

Policy Paper - Territorial / Bioregional Partnerships

List of abbreviations:

GHG	Greenhouse gas emissions
CPR	Commons Provision Regulation
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
EU	European Union
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
CLLD/LEADER	Community-Led Local Development
LAG	Local Action Groups
LDS	Long-term Development Strategy
CLI	Community-led Initiative
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
EESC	European Economic and Social Committee
EGD	European Green Deal
DE	Doughnut Economy
DG	Directorate General
EIPC	European Innovation Partnership for Climate and Communities
EC	European Commission
EP	European Parliament
EIP	European Innovation Partnership
NGO	Non Governmental Organisations

1. Challenges

Planetary Health Crisis

The EU, as with the rest of the world, is facing multiple crises, which can only be overcome through transformative changes in the way people relate to each other and to their living environments. The planetary health crisis, which has many different faces, is negatively impacting the wellbeing of both current and future generations. Marginalized communities in the Global South but also those here in Europe are the ones most affected by the destruction of our ecosystems. One of the many ecological effects of climate change can be observed in tropical territories, which are considered bioregulation zones of temperatures. Here, population displacement and the expansion of species of high temperatures and the expansion of species of high temperatures to Andean ecosystems can lead to the transmission of potential dangerous viruses and protozoa parasites that can promote pathological cases in populations without healthcare access. Young people are also particularly vulnerable in the face of the drastic changes in the environment. The prognosis of scientists is that if we don't manage to drastically reduce our GHG emissions, stop abusing the environment and finally begin to preserve and regenerate our natural resources, the world is heading towards a future that will make life on earth difficult to impossible.

Economic and social disparities

Another interlinked trend is the continuous concentration of people, financial resources, technology, economic activities, land, infrastructures and services. Amongst the most important growth-poles are cities, affluent nation states and affluent regions within nation states, all characterized by the presence of economically powerful, large and competitive corporations. The latter are themselves often hierarchically structured, which leads to further centralization of wealth and power in individuals.

The EU's Territorial Agenda analyzes that the *“increasing economic and social disparities between places and between people along with environmental risks and pressures (...) are driven by economies of scale, imbalanced access to markets and qualified labour, as well as disparities in quality of governance and public services.”* (DG Territory, 2020, p.6). Within Europe, these disparities are to a significant extent expressed in the depletion of rural areas, characterized by demographic challenges and a lack of access to a range of goods, including basic infrastructure, public services, employment, a fair income, credit and investment and a healthy environment and diet. Especially within the context of rural development, a relevant example of this trend is the agricultural sector, which has turned into a playing field for large-scale, industrialized agricultural companies, driven by their continuous investment into land and fossil-fuel based technologies, which are dangerously harmful for the planet. The Common Agricultural Policy of the EU (CAP) with its direct payments linked to land ownership has supported and enabled this problematic development.

Outside the EU, the extent of social inequality resulting from centralized wealth in the Global North is even dramatically worse. In face of the countless people who are working under inhumane conditions, ousted from the market, lured into dependent relationships, forced to migrate and starving to death, it is long overdue that the SDGs are finally implemented consistently. Last but not least, it is also in the interest of protecting Europe's democratic values, firstly, because the EU claims to be a central force for the preservation and enforcement of human rights, which are currently abused on the basis of its (missing) regulations and secondly, because the diverse divisions are a threat to European democracy. These divisions are between the urban and rural, big and small, green and farming/industry/jobs, welfare and poverty and others and can bring forward the “left behinds”, “forgotten” and marginalised, who can have low trust in society and are more open to anti-society movements and far right extremism.

Concentration of political decision-making power and corruption

The centralization of power and resources was facilitated by nation states, who assisted in the emergence of an energy- and resource-intensive, industrialized, globalized, growth-based and profit-driven economy, through political narratives on the development aims of the governed societies and their associated political programs. Nation states themselves are entities who centralize political power, and in particular the power to make decisions, which lead to political programmes, laws and regulations, that are then implemented at lower levels.

