appropriate also depends on the context and scale. Some initiatives are a novelty for Leipzig and maybe for (eastern) German cities. But one can say with certainty that in the past few years, Leipzig had to be innovative when it saw massive shrinkage of its population and had to

invent novel solutions for maintaining quality of life and ensuring provision of infrastructures and services for the remaining citizens.

4 Conclusions

Consequences of competition for scarce resources in social work

The main point for reflection arising from the described analysis of government arrangements is the dependence of these arrangements and their work on external funding from local, national, but also EU-levels. Even though we could describe some innovative concepts of dealing with this (e.g. Coordinator Economy), the mismatch between a highly ambitious approach or project and comparably little resources have led in many cases to a precariousness of arrangements. Actors need to compete and invest enormous amounts of time in applications for short term funding options. If they are not successful or if no funding scheme is available (e.g. as caused by the current restructuring of ESF-funding), capacities which have been created in pioneering projects are lost for the district, e.g. people involved, contacts and cooperation, offices, and places that had already been established. Short-term funding in long-term tasks can thus lead to a waste of resources and knowledge. The mismatch of time invested in attraction of funding or administrative tasks and the time left for the work with the target groups gets ever more pronounced with budgets cuts which occurred over the last years, even though in a European perspective these cuts were (not yet) severe. What is more, the permanent dependence of such arrangements on project funding risks the trust of target groups in the credibility and reliability of the initiatives and the related governmental institutions.

On the role of neighbourhoods or the spatial approach

There is an impact on the neighbourhood where an initiative is in place. Grünau, for instance, is a well-networked housing estate when looking at the group of people, initiatives, and private and professional actors engaged with social cohesion, social mobility, and the improvement of the economic performance of less-privileged residents. Leipzig's inner east looks back to a more than 20-year-old networking and funding history, from the foundation of the first neighbourhood association in 1991 (Neustädter Markt) up till the elaborate network structure that was developed within the framework of the urban restructuring east programme starting in 2001. As we already pointed out in our policy report (Grossmann et al., 2014), the strong role of urban planning for Leipzig's strategy-building maintains the spatial approach as a priority. The new concept of reorganisation of the senior's work follows the spatial approach as well, although this was not undisputed. The spatially-explicit policy and funding approach in Leipzig has another side-effect: the focus on some prominent areas leaves many other areas without major funding or attention. Although to set a focus on some specific areas was well justified (lagging behind, need support, concentration of problems), potential problems emerging in other areas might be overlooked.

Horizontal or hierarchical relations in governance arrangements

If we define governance arrangements as horizontal networks among state, private, and civil actors (Swyngedouw, 2005), only a few of the documented governance arrangements qualify as truly horizontal. In most cases, the state or, more precisely, the administrative bodies of the city, play an important, sometimes ambivalent role. On the one hand, the city administration is a main facilitator of much of the work described. It provides funding to initiatives, pays the professional bodies of social work, provides work spaces and infrastructure for networks, attracts funding from upper policy levels and – being less dependent on external funding than most of the private or civic actors – the administration is also firm as a rock in difficult situations, providing stability and continuity in a field full of short term projects and dependence on the next source of fund-

ing. On the other hand, with many intermediaries being paid by the municipality, they also depend on the city to prolong contracts, and to choose the existing partner for work in projects or social fields over another competitor. Thus, the notion of evaluation and control might be a hindrance to successful and transparent work of arrangements. The analysed arrangements show different modes of coping with the ambivalent role of the administration. Some exclude city representatives from their network (Working Committee Youth), some form alliances with the city (Coordinator Economy). The latter is an example for the group of intermediaries, which is an important group of actors in Leipzig's sphere of local governance. These actors operate as private organisations depending on state/public money. There are different types of intermediaries ranging from small consulting offices with few co-workers to large associations such as the DAA or Caritas. Even civic associations such as the Refugee Council are partly in the situation of an intermediary since they run the Godparent programme together with the administration and are paid by the municipality for it. Thus, many of the arrangements are not truly horizontal in their organisation.

