



Sharing Cities Sweden

Setting Foundations for Evaluations and Learning

Lund, Sweden

February 2018



**Sharing
Cities
Sweden**

A NATIONAL PROGRAM
FOR THE **SHARING**
ECONOMY IN CITIES



Sharing Cities Sweden

Sharing Cities Sweden is a national program for the sharing economy in cities. The program aims to put Sweden on the map as a country that actively and critically works with the sharing economy in cities. The objectives of the program are to develop world-leading test-beds for the sharing economy in Stockholm, Gothenburg, Malmö and Umeå, and to develop a national node in order to significantly improve national and international cooperation and promote an exchange of experience on sharing cities.

Many thanks to all participants in the workshop, including: Lena Neij, Kes McCormick, Charlotte Leire, Nina Ahlbeck, Oksana Mont, Oscar Pelin, Lucie Zvolska, Johan Sandström, Philip Näslund, Anders Sandoff, Andrius Plepys, Jagdeep Singh, Yuliya Voytenko, and Steven Curtis.

Med stöd från:



FORMAS



STRATEGISKA
INNOVATIONS-
PROGRAM

ViableCities™

Smart, sustainable and attractive.

Sharing Cities Sweden is carried out within Viable Cities, a Swedish Innovation Programme for smart sustainable cities, jointly funded by the Swedish Innovation Agency (VINNOVA), the Swedish Energy Agency and the Swedish Research Council for Environment, Agricultural Sciences and Spatial Planning (FORMAS).

Summary

An evaluations workshop for Sharing Cities Sweden was organised in Lund on **26 February 2018**. The purpose of the event was 1) to share knowledge and experiences with evaluations of the sharing economy in cities, 2) to identify synergies and opportunities between the test-beds in Sharing Cities Sweden and ongoing research projects, and 3) to put in the place the foundations for evaluations and learning across the test-beds in Sharing Cities Sweden. Key research projects on the sharing economy in cities were presented and discussed in relation to the activities of the test-beds. The projects included Sharing Potential, Urban Sharing and Sharing and the City. The next evaluations workshops for 2018 are planned for Lund, Gothenburg and Stockholm.

Introduction to Evaluations, Lena Neij

- Welcome to the IIIIEE – International Institute for Industrial Environmental Economics where we have a long history of evaluations research.
- The purpose of evaluations is learning and accountability. It is important to feed results from evaluations into decision-making.
- Sharing Cities Sweden includes a range of actors involved in research and evaluating.
- Research on evaluations often focuses on impacts. However, there are so many other things that we can learn, and there are also other criteria to evaluate.
- The key words here are attribution and triangulation, especially if you aim to create learning. In Sharing Cities Sweden, a number of methods will be used.



The purpose of evaluations is learning and accountability.

Sharing Cities Sweden, Kes McCormick

- In Sharing Cities Sweden, it is of key importance that the test-beds work together on evaluations and that learning is in focus (see appendix 1).
- Also important is learning, both with those inside the test-beds, and also across Sweden and internationally.
- There is a diversity of sharing services and the program ambition is to develop, test and evaluate across different types of sharing services.
- The national node will support evaluations and synthesize findings. The national node will also organize mobile research labs and evaluations workshops.
- All the evaluations that are planned in the program will be mapped (painted) on a canvas to get an overview of full picture of the sharing economy in cities (see appendix 2).



The program ambition is to develop, test and evaluate across different types of sharing services.

Research on Sharing Cities, Oksana Mont

- Projects at the IIIIEE with a linkage to the sharing economy include:
 - REES – A four-year program looking at circular solutions in the manufacturing industry centred on market places, companies, market sector, business models and policy tools. Partners include universities, companies and cities.
 - URBAN RECONOMY – A three-year program looking at circularity and in particular on how collaborative consumption and production can contribute to closing material urban loops. Focuses on physical assets. Deliverables include shorter case studies (snapshots) from selected cities.
 - URBAN SHARING – A three-year program that discusses what is sustainable or not. Takes into consideration design, practices and processes. Case studies include London, Berlin, San Francisco where the focus lies on sharing organisations and the role of city councils. In this program a matrix of how sharing economy is institutionalized is developed. Focus sectors include mobility and transportation, spaces and physical goods.
 - SUSTAINABLE CONSUMPTION: FROM NICHE TO MAINSTREAM – A three-year program looking at the private, public and civil sectors in regards to how to reduce, share, and be more effective. Focusing on air travel, meat consumption, furniture, and home textiles.



