

The Role of University in a Policy Making Process _

Introducing Integrated Urban Projects for Effective Urban Governance in Serbia

Danijela Milovanović Rodić^{1*}, Ratka Čolić² and Marija Maruna³

* Corresponding Author

1 Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade, Serbia, danmilrod@gmail.com

2 Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade, Serbia, colic.ratka@gmail.com

3 Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade, Serbia, m.ma@sezampro.rs

ABSTRACT

This chapter suggests a new view on the arrangement of urban governance for Serbia, where an Integrated Urban Project (IUP) is examined as an instrument for achieving sustainable development. Policy-making in Serbia's urban development is faced with the challenge of transition from a traditional, bureaucratic, and autocratic system towards a new, efficient, effective, communicative, and flexible one. The process of searching for new instruments for its realisation was initiated due to the existing model's inability to deal with complex problems brought about by the post-socialist economic and social transition, as well as global influences related to Serbia's planned accession to the European Union (EU). The first part of the chapter briefly outlines the concept of a new urban governance model. The second section defines the characteristics of an IUP as an instrument intended to create and implement sustainable public policies in the field of urban development. The third part presents curricula of master's theses and master's projects for three generations of students of the Integrated Urbanism master's programme at the Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade: (i) IUPs for Inner City Development, (ii) IUPs for Disaster Risk Management, and (iii) IUPs for Municipal Development. Regardless of the differences in topics and locations, the students' assignments were to work with specific local institutions to devise IUPs in response to identified problems of the 'real' context and indicate how these might be put into practice. This section details the results achieved by the latest generation of students: (i) the IUPs as urban governance instruments, focusing on their integration potential; and (ii) the IUPs development process, showing the types and techniques of communication and knowledge dissemination amongst students, as well as between students and mentors, and with the local community and the broader professional and academic public.

Besides aiming to contribute to a comprehensive innovation of the curriculum in the local context of a post-socialist country, the purpose of this chapter is to point out the options and opportunities for collaboration between academic institutions and local communities in the introduction of new topics, ideas, concepts, and instruments for effective urban governance in Serbia.

KEYWORDS

integrated urban project, urban governance instruments, curriculum innovation, academia – local community collaboration

1 Introduction

In post-socialist societies, which induce a crisis in professional activities, the academic community has the opportunity and obligation to contribute to the redefinition of the position and role of the urban planning profession. Planning in market economy circumstances requires new skills and knowledge, where the traditional model of planning education within the field of engineering does not provide a sufficient response to current complex requirements (Bajić Brković, 2012; Maruna, 2015; Milovanović Rodić, Živković, & Lalović, 2013). By applying creative methodological approaches in teaching, the academic community can exert influence on the introduction of new knowledge into existing practice, and change the areas and products of its operation. An important precondition for the success of these initiatives is the establishment of an academic teaching process based on real problems of planning practice at local/community level, and the creation of solutions through professional dialogue within a broad network of participants. In the Serbian local context, this type of course module is an innovative departure from traditional teaching practice.

The methodological framework of the Integrated Urbanism master's programme at the Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade, and the development of an Integrated Urban Project framework as its main instrument, are based on a specific approach. Firstly, it is focused on contemporary themes according to international and EU policies – sustainable and integrated inner-city development, urban resilience and risk disaster management, urban and territorial governance, and management of public property – that are highly relevant in the Serbian context. Secondly, the case-studies are 'live' cases, which require a problem-solving approach. Thirdly, the methodology of master thesis development includes collaboration with visiting practitioners and subject experts besides mentors, and through guest lectures, presentations, consultations, and workshops. Finally, the methodology of IUP development includes those activities listed above, but also the collaboration between domestic and international students, subject experts and representatives of local institutions through site visits, workshops, interviewing local partners and citizens, consultations, public communication via facebook, exhibitions, and presentations. This enables students to better understand the problems, and to develop and apply the new knowledge (Geppert & Cotella, 2010; Maruna et al., 2015; Mironowicz, 2015).

The participants in this process are students and teachers, the local community, professionals from various sectors of the public administration, as well as representatives of the private and civil sectors. Hence, besides helping students to understand the issues of 'real' planning practice, such a module should also change the perception of participants from the professional arena, and introduce new instruments into their practice.

This section will provide an overview of the concept of new urban governance within the local Serbian context, and the role of an IUP

framework within this context. Then it will discuss the methodological innovation of the IUP framework in relation to traditional teaching methodology in Serbia using three different case studies. In addition, it will also highlight the experiences of the latest generation of students to explore the integratory characteristics of IUPs and the process of their development.

2 A New Urban Governance Model

The main characteristics of the proposed new urban governance model in post-socialist societies were developed after recognising the need for changing the role of governments in designing and implementing public policies. Hence, an authoritarian 'government' as the single decision-making authority was to make a shift towards the 'governance' model that takes into account a large number of stakeholders in different institutional settings in order to coordinate and integrate all available community resources (Čolić, 2015; Perić & Maruna, 2012).

The new urban governance model is outlined in all United Nations (UN) key documents, starting with *Agenda 21* (1992) and including *UN Habitat II* (1996), *UN Habitat Global Campaign for Good Urban Governance* (2002) to the latest *UN New Urban Agenda (Habitat III)* (2017). All these documents are based on the UN's *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948). The following definition was proposed during the *Campaign for Good Urban Governance*, launched by UN-HABITAT in the early 2000s: "Urban governance is the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, plan and manage the common affairs of the city. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and cooperative action can be taken" (UN-Habitat, 2002, p. 14). This definition of governance recognises the importance of stakeholders, the nature of governance as a process, and the establishment of mutual interests by consensus. The value of the concept of governance lies in its ability to provide a framework within which to understand the changeable process of governing.