The hierarchical structures within the nation state and the economy inevitably cause inequalities and dependencies, which can be abused for the sake of the domination of people, both internally and externally. The history of colonization and imperialism has shown how nation states have exercised power over the populations in other parts of the world, as they emerged “*in conjunction with the first wave of globalisation and the height of European colonialism in the mid nineteenth century*” (Galvan-Alvarez, 2020, p. 1)

The dependencies that result from centralization and globalisation, lead to unequally distributed vulnerability, for example with regards to the dangers of disruptions in the supply-chain, which may arise, for example, from a pandemic (DG Territory, 2020, p.10), an oil crisis or planned attacks.

Another problem with regard to the centralization of political power, lies within its susceptibility to being influenced by economic interests. Since political decision-makers make decisions on the wealth of affluent economic stakeholders, it stands to reason that if the latter want to protect or increase their wealth, they will try to do so through gaining political influence. It is a widely known problem that lobbying and corruption are part of the political agenda, and that decisions are often not made in the interest of the whole population and on the basis of scientific facts. Even without accusing politicians of bad faith and self-serving actions, it is arguable that politicians and governments are often acting in the interest of protecting the prosperity of their own nations. This however, if it comes at the cost of the well-being of other populations, is also unethical. That this is clearly the case, is also demonstrated by the fact that the impacts of the climate crisis hit those countries and populations the hardest which have contributed to it the least.

2. Solutions

Multi-level governance and decentralization of political power

In order to counteract the political mismanagement resulting from the described political-economic systems, a decentralization of power is a necessary venture.

Fortunately, this is in line with the European Commission's priorities for the budget of 2021-2027, with one of the 5 policy goals being to bring “*Europe closer to citizens by fostering the sustainable and integrated development of all types of territories and local initiatives*”. (European Commission n.d.) The Territorial Agenda 2030 lays out specifically how this can be achieved through a place-based approach to policy making, with vertical coordination taking place amongst the local communities and their citizens, civil society, businesses and research institutions and horizontal coordination amongst the different levels of government.¹ This political direction can also be reconciled with scientific findings of various researchers. The economist and Nobel prize winner Elinor Ostrom argues that global solutions to reduce Greenhouse gas emissions negotiated at a global level, if not backed up by a variety of efforts at national, regional, and local levels, are not guaranteed to work well (Ostrom, 2010, p. 550). Ostrom therefore pledges for polycentric systems of governance - also known as multi-level-governance - characterized by multiple governing authorities at differing scales, with each unit exercising considerable independence to make norms and

¹ Link to the Cff Policy Paper on Working with Nature

rules (Ostrom, 2010, p. 552). Martin Jänicke outlines the role and potential of the different levels within the multi-level system for global climate governance, in particular recognising that the lowest level of the system for multi-level governance; the level of rural communities - has become increasingly relevant (Jänicke, 2017, p. 112). Jänicke makes a series of policy recommendations, including capacity building at all levels, supporting lower levels of government, horizontal approaches, networking and partnerships, multi-actor monitoring and evaluation practices. Groulx et al, in analysing how citizens' place attachments and place identity are linked to their perceptions of local climate change, suggest that climate change messaging must be made socially salient and must capture the community's unique social values (Groulx et al., 2014, p. 145). Schweizer *et al* support the above view on climate change messaging with an assertion, based on their research findings, that messages about climate change complexity and impacts resonate when they are nested in the cultural values and beliefs of the audience and are integrated with the experiential meaningfulness of place (Schweizer et al., 2013, p. 43).

Multi-level Governance within the EU legislative framework

Within the EU funding framework of the CPR regulation, multi-level-governance is already a reality. Member States are required to form Partnerships in a transparent and inclusive manner with national stakeholders, including public authorities at the local and regional levels, economic partners, civil society organisations, and research organisations and universities. Their Partnership Agreements, which lay out different operational programmes, are to be formulated in line with the CPR regulation, the SDGs and the Paris Agreements.