*Access over ownership,
maximize resource
utilitization, distributed
resources and digital
platforms.*

- Three reasons to research the sharing economy: 1. A growing market (28 billion euro in Europe already in 2015); 2. Strong consumer interest (and willingness to participate); and 3. The cumulative funding of asset sharing in start-ups has increased dramatically since 2013.
- Typology and definition. Features of sharing economy include access over ownership, maximize resource utilitization, distributed resources and digital platforms.
- There are also other related definitions. The mapping of what is being shared and in what way is important.
- In the project Urban Sharing, the three pillars of their definitions are: peer-to-peer among strangers, the usage of idling physical assets and access over ownership.
- Platforms are a key. Platforms challenge prevalent institutions/corporations. For example they do not require providers to be professionals. Peers themselves are users and have control of what is happening. They are usually web-based. Revenue can be fixed but is sometimes not and is typically only about 1% but can for ride-sharing services be closer to 20%. Revenues do not end up with one big

conglomeration. Another difference compared to the traditional organisation of selling is peer reviews.

- The market orientation can be either for profit or non-profits. Sometimes they start with social or sustainable intentions, and it is not in their DNA to answer to investors. The other types maintain the social values but typically struggle and need support from cities or other actors.
- What sizes are there? There are mainly two types: large size and then many small ones. A dichotomy with different drivers and differences in how they address sustainability issues.
- In accommodation sector there are mainly three business models: free, reciprocal and rental.
- The market structure involves transactions peer-to-peer, business-to-peer, business-to-business, government-to-peer, government-to-government. There is a culturally determined diversity leading to diverse stakeholders, different issues, policies, norms. In the USA they are typically more economically driven whereas in Europe more non-profit.
- Compared to traditional forms of selling, the sharing economy includes many more types of actors: individual users, social enterprise and cooperatives, non-profit enterprises, for-profit enterprises, local communities and public sector/governments.
- They also have different motivations for sharing, something that differs among actors.
- City councils take very different roles in how to support sharing economy services.
- Pre-institutional work by sharing organisations: they seize the opportunity, find the space, then protect the space and then fill the space. When they protect the space, peers cannot transact outside the platform, and it is hard for government to enforce regulations and for scientists to assess claims and access data. Then they fill the space by constructing an alternative institutional logic, however in the research they see more of norms are changing, that reputation economy is emerging, working on referral, also on the platforms.
- Cities engage with sharing in different ways resulting in different dynamics.
 - The research has found that in **Berlin** there are grassroots start-ups, which are not supported by business councils, nor do they seek support from business councils.
 - In **London** there is also bottom-up movement, both for the for-profit and non-profit. There the sharing services have a different level of maturity and they have gotten together to create the industry association called “Sharing Economy UK” as a common voice and as a seal of approval. In London different boroughs (districts) there is a project to map what assets they own and what they can share, government-to-government.
 - In **San Francisco** there is a very vibrant top-down and bottom-up, which is yet to be researched. San Francisco is also headquarters of many of the larger companies.
 - In **Seoul** there is different, top-down driven approach. The mayor there sees sharing as a way to address sustainability issues and they have a special development department with 60 staff, as well as many resources. However, they also face the problem that people are not entirely supporting this idea.

Sharing City Malmö, Oscar Pelin

- Sharing City Malmö focuses on Sege Park, Entré and Häggen. Entré is owned by Trianon and with a strong social agenda.
- The development process in Sege Park: In parallel to the ordinary process they also apply a different one called “together” aiming to build trust between actors as well as innovation competition. The Malmö Innovation Arena (MIA) focuses on dialogues. They see that the window of opportunity is now.
- Challenges include time and dependency on processes with many stakeholders. Therefore they need to limit the scope of services.
- The phases for Sege Park are: planning, construction (2020-2025), initial residents (2021-2022), fully developed/constructed (2025).
- The dialogues allow them to map experiences from different developers. Developers have their own apps for sharing however it is difficult to have the apps to link to each other in an easy way. Malmö is now focusing on 30 different sharing solutions.
- Dialogues with developers:
 - Affordability analysing the lives of residents.
 - Demand analysis looking at what do people actually want from sharing solutions.
 - Stable supply, focusing on entrepreneurs who have a business model that function. Here the cornerstone concept helps scouting entrepreneurs.



*Malmö is now
focusing on 30
different sharing
solutions.*

Sharing City Umeå, Johan Sandström and Philip Näslund

- Sharing City Umeå will evaluate sharing services in the city.
- Existing services include Delbar (peer-to-peer) and Fritidsbanken (exist also in other cities) and U-bike (started by the city). Sharing services in the planning are:
 - Green areas (Akademiska Hus and the university are looking into sharing green areas to allow them to be used by others in addition to the students).
 - Service hubs in housing areas (Umeå Energi, UPAB, VIVA, streets and parks). Focus on business models, location planning for service hubs, develop U-bike with possibility to integrate electric cargo bikes.
 - Dela Umeå – under the theme circular economy. It focuses on how can everyone contribute to sharing in Umeå. Digital meeting places. Share business ideas in one creative platform/meeting place (done with Coompanion). Show room, event space and mobile room, for sharing, reuse and recycling. Also for pop-ups for sharing services in central town.