The interpretation and discussion of the genesis and interdependences between development contexts, governance modes, and urban planning and development can be followed through the theoretical works of the following key authors: Harvey (1989), Healey (1996), Le Gale's (1998), Hydén (2011), DiGaetano and Strom (2003), Garcia (2006), Innes and Booher (2003; 2010). According to Le Gale's (1998, p. 496), governance represents the 'capacity' of the local community to unite and articulate different entities, both internally and in relation to the external environment. The focus is on understanding the mechanisms and processes that enable the acquirement of a structured mode of governance, far more than defining the governance itself. Modes of governance are the "informal arrangements that define the governing relationships among and within formal institutions implicated in urban politics" (DiGaetano & Strom, 2003, p. 362). Socially innovative practices in urban governance and territorial development are also

invariably associated with the emergence of new institutional forms that draw heavily on a greater involvement of individuals or actors from both the economy and civil society (Moulaert, Martinelli, González, & Swyngedouw, 2007).

Following Halfani, McCarney, and Rodriguez (1995, p. 95), "governance, as distinct from government, refers to the relationship between civil society and the state, between rulers and the ruled, the government and the governed". Governance relationships have been described as *joint action* and *negotiation mechanisms* (Garcia, 2006). The operationalisation of the new urban governance model has its basis in the "historic legacy of the principles of good governance, and the universality of its applications" (Cities Alliance & N-AERUS, 2016, p. 21). The basis is the UN definition of *Good Governance*, with its eight characteristics: (1) it follows the rule of law; (2) it is consensus-oriented and participatory; (3) effective and efficient; (4) accountable; (5) transparent; (6) responsive; (7) equitable; and (8) inclusive (UN-ESCAP, 2009). The implementation of urban governance principles should represent authentic practice, tailored to the specifics of the environment, which cannot be easily replicated to produce similar results (Cities Alliance & N-AERUS, 2016). In contemporary conditions, urban governance "relies less on normative blueprints and more on practical experimentation" (Hyden, 2011, p.19). Hence, urban governance means setting up *places* and mechanisms where, and through which, various *community interests* can negotiate priorities, needs, and values amongst each other, and this entails the involvement of multiple stakeholders and the examination of the specific local context, but also an understanding of the constantly shifting framework of urban governance (Cities Alliance & N-AERUS, 2016). These principles were the basis for understanding the concept of urban governance and developing IUP in the local context of Serbia.

3 Integrated Projects for Effective Urban Governance

One of the essential characteristics of contemporary urban planning is its tendency for an integrated approach. The justification for this view is rooted in new forms of collaboration and partnerships, resulting from the recognition of a number of different actors whose interests and influences co-exist in space. However, the integrated urban planning approach has a broad meaning (Amin & Thrift, 1995; Healey, 1998, 2006a, 2006b; Moulaert et al., 2007; Polèse & Stren, 2000). The integrated approach has become a recurring topic in European cohesion policy developing over more than two decades. This section is focused on the experience and practice accumulated within European Union programmes URBAN I (1994-99) and URBAN II (2000-06), co-financed by two of the European Community's Structural Funds: the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund (ESF) and formulated in *Leipzig Charter on European Cities* (EU, 2007), *Toledo Declaration* (EU, 2010), European Commission's *Cities of Tomorrow Report* (EU, 2011), *Urban Agenda for the EU* (EU, 2016) and *The New Urban Agenda* (UN, 2017) which all laid the ground in defining

principles of integrated urban development. Taking into account the practical orientation of IUPs, we focus on the following aspects of the framework for an integrated approach:

- Integration of different aspects of development – economic, social, environmental, and cultural – as the basis of sustainable development, as well as themes of urban mobility, social inclusion, urban resilience, demographic aging, brain drain, employment, urban-rural linkages, social and technical infrastructure, identity, marketing, and more (EU, 2007; EU, 2010; EU, 2011);
- Integration of different policies, strategies, and plans: in addition to traditional urban and spatial plans, these include national and local strategies for sustainable development, economic development, housing, tourism, agriculture, energy, culture, and more, with special emphasis on European policies of urban development and new urban agendas (EU, 2010; EU, 2011; EU, 2016; UN, 2017);
- Integration of different spatial levels: from the neighbourhood and municipal level to the city/village level, followed by the territory of a region, state, border region, European Region, and so on (EU, 2010; EU, 2011);
- Integration of various administrative levels of government in accordance with the country's administrative arrangements, ranging from the local, municipal, and city levels to that of administrative district and province (regional level), to the national and supranational levels (EU, 2010; EU, 2011);
- Integration of various actors and institutions that can be accessed through analysis of actors/institutions in the public, commercial, NGO, and civil sectors, as well analysis of stakeholders in and/or drivers of urban development (EU, 2010; EU, 2011; EU, 2016);
- Integration of various forms of funding: local, regional/provincial, and national budgets; public-private partnerships; available EU funds, international sources of finance, and donor programmes, and other sources (EU, 2010).

These changes reflect the influence of European policies and structural funds, which finance most diverse programs and projects to foster development. In these circumstances, an integrated approach to urban development is understood as spatial, temporal, and thematic coordination and integration of different policies for planning and defining precise objectives through (financial) instruments.

4 Integrated Urban Development Projects

This section presents the results of the teaching process of three generations of students of the Integrated Urbanism master's programme at the Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade. Students formulated IUPs as sustainable solutions to a problem identified in the real context. This was achieved in collaboration with local communities, public authorities, public enterprises, the commercial and civil sector, and members of the public. In addition, projects involved consultants: experts from national planning institutions, professional associations, staff of international programmes (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, GIZ), etc. Instruction was conceived so that the master's thesis and master's project constitute an integral whole. The task of the master's thesis was to: (a) expose students to theoretical papers, international documents, and good practices and so enable them to understand urban governance at a theoretical and methodological level and formulate a 'desirable' urban governance model whilst focusing on the key topic; and (b) allow them to identify their topic and 'action space' within the regional, national, and local development contexts.