Within this framework, Local Development Strategies - developed under the CLLD/LEADER approach are produced by Local Action Groups (LAGs), which are constituted at the sub-regional level by local stakeholders, who represent local public and private socio-economic interests. Importantly, the regulation requires that the groups are inclusive and non-discriminatory while engaging the diversity of local stakeholders, who are identified through a mapping and analysis process. (European Parliament; European Council, 2021) The area and population that they cover are not defined along administrative boundaries, but are decided upon by the LAG, taking into account physical and geographical factors, as well as an area's cultural identity, common social issues and concentrations of economic activities (European Commission, 2018, p.24) Jointly, these actors develop "*integrated and multi-sectoral area-based local development strategies, designed taking into consideration local needs and potential*" (Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy, 2014, p.2) Autonomy within communities creates ownership and a spirit of doing and can be beneficial for the overall result. Coherence with the EU's priorities is ensured as the LAGs operate within the framework of the partnership agreements and their LDS are to be selected and approved by the managing authorities.

Benefits and impact of the bottom-up action of community-led initiatives

Community-led local development has been practiced for decades by the movement of community-led initiatives, represented by ECOLISE at the European level. It can have diverse benefits in the social, ecological and economic dimensions of sustainability, as

shown in ECOLISE's report giving an overview of the movement of CLIs, based on existing research. (Penha-Lopes et al., 2019)

It demonstrates that CLIs bring about social benefits, *“including increased social capital, civic participation through volunteering, and, not uncommonly, inclusion. Economic benefits include creation of direct and indirect employment, along with a range of more general benefits, tangible and intangible, to local economies. Politically, they employ various sophisticated methods of inclusive governance that could potentially form the basis of wider direct and participatory democracy”* (Penha-Lopes et al. 2019 b) p. 5)

With regards to CLIs ecological impact, it's important to note that *“ecological footprints of ecovillages and other intentional communities tend to be a fraction of national averages as a result of infrastructural and behavioural measures. Carbon footprints of CLIs and individual participants and beneficiaries also tend to be measurably lower than national averages. This is particularly due to promoting renewable energy and low energy lifestyles, enabling the use of low-carbon transportation, and encouraging more plant-based diets.”* (Penha-Lopes et al. 2019 b), p.5) Thus, CLIs can make a significant contribution to the society's overall reductions in environmental impacts by embodying and promoting voluntary, locally-led solutions, while encouraging wider changes and demonstrating that a bottom-up and community-based transition towards sustainability is possible (Celata et al., 2019, p. 909).

To conclude, CLIs are important actors for sustainable development and with their work directly contributing to most of the SDGs, amongst other things by decoupling wellbeing from material prosperity. (Penha-Lopes et al. 2019, b) p.5)

It may be useful to view community-led climate activities as *grassroots innovation niches* whereby, *“grassroots innovations’ are networks of activists and organisations generating novel bottom–up solutions for sustainable development; solutions that respond to the local situation and the interests and values of the communities involved’* (Seyfang and Smith, 2007, p. 585). Niches, by contrast, are radical, and succession to radical change tends to begin within a network of pioneering organisations, technologies and users that form a niche practice on the margins (Seyfang and Smith, 2007, p. 588). The niche framework provides a potentially fruitful bridge between analyses of grassroots initiatives as civil society activities and a role for them in sustainable innovation policy (Seyfang and Smith, 2007, p. 590). Viewing community-led activity as innovation niches improves our understanding of the potential and needs of grassroots initiatives while offering insights into the challenges they face and their possible solutions (Seyfang and Smith, 2007, p. 585).

Inspiration for community-led climate action may be drawn from the community-led initiatives organized within the various member organizations of ECOLISE, the communities participating in the Communities for Future programme and beyond. The European Commission also recognizes the importance of the movement of environmentally friendly community-led approaches, e.g. in the field of urban CLLD, where they *“have demonstrated how community management can bring forward and implement solutions for housing, sustainable food and energy production and distribution, as illustrated by the Transition Town movement”*, (European Commission, 2018, p. 51) which is represented in the membership of ECOLISE.