- Activities will be evaluated by responsible partners in the project, and will also engage with Umeå University on their research projects. One example could be that the university can get a role in the workshop, student work, and follow up of Sharing City Umeå through new research projects with external funding. One example is U-Bike: look at user numbers and possibilities to scale it up by considering bookings, length, distance, target group and user satisfaction, taking data from the booking system and surveys. Also using deeper follow-up studies with student work focusing on pre-conditions for external actors to join and the interest among external actors to start lending on their own, market and needs.



Umeå is evaluating existing and planned sharing services in the city.

Sharing City Göteborg, Anders Sandoff

- Gothenburg has both established and new sharing initiatives. Also have more holistic project with smart maps. Smaller existing include Delamera, Cykelkøk, Growgbg, Klädoteket (collaborations with designers and not only lending/selling clothes), and Meet the locals.
- New initiatives include Testbädd Södra Älvstranden, Folkspace, and Dela kök Ringön, Co-office and Shared Space. The latter is a strategic project in Akademiska Hus that should be viable for the whole country with large potential to scale up, focusing on ICT and the infrastructure behind the sharing of space.



Evaluations so far aim to strengthen and develop the sharing economy in Gothenburg.

- Evaluations so far include formative evaluations with the purpose to strengthen and develop the sharing economy in Gothenburg. This has three perspectives: users, business models (considering whether it is a business activity or a social initiative) and the city. Planned outputs are ten thesis projects, some case studies and a synthesis. There will also be supplementary self-evaluations and other research projects.

Evaluating Sharing Cities, Andrius Plepys and Jagdeep Singh

- This research project is part of the Re:source program that analyses the sharing potential in Sweden. The purpose is to increase the sharing economy in Sweden and understand the factors to scale it up. The reference group to the project includes companies. The research approach is structured in five stages: 1. Current situation (transport, localities, tools); 2. Potential for sharing; 3. Contribution to waste prevention and sustainable development; 4. Factors for scaling up and positive effects; and 5. Recommendations to other actors. The project is starting now.
- Questions include: Should cities evaluate the sharing economy? What resource re-allocations are induced in the sharing economy? Changes in economic flows, changes in material flows.
- Induced effects? Changed resource intensities, carbon footprints, waste; Changed income, expenditure, employment. Effects are both indirect and direct. Maybe less relevant to ask “how much does the sharing economy contribute to environmental improvement” but rather ask “how does it affect” environmental goals.
- Behavioural responses are one type of effect. Sharing economy and consumption. We expect it to shrink but we do not know how. It is also location specific and subject to fashion trends.



What resource re-allocations are induced in the sharing economy?

- One example is the case of Vienna, car-sharing and consumption footprint. The studied net-effect proved to be not so great.
- There are also economic side effects, which should be relevant to the cities. Studies on AirBnB show that hosts earn one or two months of extra income.
- Studies from New Orleans in the USA also show that sharing economy creates jobs.
- Also, there are indirect effects that business also benefits from the sharing economy as well as negative effects that the sharing economy is “impacting” local economies.

- Indirect effects are manifold and have unique patterns and can be more or less predictable. These can include tax revenues, quality of life, social welfare and possible effects on products and technologies.
- We need a better understanding on the effects on the production and the consumption sides, including business models, offerings, pricing, and users preferences.
- The greatest problem is data availability. Methods are less of a problem.
- Evaluation aspects include environmental indicators, economic indicators, social indicators, and the evaluation scope. Including normative question, such as: should we do it if it is good for one city and not for another?
- Information and data needs: consumer behaviour data (expenditure pattern, preferences, substitution), product data (product lifecycle information, performance and lifetime), design and operation sharing schemes.



We need a better understanding on the effects on the production and the consumption sides.