Although diverse in terms of the themes and applications of the spatial framework, all projects are founded on the understanding that sustainable urban development can be achieved by integrating different: (i) aspects of development; (ii) instruments for urban governance (policies, strategies, plans, etc.); (iii) spatial levels; (iv) administrative levels of government; (v) the various actors and institutions; and (vi) different forms of funding.

The last part of this section presents 23 IUPs of the final generation of students in detail, focusing on the content and process framework of IUP as a new urban governance instrument, and the modes for its introduction into professional discourse through collaboration in teaching between academia and the local community.

4.1 IUPs for Inner City Development: The Case of Kragujevac

The projects of the first generation of 13 students (mentored by six teachers in the academic year 2013/14) of the Integrated Urbanism master's programme were undertaken through the co-operation of the Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade, and the GIZ-AMBERO project *Strengthening the local land management in Serbia* (Müller et al., 2015). The students were given the assignment to choose one development measure envisaged under the *Integrated Urban Development Strategy for the Inner City of Kragujevac: Kragujevac 2030* (Jevtović, Čolić & Cerhe, 2013), and formulate an IUP for its implementation. The Strategy, which had at the time just been enacted, represented a new instrument in Serbia's planning and development context, and aimed at allowing environmentally responsible, socially balanced, and economically justified development of the city's

central core. The Strategy was developed jointly by GIZ-AMBERO, the Kragujevac local government, officers of the relevant local institutions, and members of the public, following the latest European experiences in urban governance (Jevtović et al., 2013).

In addition to being able to confer with their mentors and commission members from the Faculty of Architecture, the students could also consult officers of the relevant institutions and organisations, such as the Ministry of Construction, Transportation and Infrastructure, Serbian Institute of Architecture and Urban and Spatial Planning (SIAUSP), Belgrade Town Planning Institute (TPI), Serbian Chamber of Engineers (SCE), Kragujevac Directorate for Urbanism (DU), and GIZ/AMBERO of Belgrade (Figure 4.1).



FIG. 4.1 Workshop with consultants
(Image by authors, 2014)

The students' projects covered a broad range of topics, including: local economic development based on cultural heritage and tourism; enhancing quality of life by improving public spaces, developing green and recreational networks, increasing mobility, and revitalising riverbanks; activating abandoned spaces by allowing for their temporary use; and revitalising brownfield sites in the city centre by redeveloping them into an innovation district. All the projects are presented in *Integrated urban projects for Kragujevac inner city development* (Maruna & Čolić, 2014) and were also exhibited at the Faculty of Architecture and in the lobby of the Kragujevac City Hall.

4.2 IUPs for Disaster Risk Management: The Case of Obrenovac

The projects of the second generation of 11 students (mentored by four teachers in the academic year 2014/15) of the Integrated Urbanism master's programme were undertaken by the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, in co-operation with the GIZ/AMBERO project

Strengthening the Local Land Management in Serbia (Müller et al., 2015) and the Urban Management master's programme of the Technical University in Berlin. They investigated the impact of climate change on the development of cities in the context of severe floods that affected Serbia in the spring of 2014. The IUPs took as their point of departure a report of the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction entitled *How to Make Cities More Resilient: A Handbook for Local Government Leaders* (UNISDR, 2012). The municipality of Obrenovac, which suffered the greatest damage and losses in the 2014 flooding, was chosen for the development of IUPs. The first stage of independent research was followed by a 12-day workshop at the Faculty of Architecture in Belgrade with 4 Serbian and 3 German mentors-teachers and 11 Serbian and 26 German students of differing levels of education and professional backgrounds (architecture, landscape architecture, urban planning, construction, geography, economics, etc.). The students formed cross-sectional international teams to develop IUPs to address previously identified key issues (Figure 4.2).



FIG. 4.2 Workshop of TU Berlin and AF Belgrade students (Image by authors, 2015)

Support from a broader consulting team was again secured this year - this was made up of officers of the relevant national and local institutions, and a guided tour of the assignment location was organised.

The final students' projects constitute the concept of an Action Plan that consists of individual IUPs for disaster risk management in the

municipality of Obrenovac. These IUPs cover a broad range of issues, such as management and diversification of green spaces and introduction of reservoirs with water filtration systems to reduce housing exposure to flooding; development of GIS databases to manage flood risk; enhancing the resilience of vital urban services such as healthcare facilities and schools; improvement of housing construction; development of green infrastructure to regulate precipitation; remodelling of flooding defence lines (embankments); training and awareness-raising of the general public in how to act in emergencies; etc. All the projects are presented in *Integrated Urban Projects for Flood Risk Management: The Case of Obrenovac* (Čolić, Maruna, Milovanović Rodić, & Lalović, 2015), which is exhibited at the Faculty of Architecture and the Obrenovac City Gallery. The IUP *GIS Application for Disaster Risk Management in Obrenovac* won the first prize at the 2015 GIS Day at the Faculty of Civil Engineering in Belgrade.

4.3 IUPs for Municipal Development: The Case of Pančevo

The projects of the third generation of 27 students (mentored by three teachers in the academic year 2015/16) of the Integrated Urbanism master's programme were undertaken in co-operation of the Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade, and the City of Pančevo. The main topic for students' assignments was *Integrated Urban Governance Instruments*, with particular emphasis on multi-level urban governance instruments. The students were asked to come up with an IUP for an identified problem in the given development context, as well as to specify instruments for its formulation and implementation.

