

Modes of Governance in Local Adaptation to Climate Change: Networks Bound by Hierarchy and Market Motivation?

Paweł Swianiewicz

Department of Local Development and Policy

Faculty of Geography and Regional Studies

University of Warsaw



UW³
Dwa stulecia
Dobry początek



Climate change policies in conduct of local business

- Increasing awareness of the issue
- In some cases strengthened by specific local challenges (such as floods)
- Incentive role of EU funds (especially 2013-2020 perspective)
- On the other hand
 - Frequent doubts of local politicians and bureaucrats concerning the climate change
 - Even more skeptical opinions of their electorate
 - CBOS – 2014 – 34% doubt in climate change, 46% doubt if the change is a related to human activity
 - Weak pressure from below (except of relatively small groups of specialised NGOs)
- How it all reflects in modes of local governance?

Modes of governance

- Hierarchy
 - Formal, vertical relationship
 - Limited (and mainly formal) communication among policy actors
 - Dominance of „power over”
- Market
 - Knowledge and resources utilized to maximize gains
 - Usually gains related to financial or economic profits
 - But in some models extended also to market logic of collecting political capital
- Network
 - „Power to” instead of „power over”
 - Mobilizing and combining resource of numerous actors (multi-level and multi-sector)
 - Numerous, horizontal relationship based on negotiations and consensus (arguing or bargaining)
 - Partnership as the key value

Empirical material

- Four case studies:
 - Bydgoszcz (17 interviews)
 - Sandomierz (12 interviews)
 - Sopot (13 interviews)
 - Słupsk (14 interviews)
- Mostly qualitative material
 - Discourse analysis of local documents
 - In-depth interviews with: mayors, councillors, local administration, managers in public utilities, NGO representatives
 - Also: quantitative survey of Polish municipalities

Main observations on climate change policies

	Bydgoszcz	Sandomierz	Sopot	Słupsk
Adaptation	Marginal (flood)	Dominant (flood, rain-water)	Dominant (rain-water)	Less important
Mitigation	Dominant (low emission)	Marginal (low emission, bike transport)	Less important (low emission)	Dominant as result of political choice of the mayor (low emission, bike-transport, renewable energy)
Strategy	One of pioneers but weak mainstreaming	Not clear	Participation in ME project	Request of the mayor to ME
Motivation	EU funds But also willingness to develop intl. co-operation	Vulnerability But also EU funds	EU funds Maintaining spa status	Political choice, not fully internalized by the administration
Steering	Mid-level administrative management	Rather political (impact of city mayor)	No steering (isolated, semi-spontaneous processes)	Clearly political

Policy management - main observations

- Weak communication among departments in local administration
- Weak knowledge of projects cities participate in (even of a strategic character)
- No mainstreaming of climate change policies
- Access to EU funds as main motivation
 - Sopot – spa status and dependence on tourists as additional „market motivation” of mitigation activities
- But individual politicians and bureaucrats with more endogenous motivations
 - The case of Słupsk – top-down insemination of the importance of policy and networking style of operation?

Modes of governance - conclusions

- The nature of challenge requires networking and going beyond the city hall
- Signs of (weak) inter-municipal (metropolitan) co-operation in Sopot (almost none in remaining cases)
- But low „endogenous motivation” does not stimulate bottom-up networking.
- Actual policies mainly through the hierarchical style of management
- „Market motivation” of the access to EU funds in the background

Poland and Norway – differences in modes of governance

- Multi-level governance
 - Poland – induced by EU (almost exclusively)
 - Role of national level (strategies for large cities)
 - Role of regions as managing authorities of ROP
 - Norway – more active role of central government
- Political vs administrative steering
 - Poland – dominant position of mayors
 - Norway – larger role of professionals, administration
 - Factors beyond:
 - Different types of local political leadership (strong mayor vs. collective model)
 - Different political and administrative cultures
- Cases of climate policy mainstreaming in Norway; practically absent in Poland