The model put forward by the People's Transition can be taken as another source of inspiration. It views climate action as an enabler of local development, gives people and communities ownership of the transition to zero carbon societies and enhances public support for a Just Transition by tackling inequality and by raising standards of living through the delivery of climate solutions (TASC and FEPS, 2020, p. 4). The People's Transition prioritises the inclusion of people and communities in the design, planning and implementation of the transition to zero carbon societies, viewing this as not simply the fairest but also the fastest approach (TASC and FEPS, 2020, p. 4).

Territorial / Bioregional Partnerships

However, while some environmental action can be taken at the scale of a local community, the solutions often still depend on and are intertwined with the global market, whose social and environmental problems were outlined at the beginning of this paper.

Therefore, it is crucial to implement the principles and practices of community-led initiatives at the regional level, which is precisely why the CLLD approach is so appropriate for implementing our vision. By facilitating exchange of ideas, knowledge and innovations territorial partnerships offer a framework for the scaling out of innovative community-led action as it may create a positive circle with impact on bigger territorial areas leading to a more systemic change. Moreover, the partnerships at territorial level allow for the scaling up of solutions, by engaging and enabling the population of the defined area to create localized, circular economies.

Bioregional Partnerships are a specific form of territorial partnerships that are explicitly geared to embody the principles described in this paper. The purpose of these partnerships is to re-align with nature's principles of creating conditions conducive to life, and thus re-inhabiting the Earth by means of re-localizing decision-making processes and the economy. (Wahl, 2020, b) In order to achieve the goal of harmonious integration into ecosystems, the territory is defined on the basis of geographic and biophysical features and is therefore called bioregion. While acting local is central to bioregionalism, thinking global is also an indispensable part of it. The vision of bioregional regeneration is one that stands firmly for solidarity with the human population and for cooperation at larger scales. In recognition of the suffering caused through colonization and other forms of oppression, bioregionalism is a call for healing all relationships, both between humans and nature and humans and humans. This aim is pursued by the regeneration of the ecosystems,² the empowerment of regions across the globe to be in charge of the development of their regions, the acknowledgement and utilization of the wisdom of indigenous cultures and the offering of support for the oppressed. (Wahl, 2020, a)

Place-based, circular and well-being economy

As already indicated, an important component of the partnerships is the localization of the economy. In line with the EU Commission's priorities and programmes for 2021-2027, we promote a greener, low-carbon transitioning towards a net zero carbon economy that increases resilience and self-sufficiency through the means of establishing place-based

² As explained in the CfF policy paper on Working with Nature

circular economies. The movement of CLIs has been at the forefront of demonstrating practices of circular economy, which “*aims to close material and energy loops through long-lasting design, maintenance, repair, reuse, remanufacturing, refurbishing and recycling.*” (DG Territory 2020, p.12) A practical example of the combined localization of decision-making and the economy, also geared at creating well-being for all, are food policy councils. These are bottom-up associations of local stakeholders, from different sectors, who work together to plan and implement local, environmentally sustainable food production, distribution and consumption.

Theoretical models provide frameworks for the realization of the re-localization of the economy. The model of the Doughnut Economy, as created by Kate Raworth, advocates for a move away from a fixation on GDP as the first measure of economic progress (Raworth, 2017, p. 219). Instead, Raworth offers a more ambitious and global economic goal: meeting the needs of all within the means of the planet by setting a challenge to create local to global economies that ensure that no one falls short on life’s essentials – from food and housing to healthcare and political voice – while safeguarding Earth’s life-giving systems, from a stable climate and fertile soils to healthy oceans and a protective ozone layer (Raworth, 2017, p. 219). Another viable model is the economy for the common, which advocates for the establishment of market rules that incentivize and support economic activities that serve socio-ecological regeneration and hinder those that lead to the exploitation of people and nature. Being in line with these models, we support the call of the EESC for a well-being economy, which is essentially characterized by measuring economic progress beyond traditional indicators of GDP.