The starting point for these IUPs was the *City of Pančevo Development Strategy: 2014-2020* (City of Pančevo, 2014), the city's current development framework. To allow students to gain insight into a 'real' development environment in Pančevo and other areas of Serbia, they were given access to public officials and representatives of business associations, the City of Pančevo Business Council (CPBC) and the Regional Chamber of Commerce (RCC). As had happened in previous years, the development of students' final projects was facilitated not only by local stakeholders, but also by officials of key national planning and urban government institutions, the Ministry of Construction, Transportation and Infrastructure (MCTI), Serbian Chamber of Engineers (SCE), Belgrade Town Planning Institute (TPI), and the Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities (SCTM), who attended workshops as consultants. Various forms of communication with 'external actors' took place throughout the process, with differing purposes and outcomes.

Students' projects will be presented in greater detail below to provide a general illustration of the content of IUPs and process of their development in support of the *City of Pančevo Development Strategy: 2014-2020* (City of Pančevo, 2014).

4.4 IUPs Content Framework

Students' projects are grouped into seven thematic units: City that Lives on the River; Fair City and Active Communities; City of Enhanced Mobility; City of Culture and Active Heritage; Good Governance; Healthy, Accountable, and Safe City; and Good Living in the Country that correspond to aspects of the development vision for the city: "Pančevo is a place with many small and medium-sized businesses, well-equipped industrial zones, numerous shops, well-developed agricultural production, modern residential areas, a rich tourist offering, cleaner rivers, regulated riverbanks, promenades, beaches, more green spaces, and a developed old city core" (City of Pančevo, 2014, p.11).

All students' projects share a common key characteristic: they constitute an integrated response to the spatial, environmental, technological, and social potentials, as well as the limitations, needs of the community, and capabilities of the local government, summed up as 11 strategic development priorities in the Development Strategy. These projects offer solutions in various forms - whilst some predominantly deal with spatial interventions and changes to physical structure, others are focused on social or economic objectives and the design of institutions and mechanisms that facilitate change. Thus, they differ in both how detailed they are and in the spatial levels at which they are implemented. The key characteristics of these projects, by integration criteria from (i) to (vi), are shown in Table 4.1.

These IUPs constitute a set of mutually compatible and complementary projects in support of the *City of Pančevo Development Strategy: 2014-2020* (City of Pančevo, 2014). They are based on research of the regional, national, and local context, institutional framework, international documents, theoretical papers, and best practice examples. They differ in many respects, but, regardless of their variation, they are all rooted in the understanding that sustainable development is possible if various sectoral policies are integrated, co-ordination is allowed between various levels of governance, active and continuous co-operation is established between stakeholders when solutions are formulated and implemented, and various sources and modes of financing are integrated.

MASTER'S PROJECT TOPICS	INTEGRATED URBAN PROJECTS CONTENT FRAMEWORK: INTRODUCING NEW INSTRUMENTS: IUPS INTEGRATE					
	(i) Strategic Priorities	(ii) Policies	(iii) Spatial Levels	(iv) Level of Governance	(v) Stake-holders	(vi) Funding
City That Lives on the River						
Environmentally and socially sensitive tourist potentials' activation: Riverbanks	2, 5, 11	3, 4, 5, 6	4, 6	1, 2	2, 4, 5, 6	1, 2, 3, 8
Pančevo Green Meridian for flood risk management	3, 5, 8	1, 4, 5, 6	4, 9	1, 2	1, 5, 6, 7	2, 3, 8
Re-branding for sustainable development: Biophilic city beach	1, 2, 5, 11	4, 5	1, 4, 9	1, 2	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10	1, 2, 3, 8, 9
Partnering to revitalise First Steam Mill brownfield site as an artisan centre	1, 2, 5, 9, 11	4, 6, 8	1	1, 2, 3	2, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 4, 7, 8
Partnering to enhance SME business: Bathing area development	1, 2, 5, 10	4, 6	1, 9	1	2, 4, 5,	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9
Fair City and Active Communities						
Civic involvement in the activation of public spaces: Kotež 2 neighbourhood	5, 8, 10	4, 5	4, 8	1	2, 5	1, 4, 6
Neighbourhood Committees to facilitate activation of unused public spaces	5, 8, 10	4, 6	2, 4	1	2, 5, 10	1, 6
Allowing access to city centre office space for social entrepreneurship	1, 2, 9, 10	2, 4, 6	1, 4, 9	1	2, 3, 4, 5, 7,	1, 3, 8
Urban gardens as a sustainable mode of using abandoned spaces in Pančevo	3, 5, 9	4, 6	1, 4	1	1, 5, 7	1, 3, 8
City of Enhanced Mobility						
Cycling development: Joining the Eurovelo Network	2, 3, 5, 11	1, 2, 3, 4, 8	1, 6, 9, 10	1, 2, 3, 4	2, 3, 4, 5,	8
City of Culture and Active Heritage						
Development of tourist infrastructure: Inner city film tours	2, 3, 11	4, 6, 7	1, 6	1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9	1, 2, 3, 5, 8
Industrial tourism as a means of revitalising industr. heritage: City centre	1, 2, 3, 11	2, 4, 6, 7, 8	4, 6	1, 2, 3	5, 7, 8	1, 2, 3, 8
Creative industries as a means of revitalising industr. heritage: Glassworks	1, 2, 3, 11	2, 4, 6	1, 4	1, 2, 3	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 8
Cultural offering of Pančevo as part of the Danube Route cultural network	2, 9, 10, 11	2, 3, 4	1, 6, 9, 10	1, 2, 3, 4	4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 5, 8
Healthy, Accountable, and Safe City						
Mapping environmental pollutants based on GIS	5, 8, 10	2, 4	9	1, 2	3, 5, 7,	1, 2, 3, 8
Sustainable system to manage hazardous household and farm waste	3, 4, 5, 6	2, 4	1, 6, 9	1, 2, 3	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9	1, 3, 7, 8
Construction of a biogas facility	3, 5, 7	2, 4, 5	1, 6, 8	1, 2, 3	3, 5, 7	1, 2, 3, 5, 8
Good Living in the Country						
Co-operatives in support of organic farming: Dolovo village	2, 4, 5, 10	2, 4	7, 9	1, 2, 3	2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10	1, 2, 3, 5, 8
Rural tourism as an incentive for rural development: Ivanovo village	2, 9, 10	2, 3, 4	7, 9, 10	1, 2	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 3, 8
Good Governance						
E-platform for development ideas	1, 3, 8, 10	4	9	1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9	2, 3, 8
Increasing city block density through public-private partnerships	1, 2, 3, 10	2, 4, 6	2, 8	1	3, 5	1, 5
Integrated branding as an instrument for govern. sustainable local development	1, 2, 8, 10	4	9	1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9	1, 3, 8
Monitoring implementation of the Development Strategy	1, 8, 10	4	9	1	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7,	1