Grant coalitions, alliances and participation

Previous research regarding policy analysis (see Grossmann et al., 2014) shows that top-down approaches dominate policies addressing social cohesion issues in Leipzig. In the analyses of governance arrangements, it became clear that in recent strategies, the municipality seems to put an emphasis on concept development and strategic visions in the researched policy fields. Participation in this strategic and conceptual work is selective in a twofold way: the administration selects who is invited to participate and which topics are open for discussion. Set against the ongoing austerity condition and budget cuts, these concepts and visions are in conflict with an incremental mode of implementation caused by scarce resources and personnel, which lead to yet other tensions. These tensions, in return, impact the work of governance arrangements. Those who work in close contact with the administration often develop common, more or less transparent strategies in settings which might be best described as grant coalitions (Bernt 2009). The advantage of a common endeavour of fundraising is clearly that capacities can be bundled and experiences on both sides used commonly; the risk is – more for the civic actors – becoming too dependent on the administration. In case of conflict or political/ideological differences, they lose their independent position and potentially the trust of the target groups. Other actors and arrangements see the municipality as an opponent and form alliances with professionals working in the same field, e.g. with the Network of Community Organisations or the Campus Grünau. They fight and negotiate in a more political arena for resources and attention of the decision makers: both from the administration and politicians. NGOs like the Initiative for Human Dignity develop their mode of conduct between opposing policy decisions and cooperation with (parts of the) administration.

Conditions of stability of governance arrangements

Both, the exclusion of hierarchies as well as the formation of alliances with superior actors can contribute to the stability of networks. Strong intermediaries, however, seem to be a key to stability. They have the greatest knowledge and capacities in attracting funding, they build up a certain depth of insight in the field, in the perception and orientations of target groups in the area and – last but not least – they have a genuine interest in continuity of their own professional work. It can be emphasised that the establishment of strong, even personal relationships has had a decisive impact on the work of arrangements. The same holds true for the development of conceptualised approaches where the experiences and solidarity of professional workers with their work environment (especially in social work) is crucial. This means that in order to ensure sustainable development of social cohesion, it is indispensable to support intense linkages between profes-

sionals and volunteers to the environment of their work. Stability and the amount of time available as a resource have turned out to be decisive.

Learning to work in a diversifying urban society

A clear problem seems to be the cultural distance between the governance community and the (newly arriving) target groups. Previous research regarding policy analysis (see Grossmann et al., 2014) identifies that the multiplicity of a diversifying urban society is recognised, but the multiple voices of the heterogeneous urban society are neither well-understood nor transferred into policy. Also, in the governance arrangements, this gap has been identified by interviewees as an obstacle to achieving their goals. The recognition of multiple voices is more in the hands of the governance arrangements. Municipal policy makers should use this potential when elaborating on concepts and policies. The experience of the governance arrangements, their success and failure, and their insight into the complexities of diversity that cannot be reduced to standard macro-categories, are thus a valuable pool of experience. Especially with respect to the ethnic diversification, the will to engage with this group is hardly accompanied by competences to approach this group. Here, learning processes on the side of policy actors are reported on frequently. A more participatory and horizontal mode of strategy development would enable a better transfer of knowledge about the target group and place specifics and make municipal policies more effective. This is even more important in a context where the recognition of different voices of a diversifying urban society is still a learning process for decision makers.

5 References

Legal documents and policy programmes

- Altenhilfeplan (2012). *Stadt Leipzig, 3. Altenhilfeplan Leipzig 2012* [3rd Care Plan for Old People Leipzig 2012]. Leipzig: Dezernat Jugend, Gesundheit und Schule, Sozialamt
- RIS (17.09.2008). *Stadt Leipzig, Festschreibung bis zu 5% für Freie Szene Kultur* [Assessment up to 5% for Independent Cultural Scene], Leipzig: Stadtrat Nr. RBV-1302/08
- RIS (21.03.2012). *Stadt Leipzig, Begründung der Seniorenpolitischen Leitlinien: Beschluss der Ratsversammlung* [Statement of Policy Guidelines for Old People: Council Resolution], Leipzig: Stadtrat Nr. RBV-1165/12
- Stadt Leipzig (2013). *Stadt Leipzig: Statistisches Jahrbuch 2013* [Annual Report of Statistics 2013], Leipzig: Amt für Statistik und Wahlen
- Stadt Leipzig (2008). *Stadt Leipzig: Kleinräumiges Monitoring der Stadtentwicklung in Leipzig* [Broucher: Small Scale Monitoring of the Urban Development in Leipzig], Leipzig: Dezernat Stadtentwicklung und Bau
- PIB (2014). Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung: Jedes Alter zählt. Demographiestrategie der Bundesregierung. [Every Age Counts. Strategy of Demographics of the Federal Government] Online: http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/_Anlagen/Demografie/demo-grafiestrategie-langfassung.pdf?__blob=publicationFile, Status: 04.08.2014