3. Call-to-Action

Now that it’s clear what the elements of our vision for territorial/bioregional partnerships are, it is time for its implementation and your support is needed. Whether you are a political decision-maker at the EU, national, regional or local level; an entrepreneur; employee; unemployed; researcher or farmer, we call on you to engage with our vision for territorial/bioregional partnerships. In this sense, the following issues regarding the development of territorial / bioregional partnerships should be addressed:

1. Research and learning: A supportive network for effective community-led climate and environmental action facilitates and encourages the search for and adoption of place-based solutions to be implemented at the local and regional scale, while recognizing that there is no ‘one-size-fits-all’ model for climate action at the local level and that design solutions which may work in one jurisdiction may not be effective in another. Requirements for developing climate change solutions at the community level include generating an engaging, accessible process, appropriate, effective responses that are personally relevant and motivating and understandable and salient information for local public and decision-makers (Sheppard et al., 2011, pp. 401–402). Horizon projects should be more available to local actions and paid involvement. Living labs³ and action-research should be given a bigger space in the implementation of the Horizon programs. Pilot projects at the local and regional level aimed

³ Link with the CfF Policy Paper on Working with Nature

at learning how to design integrated funding mechanisms, how to engage citizens in planning and how to build localized, circular, well-being economies should be implemented.

2. Knowledge and innovation transfer: The identified and developed best practices need to be shared and replicated to inspire joint actions across Europe, as suggested in the Territorial Agenda. Regional, national and international community forums, such as the Communities for Future platform facilitate the sharing of experience and knowledge. To achieve this, the barriers within the funding schemes that prevent the replication of innovations, with an existing pressure to be innovative every year, must also be removed. In order to act on the need identified by the Commission, which states that the *“next round of local development strategies must keep pace with the main changes in citizens needs and, where possible, find ways of supporting many of the creative grass roots responses that have already emerged”* (European Commission, 2018, p.20) CLIs and their associations need to be actively engaged into existing LAGs and supported to set up their own ones. The purpose of this would be to enable grassroots innovations to contribute to the development of regenerative territorial/bioregional partnerships with their values, knowledge and experience. Economic matrix change programs that try to apply biotechnology and biomedicine knowledge to be an integral concept for marginalised communities need to be supported, as well as academic institutions with research experience that can apply ethnobiological knowledge to biotechnology and pharmacological advances in antiviral, cardiovascular treatments and neuropathologies degenerative. The scientific potential in regions with hotspots of biodiversity is an evident fact that needs to be acknowledged and acted upon.

3. Involving local actors: A stronger trust and will to involve and include local actors and citizens in the common actions and give responsibilities based on contractual or partnership models, laid out in the regulatory framework, is required. There is a need for a change in attitudes and values to ensure a paradigm change. For successful implementation of the partnerships, there should be a willingness on the part of local authorities to engage in dialogue to better understand the intricacies of local climate action and how to work in partnership *with* communities while balancing science and rationale and communicate the possibilities and benefits of involvement in local development to community groups. Local actors should also be considered as partners with similar rights to be heard and paid for the actions done, even though voluntary work (valued most certainly to billions at EU-level) is a big part of rural or urban community work. Action should be led by needs, not funding requirements. The CPR regulation, which offers support for capacity building and preparatory actions supporting the design and future implementation of the strategy, needs to be utilized for this purpose.

4. Horizontal and integrated thinking: Policies and programming for the most part do not have horizontal thinking behind them. Funding schemes are a reflection of sectoral planning limiting innovative multi-actor horizontal territorial approaches, including the financing of integrated community-led action. LEADER is by nature horizontal and partnership-based, but it is not always implemented in such a way. There are good cases of functioning territories within the territories funded by LEADER, but they have limitations, as not all of Europe is

covered, the territorial strategies are very different from one country to another and the CLLD or multi-fund-approach is for the moment at a weak level due to sectoral thinking. On the other hand, good cases of implementing the LEADER method outside the funding structure have led to good results. Horizon is very sectoral and researcher-based, even though local participation is growing and living-labs are often part of research projects. The regional funds are often quite urban-directed. This barrier needs to be addressed by the consequent implementation of a multi-funded CLLD approach within existing legislative frameworks and for this purpose newly created ones, which embrace integrated development.