TABLE 4.1 IUP Content Framework for implementation of the 'City of Pančevo Development Strategy: 2014-2020'

>>>

TABLE LEGEND:

(i) Strategic priorities: 1. Improving the business environment, 2. Increasing employment, 3. Enhancing utility infrastructure, 4. Improving farming and rural infrastructure, 5. Enhancing quality of the environment, 6. Developing sustainable waste management, 7. Improving energy efficiency and use of alternative sources of energy, 8. Enhancing the planning process, 9. Improving the position of vulnerable groups, 10. Improving the operation of public services, 11. Tourism development.

(ii) Policies & documents: 1. EU policies / Danube Strategy, 2. National policies, 3. Regional policies, 4. Municipal policies, 5. General urban plan, 6. Detailed urban plan, 7. Urban design project, 8. Architectural design project.

(iii) Spatial level: 1. Land parcel, 2. Block, 3. Quarter, 4. Area, 5. Belt - corridor, 6. Network, 7. Village/ neighbourhood, 8. City, 9. Municipality, 9. Region

(iv) Level of government: 1. Local, 2. Provincial (regional), 3. National, 4. Subnational (Danube region).

(v) Stakeholders: 1. Citizens, 2. NGOs, 3. Entrepreneurs, 4. Professional associations, 5. Local authorities, 6. Provincial authorities, 7. National authorities, 8. International organisation (GIZ, REC, etc.), 9. Media, 10. Academy.

(vi) Sources of funding: 1. Local budget, 2. Provincial budget, 3. National budget, 4. Private funds & donors, 5. Private-sector capital, 6. Community funds, 7. International: donors' programs (GIZ, USAID, ECF, SC), 8. EU instruments (Cross-border cooperation, IPA, INTERREG, etc.), 9. International financial instruments (WBIF, CEB, EIB, EBRD, WB, KfW, Green for Growth Fund, commercial banks).

4.5 IUPs Process Framework



FIG. 4.3 Workshop (Image by authors, 2016)

The project development process is designed to allow continuous, active, and constructive communication amongst students (Figure 4.3); between students and mentors, the city administration and residents of Pančevo (Figure 4.4), and the professional and academic communities; and between Pančevo officials and consultants.

The process involved three key forms of communication between the stakeholders; these differed in their purpose, and, as such, in the methods and techniques of communication utilised:

- Information release: Dissemination of information via the media, exhibitions, and publications, designed to allow residents of Pančevo and the academic, professional, and broader communities to learn more about the topic chosen for co-operation and the results of joint efforts. Information was published in local and national broadcast and print media; designs were exhibited; and a publication outlining the outcomes of the process was also released (Milovanović Rodić, Maruna, & Čolić, 2016).

- Consultation: This entailed interactive lectures and organised visits to relevant institutions to facilitate exchange of information and so allow students, mentors, city officials, staff of Pančevo’s local institutions and associations, and consultants from national professional associations and planning institutions to gain knowledge and understanding of development-related issues and opportunities. The residents of Pančevo were also able to voice their views on the IUPs as part of the participatory budgeting process.
- Collaboration: Collaboration and joint work by students with one another and with mentors, city officials, staff of Pančevo institutions and associations, and consultants from national professional associations and planning institutions in the process of coming up with solutions.
- Results verification: The quality of the results achieved was subject to multiple forms and modes of professional and external verification, of which the most important included:
 - The projects were exhibited and received awards at the international Urban Planners Exhibition (Nis, Serbia, 2016), the international Landscape Architecture Exhibition (Belgrade, Serbia, 2017), where the publication won first prize in its category, and the national Salon of Architecture (Belgrade, Serbia, 2017).
 - The best-rated projects were included in the City of Pančevo participatory budgeting process for 2017, with the involvement of the students (who had by then graduated) and the mentoring team. The public and residents of Pančevo selected one project, and RSD 5 million (EUR 40,000) was allocated from the city’s 2017 budget for its implementation.
 - The Teaching and Scientific Council of the Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade, has accepted this model of collaboration between a local authority and a university to implement the City of Pančevo 2017 participatory budgeting project as a ‘scientific research result’, an outcome used in evaluating research quality, in the category of ‘New technical solution applied at the national level’, and has applied for its approval with the appropriate Scientific Committee of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development.
 - The City of Pančevo and the Faculty of Architecture have signed an agreement to continue collaboration in teaching. A new generation of students is engaged in developing their master’s projects in Pančevo on the topic of ‘Application of urban governance instruments for better use of public property at the local level’.