Reviewed documents and sources of the selected governance arrangements

- Ak Jugend (2014). *Meer als chillen. Eine Initiative für Leipzig Grünau*. [More Than Just Chilling. An Initiative for Leipzig Grünau], Online: <http://www.mehr-als-chillen.de/de/2/p1/home.html>, Status: 25.06.2014
- Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik (Difu) (2000). *Soziale Stadt info Nr. 2. Schwerpunktthema: Quartiermanagement*. [Soziale Stadt info 2. issue: District Management], Berlin
- FOCO (2014). Forum Community Organizing e. V. (FOCO). Online: <http://www.foco.info/organizing/literatur-und-handbuecher/stock/articles/buergerbeteiligung-in-der-sozialen-stadt-foerdervoraussetzung-oder-antagonismus-erfahrungen-aus-dem-leipziger-osten.html>, Status: 04.08.2014
- Stadt Leipzig (2011). *Stadt Leipzig: Der Leipziger Osten – Eine Kursbestimmung, Strategiewerkstatt Leipziger Osten 5. bis 8. April 2011* [Leipzig's East – Direction Determining, City Work Shop Leipzig East April 5th till 8th 2011], Leipzig: Dezernat für Stadtentwicklung und Bau, Amt für Stadterneuerung und Wohnungsbauförderung (ASW)
- Stadt Leipzig (2002). *Soziale Stadt – Stadtteilmagazin Leipziger Osten. 7. Ausgabe* [Soziale Stadt – District Management Leipzig's East. issue 7], Leipzig: Dezernat Stadtentwicklung und Bau

Bibliography

- Bernt, M. (2009). "Partnerships for demolition: the governance of urban renewal in East Germany's shrinking cities", *International Journal of Urban Regional Research*, 33(3), 754-769.
- Grossmann K., A. Haase, K. Kullmann and C. Hedtke (2014). *Assessment of Urban Policies in Leipzig, Germany*, Leipzig: Department of Urban and Environmental Sociology, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research – UFZ.
- Heinrich Böll Stiftung (2014). Möglichkeiten einer partizipativen Integrationspolitik – Das Beispiel der Stadt Leipzig. [Possibilities for a Participatory Integration Policy – The Example of the City of Leipzig], Online: <http://heimatkunde.boell.de/2012/11/18/moeglichkeiten-einer-partizipativen-integrationspolitik-das-beispiel-der-stadt-leipzig>, Status: 05.08.2014.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2005). "Governance innovation and the citizen: the Janus Face of governance-beyond-the-state", *Urban Studies*, 42 (11), 1991-2006.

6 Appendix

List of the interviewed persons

- L1 (10th April 2014), project coordinator of the city administration Leipzig “Intercultural Weeks”
- L2 (8th April 2014), responsible Department of Youth, Social Issues, Health and Education of the city of Leipzig “Offices for Senior Citizens”
- L3 (8th April 2014), member “Network of Community Organisations”
- L4 (30th April 2014), member of the Senior Citizens’ Advisory Board “Offices for Senior Citizens”
- L5 (30th April 2014), coordinator “Godparent Programme for Asylum Seekers”
- L6 (14th May 2014), responsible Centre for Democratic Education of the city of Leipzig and supporter of the “Initiative for Human Dignity”
- L7 (28th January 2014), volunteer member of “Initiative for Human Dignity”
- LeO1 (11th April 2014), former employee “International Chamber of Commerce“
- LeO2 (11th April 2014), former project director “Factory East”
- LeO3 (8th April 2014), coordinator and co-worker “Labour Shop East”
- LeO4 (22nd April 2014), volunteer member “HausHalten e.V. – Guardian Houses and housing projects“
- LeO5 (22nd January 2014), chairman “Lock-Meile Leipzig e.V.”
- LeO6 (6th May 2014), employees of Mühlstrasse e.V. “Offices for Senior Citizens East”
- LG1 (8th May 2014), executive director “Labour Shop Grünau”
- LG2 (8th May 2014), representative “Campus Grünau”
- LG3 (6th May 2014), employees Workers’ Welfare Association “Offices for Senior Citizens West“
- LG4 (9th April 2014), representative “Working Committee Youth”

List of the participants of the round-table talk

Date: July 8, 2014

Place: Heizhaus Leipzig

- Uwe Kowski, district management Grünau
- Uwe Krüger, Labour Shop Grünau, Association Work and Live (e.V.)
- Sven Bielig, Association Urban Souls (e.V.)
- Anne-Kathrin Sepp and René Goldbach, Offices for Senior Citizens West, Workers’ Welfare Association Leipzig
- Philipp Bludovsky, FC United, Association Network Blue-Yellow (e.V.)