5. Green thinking: Green thinking has not been strongly present in rural and agricultural policies and development strategies. Now with the Green deal and the new environmental requirements there is an opportunity to work for green economy solutions in territorial/bioregional partnerships. The institutional path forward should be using existing structures like LAG's, existing green value partnerships and creating new ones by activating/motivating actors towards holistic thinking. It should be required that LAGs include climate and environment actions in their territorial strategies and all LAGs should ensure their local strategies are in full compliance with the intentions of the EGD and EU Climate obligations. Moreover, it needs to be ensured that the National Strategic Plans of all the Member States contribute to the Green Deal and in particular to the farm-to-fork strategy. Climate and environment award criteria are a necessary means to direct actions towards being environmentally sound. Policies that sanction environmental destruction are also necessary.

6. Inclusiveness and social equity: Social disparities arise from funding schemes and development efforts, which constantly benefit the usual suspects and therefore centralize resources. The demands of a lot of unpaid voluntary work, e.g. in Horizon Projects, which generate value for the society, but are not financially rewarding for the individuals are unfair and are part of the reproduction and growth of inequality. Those are also related to the fact that within the current political-economic system the value for the common good is not sufficiently appreciated in the current economic system and the damage to it is not adequately sanctioned. This needs to be addressed through policy frameworks that enable the creation of a well-being economy and programme funding that redistributes wealth to those which have been disadvantaged so far.

7. Democracy and evidence-based policy making: Lobby groups influence the work to divert funds in their direction. Interests and egotism, instead of a sound evidence-base often govern policies, and create geographical and social divides and inequalities. As a consequence, the existing diversity of territories and contexts is not reflected today in programmes and policy papers. This issue needs to be addressed through localizing decision-making processes whilst ensuring evidence-based policy making.

8. Transparency: One of the biggest problems of the political system is a lack of transparency. Politicians do not want to share information on the structure of their policies. Numerous cases of the parliament asking for information without receiving it result in a lack

of trust of citizens in politicians. We therefore demand more transparency within the political system of the EU. This should also include the member States' handling of EU funding and strategy implementation where opaqueness also exists.

9. Awareness and communication: There is still a lack of awareness with regards to the severity of the environmental and social crisis amongst citizens and politicians. Moreover, at the EU level different DG's are not sufficiently aware of each other's activities even in cases where there are clear interlinkages. An example is the lack of awareness within the EU Commission for the Smart Villages project. Effective communication needs to take place across sectoral boundaries to raise awareness about problems and existing solutions and approaches in order to facilitate the necessary transformation.

10. New programmes: A flexible programme/ sub programme with a funding mechanism (EU/other) in the form of a territory fund or similar and ease for local actors should be created or baked into existing financial tools. It should facilitate and respect a social and green transition and lead towards a well-being economy. The programme and fund would create and manage a democratic know-how and learning platform. The implementation structure would provide support services like guidance and development proposals.

11. New partnerships: Under other policy and financing programmes (e.g. Green deal, LIFE, Horizon Eco-innovation plan) partnerships similar to the EIP-European Innovation Partnership could be piloted and developed. The EC and the EP supported by the Council could plan a European Innovation partnership for climate and communities (EPIC) with interested stakeholders. Pilot projects within consortia could be experimented with using the CLLD and EIP methods and processes, and thus including local actors' participation, and supporting innovations from NGOs, Locals, Climate Specialist, universities and public sector through cross-sector thinking and funding. The EPIC system could be financed from different programmes in the CLLD spirit. Each programme would earmark EPIC Partnership funding. This could be done in a specific section dedicated to innovative partnerships. EPIC partnerships could be awarded based on a multiannual plan and funds awarded on result-based criteria. Climate and environmentally favorable criteria would give additional selection points. These EPIC pilots and later included in programmed and funded strategies could be initiated within the Green Deal funding schemes. The successful model of European Innovation partnerships could also be transferred to cover a holistic approach in rural development, including urban linkages.