These types and modes of communication and knowledge verification, as well as the various approaches to external verification of results, are shown in Table 4.2.



FIG. 4.4 IUPs exhibition in Pancevo City Hall, July 2016 (Image by authors, 2016)

In addition to allowing students to understand the characteristics of the development environment and so enhance the quality of their projects, the process was also designed to permit an exchange of knowledge and experiences, and to disseminate the notion of the need for an integrated approach to governance and the characteristics of integrated urban projects as instruments of such governance.

INTEGRATED URBAN PROJECTS PROCESS FRAMEWORK			
Introducing new instruments: Communication and dissemination tools			
I. Information release	II. Consultation	III. Collaboration	IV. Result verification
<p>1. Media features on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pančevo local radio and television b. Serbian national broadcasting corporation c. <i>Pančevac</i> local weekly d. Faculty of Architecture web site e. Pančevo local government official web site f. eKapija business-oriented web site <p>2. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph</p> <p>3. Exhibitions of projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pančevo City Hall b. Faculty of Architecture ceremonial hall 	<p>1. Organised city tour with Pančevo Public Enterprises' officials</p> <p>2. Study visits to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CPBC b. Construction and Development Directorate c. SCTM <p>3. Experts' guest lectures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Member of Pančevo City Council b. SCTM expert in project budgeting <p>4. Public presentation and discussion of the projects as part of the participatory budgeting project</p> <p>5. Participation of Pančevo residents in the selection of a project to be implemented, as part of the local participatory budgeting project</p>	<p>1. Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 'Multi-level governance instruments' – students and mentors b. 'Formulation of research questions and topics' – students, mentors, Mayor, consultants c. 'Problems and potentials of local community development' –students and mentors d. 'Discussion of development ideas and project concepts' – students, mentors, consultants e. 'Project integration: Assessment of alignment, complementarity, and interdependence' –students and mentors <p>2. Collaboration in the selection of students' projects for presentation to residents of Pančevo</p>	<p>1. Professional events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. International Urban Planners Exhibition 2016 b. International Landscape Architecture Exhibition 2017(first prize) c. National Salon of Architecture 2017 <p>2. Submitted application for national best regional development ideas competition</p> <p>3. Collaboration between City of Pančevo and FA on the Participatory Budgeting Project for 2016</p> <p>4. Project admitted in the category of 'New technical solution applied at the national level'</p> <p>5. Agreement on collaboration in teaching between City of Pančevo and FA in 2017</p>

TABLE 4.2 IUPs Process Framework

5 Conclusions

Since students were engaged in real-life projects and the local context, they communicated with a range of experts, local politicians, NGO representatives, and citizens, as well as amongst themselves, in order to meet the complex demands of integrated urban development planning and contextualised urban governance. The final IUPs demonstrate a 'sophisticated exploration' of the chosen inner-city urban renewal, urban resilience and urban governance.

External evaluators have also voiced their opinions about the master's project:

"The students' projects constitute an up-to-date interpretation of a number of themes – cultural heritage, quality of life, local economic development, good governance, green mobility, intensive land use, capacity-building, regeneration, innovation [...] adjusted to the local context" (Nikezić, 2015, p. 5).

"An interdisciplinary approach can be seen in the students' works, albeit with a recognisable foundation of architectural and urban planning theory and practice, and where social, political, economic, and environmental dimensions of the assignment are clearly defined through the spatial aspect" (Đokić, 2015, p. 11).

In practice, the implementation of IUPs depends on a number of factors. It demands capacity and better understanding, interaction between various developmental sectors, and, particularly significantly,

formal support through the legal framework. There have recently been encouraging developments at the national level that indicate progress may be possible here as well. The draft of *Serbian Planning System Law*, proposed in 2016, defines the IUP as a policy instrument (Čolić, Milovanović Rodić, & Maruna, 2017). In addition, in May 2017, the Ministry of Construction, Transportation and Infrastructure announced the creation of a *National Sustainable and Integrated Urban Development Policy* (Radosavljević, Čolić, Mueller, Milić, & Trkulja, 2017) which is also envisaged to be implemented by means of IUPs.

The IUP as a new instrument for effective urban governance can introduce a more sustainable and resilient urban policy in Serbia. The results presented in this chapter show that a programme conceived in such a way can play a major part in further enhancing the quality of the Integrated Urbanism master's programme as it contributes to improving the level of academic knowledge and developing the professional competences of future planners, relying as it does so on up-to-date concepts, verified by using practical examples.