Sharing and the City, Yuliya Voytenko

- This project examines the role of the government in the initiation, implementation and institutionalisation of sharing organisations across cities in Europe. Cities included are Malmö, Rotterdam and one more city, yet to be decided.
- The research objectives are 1. Initiation = to look how city governments engage with sharing based on their visions and strategies, 2. Implementation = which channels do cities employ to engage with sharing, 3. Institutionalisation = what is the role of the cities in the institutionalisation of sharing.
- Looking at the four roles of the city that relate to governing. To different degrees, the city can act as follows:
 - **Regulator** – governing by authority. A vague terrain, many uncertainties, examples are specific regulations for unwanted and disruptive urban sharing organisations (USOs) such as time caps for renting out in Berlin or London.
 - **Provider** – governing by provision (host, funder). A limited role in Berlin and London, mostly as host. A prominent role in Malmö.
 - **Enabler** – governing through enabling (partner, communicator, match-maker). In London and Berlin there is hope for more support.
 - **Consumer** – originally via public procurement. But more, London Croydon and Zipcar services for municipal employees, a project by London waste and recycling board on sharing of high value low use assets between boroughs (districts).

- Additional findings include that in London and Berlin larger for-profit USOs receive various support from the city more often than non-profit. However in Malmö it is the other way around.



What are the roles of city governments in the sharing economy?

- If seen as potential solutions to urban sustainability challenges or as contributing to urban agendas, USOs tend to attract more interest from the city governments. If managed properly, USOs have a potential to improve environmental and social conditions in cities, however support for such USOs remain fragmented. Suggestion: cities should continue to regulate larger USOs on a case-by-case basis AND provide supportive mechanisms for smaller bottom-up USOs.

Urban Sharing, Steven Curtis

- Urban Sharing is a five-year project with seven researchers focusing on five cities.
- The aim and objectives include the design (the first international cross-city and cross-sectoral study), sustainability (multi-dimensional sustainability evaluation frameworks for assessing impacts and claims), and institutionalisation (high upscale).



Peer to peer, physical goods, access, and rivalrous.

- The study uses mobile research labs: In-situ analysis, experience and observations. The different researchers have different roles because of their different theoretical lenses, reflections, and recordings.
- The project studies what makes each city unique with deep immersion (1 month + 1 researcher, embedded in city context).

- Definition of sharing initiatives are discussed with a literature study based on 290 papers, analysing how practitioners place themselves in the sharing economy generating a matrix with sector and types of users/providers.
- The project views the diversity in definitions but they are interested in sustainability, so focusing on: peer to peer, physical goods, access (no transfer of ownership unless it is non-reconsumable goods such as food), rivalrous, should be available online.

APPENDIX 1

Workshop on “Evaluating the sharing economy in cities: Learning from projects at the IIIEE”

Date and time: 26 February, 11.00-16.00

Location: IIIEE, Lund University

Agenda

- 10.45-11.00 Coffee*
- 11.00-11.15 Evaluations approach for Sharing Cities Sweden. Assoc. Prof. Kes McCormick*
- 11.15-11.45 What are evaluations? An introduction. Prof. Lena Neij*
- 11.45-12.15 Projects on evaluations within sharing economy/cities at the IIIEE. Prof. Oksana Mont*
- 12.15-12.45 Lunch*
- 12.45-13.45 Presentations from test-beds about conducted and planned evaluations*
- Gothenburg*
 - Malmö*
 - Umeå*
 - Stockholm*
- 13.45-14.45 Presentations of key projects at the IIIEE*
- Urban Sharing (ERC). Steven Curtis*
 - Sharing Potential (Swedish Energy Agency). Andrius Plepys and Jagdeep Singh*
 - Sharing and the City (FORMAS). Yuliya Voytenko*
- 14.45-15.00 Fika*
- 15.00-16.00 Final discussion with the test-beds*
- How to identify common elements to include in the evaluations across the test-beds on the sharing economy/cities?*
 - How to collate comparable information from evaluations of the sharing economy/cities?*
 - How to develop evaluations on energy and climate impacts from the sharing economy/cities?*

APPENDIX 2

	National node			
	Stockholm test-bed	Malmö test-bed	Gothenburg test-bed	Umeå test-bed
Energy and climate. Hur bidrar projektet till en minskad energi och klimatpåverkan?				
Resource use. Hur bidrar projektet till en minskad resursanvändning?				
Economic effects. Vilka ekonomiska effekter har delningstjänsten?				
Lifestyles and behaviour. Hur påverkar delningstjänsterna beteenden, livsstil och/eller attityder/värderingar?				
ICT solutions. Vilka erfarenheter har vi av olika typer av IKT-plattformar?				
Institutions and regulations. Vad kräver projektet i form av nya institutioner och regelverk?				
Government processes. Hur påverkas befintliga processer inom stat/kommun/stadsdel?				
Government support. Hur kan stat/stad stödja processer för initiering och implementering?				
Active entrepreneurship. Hur stödjer vi ett aktivt entreprenörskap för denna typ av delningstjänst?				
Small cities and rural areas. I vilken omfattning kan denna modell för delningsekonomi appliceras i mindre städer och på landsbygden?				