12. Advocacy on behalf of communities and territorial / bioregional partnerships: Political ambassadors should promote the pilot projects of regenerative territorial/bioregional partnerships in order to increase their visibility and impact to inspire joint action across Europe. Advocating on behalf of communities may include informing about activities and results, creating partnerships at the right levels and networking with officials and decision makers. It may also include statements, policy and programme proposals connected with research for a stronger evidence-based advocacy. It is possible for one group to join forces with already existing networks advocating for communities at EU level and with the possibility to instigate a citizens' initiative on local development.

1. References

Arnsperger, C., 2017. Communities of reinhabitation : bioregionalism, biogeography, and the contemporary North American reflection on sustainability, In: Swiss Association of University Teachers of English (Ed.), American Communities : between the popular and the Volume 35, p. 147



Celata, F., Dinnie, L., Holsten, A., 2019. Sustainability transitions to low-carbon societies: insights from European community-based initiatives. *Reg Environ Change* 19, 909–912. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-019-01488-6>

Directorate-General for Territory (DGT) of the European Commission, 2020. Territorial Agenda 2030. A future for all places

Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy of the European Commission, 2014. Community-led Local Development. Cohesion Policy 2014-2020. Factsheet.

European Commission, 2018. Guidance for Local Actors on Community-Led Local Development. European Structural Investment Funds. EGESIF_18-0034-00

European Commission, n.d., Priorities for 2021-2027. In: European Commission - Regional Policy. https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/how/priorities. Accessed 27 Jul 2021

European Parliament; European Council, 2021. Regulation (EU) 2021/1060 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 June 2021 laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund Plus, the Cohesion Fund, the Just Transition Fund and the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund and financial rules for those and for the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, the Internal Security Fund and the Instrument for Financial Support for Border Management and Visa Policy

Galvan-Alvarez E., Laursen, O. & Ridda, M., 2020. Decolonising the state: subversion, mimicry and criminality, *Postcolonial Studies*, 23:2, 161-169, DOI: 10.1080/13688790.2020.1752356

Forrest, N., Wiek, A., 2014. Learning from success—Toward evidence-informed sustainability transitions in communities. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 12, 66–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2014.01.003>

Groulx, M., Lewis, J., Lemieux, C., Dawson, J., 2014. Place-based climate change adaptation: A critical case study of climate change messaging and collective action in Churchill, Manitoba. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 132, 136–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.09.002>

Jänicke, M., 2017. The Multi-level System of Global Climate Governance – the Model and its Current State. *Environmental Policy and Governance* 27, 108–121. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1747>

Ostrom, E., 2010. Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change. *Global Environmental Change* 20, 550–557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.07.004>

Penha-Lopes, G. & T. Henfrey (eds.), 2019. Reshaping the Future: how communities are catalysing social, economic and ecological transformation in Europe. The First Status Report on Community-led Action on Sustainability and Climate Change. Brussels: ECOLISE

Raworth, K., 2017. Why it's time for Doughnut Economics. IPPR Progressive Review 24, 216–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/newe.12058>

Schweizer, S., Davis, S., Thompson, J.L., 2013. Changing the Conversation about Climate Change: A Theoretical Framework for Place-Based Climate Change Engagement. *Environmental Communication* 7, 42–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2012.753634>

Seyfang, G., Smith, A., 2007. Grassroots innovations for sustainable development: Towards a new research and policy agenda. *Environmental Politics* 16, 584–603. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644010701419121>

Sheppard, S.R.J., Shaw, A., Flanders, D., Burch, S., Wiek, A., Carmichael, J., Robinson, J., Cohen, S., 2011. Future visioning of local climate change: A framework for community engagement and planning with scenarios and visualisation. *Futures* 43, 400–412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.01.009>

TASC, FEPS, 2020. The People's Transition: Community-led Development for Climate Justice.

Wahl, D. et. al, 2020: Bioregional Economies and Subsidiarity – Enabling life to create conditions conducive to life <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8Hnz2RCjyLg&t=1879s>

Wahl, D., 2020: Reinhabitation: Body, Place, Bioregion, <https://medium.com/activate-the-future/reinhabitation-body-place-bioregion-62a3fcdca351>