References

- Amin, A., & Thrift, N. (1995). Globalisation, 'institutional thickness' and the local economy. In P. Healey, S. Cameron, S. Davoudi, S. Graham, & A. Madaripour (Eds.), *Managing Cities* (pp. 91-108). Chichester, Sussex: John Wiley
- Bajić Brković, M. (2012). Societies in Transition and Planning Education: The Case of the West Balkan Countries. In B. Scholl (Ed.), *HESP: Higher Education in Spatial Planning* (pp. 154-168) Zurich: vdf Hochschulverlag ETH.
- Cities Alliance & N-AERUS. (2016). *N-AERUS recommendations for the New urban agenda. A Cities Alliance and N-AERUS Partnership Activity to facilitate the link between knowledge generation and global policy-making towards Habitat III*. Retrieved from http://www.citiesalliance.org/sites/citiesalliance.org/files/N-aerus_Recommendations-for-the-New-Urban-Agenda_DIGITAL.pdf
- Čolić, R. (2015). Integrated Urban Development Strategy as an Instrument for Supporting Urban Governance. *Serbian Architectural Journal*, 7(3), 317-342. Retrieved from <http://saj.rs/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/SAJ-2015-03-R-Colic.pdf>
- Čolić, R., Maruna, M., Milovanović Rodić, D., & Latović, K. (Eds.). (2015). *Integralni urbani projekti za upravljanje rizikom od poplava na primeru Obrenovca: katalog izložbe završnih radova generacije studenata 2013/14. [Integrated Urban Projects for Disaster Risk Management: Case Study of Obrenovac: Final Projects' Exhibition Catalogue: Generation of Students 2013/2014]*. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu, Arhitektonski fakultet.
- Čolić, R., Milovanović Rodić, D., & Maruna, M. (2017). Instrumenti upravljanja urbanim razvojem u novom legalnom okviru [Urban governance instruments in the new legal framework]. *Conference: The planning and normative protection of space and environment*. 11-13. May 2017, Subotica - Palić, Serbia.
- DiGaetano, A., & Strom, E. (2003). Comparative Urban Governance: An Integrated Approach. *Urban Affairs Review*, 38, 356-395. DOI: 10.1177/1078087402238806
- Dokić, V. (2015). Foreword. In Čolić, R., Maruna, M., Milovanović Rodić, D., & Latović, K. (Eds.). *Integralni urbani projekti za upravljanje rizikom od poplava na primeru Obrenovca: katalog izložbe završnih radova generacije studenata 2013/14. [Integrated Urban Projects for Disaster Risk Management: Case Study of Obrenovac: Final Projects' Exhibition Catalogue: Generation of Students 2013/2014]* (pp. 11). Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu, Arhitektonski fakultet.
- EU - European Union. (2007). Leipzig Charter on Sustainable Cities. Adopted at the Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial Cohesion in Leipzig on 24-25 May 2007. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/themes/urban/leipzig_charter.pdf
- EU - European Union. (2010). Toledo Declaration. Adopted at the Informal Ministerial Meeting on the Urban Development Declaration in Toledo on 22 June 2010. Retrieved from http://www.mdrap.ro/userfiles/declaratie_Toledo_en.pdf
- EU - European Union. (2011). Cities of Tomorrow. Challenges, visions, ways forward. European Commission, GD Regional Policy. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index_en.htm

- EU - European Union. (2016). Urban Agenda for the EU. Agreed at the Informal Meeting of EU Ministers Responsible for Urban Matters on 30 May 2016 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/themes/urban-development/agenda/pact-of-amsterdam.pdf
- Garcia, M. (2006). Citizenship, Practices and Urban Governance in European Cities. *Urban Studies*, 43(4), 745-765. DOI: 10.1080=00420980600597491
- Geppert, A., & Cotella, G. (Eds.). (2010). Quality Issues in a changing European Higher Education Area. *Planning Education*, 2. Reims: AESOP.
- Grad Pančevo (2014). Strategija razvoja grada Pančeva 2014-2020 [City of Pančevo (2014). City of Pančevo Development Strategy 2014-2020]. Retrieved from http://www.pancevo.rs/?wpfb_dl=886
- Halfani, M., McCarney, P., & Rodriguez, A. (1995). Towards an understanding of governance. In R. Stern, & J. Bell (Eds.). *Urban research in the developing world*. Perspective on the City, 4. (pp. 91-141). Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
- Harvey, D. (1989). From Managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler*, 71(1), 3-17. DOI: 10.2307/490503
- Healey, P. (1997). *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press.
- Healey, P. (1998). Building Institutional Capacity through Collaborative Approaches to Urban Planning. *Environment and Planning A*, 30(9), 1531-1546. DOI: 10.1068/a301531
- Healey, P. (2006a). Transforming governance: challenges of institutional adaptation and a new politics of space. *European Planning Studies*, 14, 299-320. Retrieved from http://fondazionefeltrinelli.it/app/uploads/2015/02/Healey_trasforming-governanceOK.pdf
- Healey, P. (2006b). *Urban Complexity and Spatial Planning: Towards a relational planning for our time*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hyden, G. (2011). Making the state responsive: rethinking governance theory and practice. In G. Hyden, & J. Samuel (Eds.). *Making the state responsive: Experience with democratic governance assessments*. (pp. 5-28). New York: UNDP. Retrieved from http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/documents/partners/civil_society/additional_documents/Africa%20Forum%20on%20Civil%20Society%20and%20Governance%20Assessments/Making%20the%20state%20responsive.pdf
- Innes, J. & Booher, D. (2003). Collaborative policy making: governance through dialogue. In M. Hajer, & H. Wagenaar, (Eds.), *Deliberative Policy Analysis: understanding governance in the network society*. (pp. 33-59). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Innes, J. & Booher, D. (2010). *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy*. London and New York: Routledge
- Jevtović, D., Čolić, R. & Cerhe, I. (2013). The Integrated Urban Development Strategy for the Inner City of Kragujevac: Kragujevac 2030. Kragujevac: Urban Planning Directorate Kragujevac. Retrieved from <http://www.urbanlandmanagement.rs/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Kragujevac2030.pdf>
- Le Gales, P. (1998). Regulations and Governance in European Cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 22(39), 482-506. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2427.00153
- Maruna, M. (2015). Proces izrade master rada kao poligon za dijalog i razvoj profesionalnih kapaciteta [The process of working on masters' theses as a stage for dialogue and professional capacity-building]. (pp. 39-57). In M. Maruna, & R. Čolić (Eds.). *Inovativni metodološki pristup izradi master rada: doprinos edukaciji profila urbaniste* [The innovative methodological approach to the development of master work: A contribution to the education of urban planners' profile]. Beograd: Arhitektonski fakultet & GIZ/AMBERO Beograd
- Maruna, M. & Čolić, R. (Eds.) (2014). *Integralni urbani projekti za razvoj centra Kragujevca: Katalog izložbe završnih radova generacije studenata 2012/13* [Integrated Urban Projects for Kragujevac Inner City Development: Final Works' Exhibition Catalogue: Generation of Students 2012/2013]. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu, Arhitektonski fakultet
- Maruna, M. & Čolić, R. (Eds.) (2015). *Inovativni metodološki pristup izradi master rada: doprinos edukaciji profila urbaniste* [The innovative methodological approach to the development of master work: A contribution to the education of urban planners profile]. Beograd: Arhitektonski fakultet & GIZ/AMBERO Beograd
- Maruna, M., Čolić, R., Fokdal, J., Zehner, C., Milovanović Rodić, D. & Lalović, K. (2015). Collaborative and practice oriented learning of disaster risk management in post socialist transition countries. In *XVI N-AERUS Conference: Who wins and who loses? Exploring and Learning from Transformations and Actors in the Cities of the South*. 19-21 November 2015, Dortmund, Germany. Retrieved from http://n-aerus.net/wp/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Dokumentation_N-Aerus_2015-part-1.pdf
- Milovanović Rodić, D., Maruna, M. & Čolić, R. (2016). *Instrumenti upravljanja integralnim urbanim razvojem na primeru grada Pančeva: Katalog izložbe završnih radova generacije studenata 2013/14* [Instruments for Integrated Urban Development – Case of Pancevo: Final Works' Exhibition Catalogue: Generation of Students 2013/2014]. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu, Arhitektonski fakultet

- Milovanović Rodić, D., Živković, J. & Lalović, K. (2013). Changing Architectural Education for Reaching Sustainable Future: A Contribution to The Discussion. *Spatium*, 29, pp. 75-80. DOI: 10.2298/SPAT1329075M
- Mironowicz, I. (Ed.). (2015). Excellence in Planning Education: Local, European and Global Perspective. *AESOP Planning Education*, 3. Retrieved from http://www.aesop-planning.eu/en_GB/planning-education
- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., González, S. & Swyngedouw, E. (2007). Introduction: Social innovation and Governance in European cities: Urban Development Between Path Dependency and Radical Innovation. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 14(3), 195-209. DOI: 10.1177/0969776407077737
- Müller, H., Werman B., Čolić, R., Fürst, A., Begović, B., Wirtz, J.C., Božić, B., Ferenčak, M. & Zeković, S. (2015) *Strengthening of Local Land Management in Serbia, Results of 6 Years of German-Serbian Cooperation, Module 1: Urban Land Mangement*, Belgrade: AMBERO Consulting Representative Office in Belgrade; Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit. Retrieved from
- Nacrt Zakona o planskom sistemu Srbije (2016) [The draft of Serbian Planning System Law]. Republika Srbija. Retrieved from http://paragraf.rs/nacrti_i_predlozi/141116-nacrt_zakona_o_planskom_sistemu_republike_srbije.html
- Nikezić, Z. (2015). Reviewer's report. In Čolić, R., Maruna, M., Milovanović Rodić, D., & Lalović, K. (Eds.). *Integralni urbani projekti za upravljanje rizikom od poplava na primeru Obrenovca: katalog izložbe završnih radova generacije studenata 2013/14*. [Integrated Urban Projects for Disaster Risk Management: Case Study of Obrenovac: Final Projects' Exhibition Catalogue: Generation of Students 2013/2014] (pp. 5). Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu, Arhitektonski fakultet.
- Perić, A. & Maruna, M. (2012). Predstavnicu društvene akcije u procesu regeneracije priobalja – slučaj braunfield lokacije "Luka Beograd" [Representatives of Social Action in The Process of Coastal Regeneration - The Case of Brownfield Location "Port of Belgrade]. *Sociologija i prostor*, 192 (1), 61-88. DOI 10.5673/sip.50.1.4
- Polèse, M. & Stren, R. E. (2000). *The social sustainability of cities: Diversity and the management of change*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Radosavljević, Z., Čolić, R., Mueller, H., Milić, Đ. & Trkulja, S. (2017). Polazišta za novu nacionalnu politiku održivog i integralnog urbanog razvoja u Republici Srbiji [Starting Points for a New National Integrated and Sustainable Urban Development Policy in Serbia]. *Conference: The planning and normative protection of space and environment*. 11-13. maj 2017, Subotica - Palić, Serbia.
- UN - United Nations (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved from http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf
- UN - United Nations (1992). Agenda 21. Adopted at the United Nations Conference on Environment & Development in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 3-14 June 1992. Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/Agenda21.pdf>
- UN-ESCAP - United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (2009). What is Good Governance? United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. Retrieved from <http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf>
- UN-HABITAT - United Nations Human Settlements Programme (1996). Habitat II Agenda. Adopted at the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) in Istanbul, Turkey, 3-14 June 1996. Retrieved from <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G96/025/00/PDF/G9602500.pdf?OpenElement>
- UN-HABITAT - United Nations Human Settlements Programme (2002). The global campaign for good urban governance. Concept Paper. Retrieved from <http://mirror.unhabitat.org/pmss/listItemDetails.aspx?publicationID=1537>
- UN-HABITAT - United Nations Human Settlements Programme (2017). New Urban Agenda. Adopted at the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) in Quito, Ecuador, on 20th October 2016. Retrieved from <https://www2.habitat3.org/bitcache/97ced11dcecef85d41f74043195e5472836f6291?vid=588897&disposition=inline&op=view>
- UNISDR - United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (2012). How to Make Cities More Resilient: A Handbook for Local Government Leaders. Geneva. Retrieved from http://www.unisdr.org/files/26462_handbookfinalonlineversion.pdf