

## SWOT BEGIN PARTNER CITIES

Date: 1 March 2018; Last modified: 1 May 2018

Authoer: William Veerbeek

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
Aberdeen				
BGI Resilience to floods, Drought and heat	Extensive hydrological knoweldge; Iniight in flood hazard distribution; No issues with heat and drought; tangible case study	Challenging terrain; financing; Lack of larger vision		Business case is not dveloped
Community engagement	Stakeholders are well mapped	Outreach and consultation is performed in a 'standard fashion'; Imited reach		Fragmented/piecemeal messages to local community
Governance		illiteu reacii	Integration social programmes with flood risk management	No integrated planning tradition;
Antwerp				
Resilience to floods, Drought and heat	Limited flood vulnerability;	Large scale strategic project; Heatstress issue in center but not in scope BEGIN; Limited insight in		Project will remain merely strategic/visionary
Resilience to noous, brought and neat		future uncertanties;		
Community engagement		Lack of a narrative/branding of the project		
Governance		Limited political support for BGI;	Ample room for developing the BGI- business case, incl. on a strategic level	Volaitile poliitical climate;
Bergen				
BGI		Difficulties in defining how BGI-driven case differs from traditional case; shallow BGI-approach	Flagship project	BIG is merely 'cosmetic'
Resilience to floods, Drought and heat	No significant drought and heat issues;	No appraisal of flood risk;	Full integration of climate related risk;	No CC taken into account during design, yet horizion is 20 years or more
Community engagement	No information;		Engagement of new (suburban) cumminty; new approach	
Governance	Strong political commitment			
Bradford				

BGI	Multi-discplinary approach; strong knowledge on BGI; leadership; strong commitment to knowledge exchange;		No business case	Mang long-term uncertainties incl. step-wise development of project (micro-level), alternative transport in and along corridor (meso) and Brexit (macro)
Resilience to floods, Drought and heat	No significant drought and heat issues; flood risk is evaluated;	Foucs on single vision while project is facing many uncertainties;	Many project development opportunities along	No alternative pathways for future devleopment;
Community engagement	Good stakeholder mapping; strong communication strategy and organisation;	Lack of a narrative/branding of the project	the corridor; Current	
Governance	Strong cross- departmental support;	Political support is fragile;		Fragmentation of project due to many stakholders that are involved;
Dordrecht				
BGI		Implementation gap;	Current development of BGI-driven long term vision and associated pilots;	No choices are made on which porject will focus;
Resilience to floods, Drought and heat	Estensive experience with flood risk managmenet;	Limited implementation of actual measures;	Dordrecht is still one of the frontrunners in NL (CC-adaptation, water management);	Implementation barrier is not overocme; endless plan development cycles; opportunism;
Covernance	Many existing community engagement programs;	Extensive social (i.e. challenging neighbourhoods); socioeconomic disparity		
Governance				
Enfield				
BGI	Track record; many implemented BGI projects;	Lack of larger vision;	Monitoring of existing BGI proejcts; further upscaling of projects into comprehensive vision	Lack of a coherent strategy; stop of funding
Resilience to floods, Drought and heat	Extensive techinical knowledge;	Sectoral approach		
Community engagement	Community-drive maintenance;	Limited engagement of small subsection of population;	Private sector engagment; new communities committed to integrated multi- functional BGI-	Only limited target group is reached; dependend on charity and external funding;
Governance	Commitment to BGI projects		projects; Redevelopment of extensive area in South-East; momentum for BGI	Increasing budget cuts on public spending
Ghent	<b>.</b>			
BGI	Extensive 8 axis-based BGI strategy that crosses urban-peri-urban and rural area;	No appraisal of MBs; no insight in performance of BGI	Existing BGI along fringes could be further integrated in city	Comprehsive vision but lack of concret projects;
Resilience to floods, Drought and heat		No insight in potential (CI-Induced) floods, drought and heat		CC-adpatation is not taking off (esp. in innercity); continue as separate projects

Strong community involvement  BGI-driven masterplan already accepted years	Little commitment to revilatise BGI	Use exisintg community engagment projects as vehicles to mainstream BGI	Difficulties to keep focus on 8 separate
ago	masterplan		green axes
No apparent flood, drought or heat problems	experience in appraisal No apparent quantiative apprasial of future CC-induced	approach to research by design;	BGI-project only in big architecture driven projects
Strong sense of marketing; identifty; Community building around projects;	Engagement is not especially related to BGI-project;		
A also assile de assesse e f	Linetherd annualization	Duning at the surround	Durain structula di unita d
BGI	of MBs of BGI; no bsuiness case;	beyond frm and becomes integrated pilot;	Project will be limited to iplementation of a single SUD
Extensive knowledge, egineering capacity on flood risk management; tangible case study	Very technical approach; engineering driven; little regard for addional aspects (e.g. urban planning)		Focus on flood hazard mitigation, while ignoring other natural hazards;
	engagement; community is	sronger collaboration with different types of	Community is estranged due to lack of opportunities (i.e. only have a validating role)
Modest experience in delivery of BGI-based projects;		Extending BGI project portfolio; learning across different Kent burroughs	Projects are limited to small scal SUDS;
No significant drought & heat stress;			
Strong sentiments of small groups of stakeholders; strong commitment; strong sense fo community	Modest resources; depending on single champion;		Community is activation becomes synomym with community resistance;
County-wide reach;	Limited scope for comprehensive vision;	County-wide policy, strategy, approaches; multitude of projects	
	involvement  BGI-driven masterplan already accepted years ago  No apparent flood, drought or heat problems  Strong sense of marketing; identifty; Community building around projects;  Acknowledgement of BGI  Extensive knowledge, egineering capacity on flood risk management; tangible case study  Modest experience in delivery of BGI-based projects;  No significant drought & heat stress;  Strong sentiments of small groups of stakeholders; strong sense fo community	involvement  BGI-driven masterplan already accepted years ago  Pilot paradox; No experience in appraisal No apparent flood, drought or heat problems  Strong sense of marketing; identifty; Community building around projects;  Acknowledgement of BGI  Extensive knowledge, egineering capacity on flood risk management; tangible case study  Modest experience in delivery of BGI-based projects;  No significant drought & heat stress;  Strong sentiments of small groups of stakeholders; strong sense fo community County-wide reach;  Little commitment to revilatise BGI masterplan  Pilot paradox; No experience in quantiative apprasial of future CC-induced flood problems  Limited appreciasion of MBs of BGI; no bsuiness case;  Very technical approach; engineering driven; little regard for addional aspects (e.g. urban planning)  Very traditional approach to commuty engagement; community is informed rather than engaged;  Modest experience in delivery of BGI-based projects;  Modest resources; depending on single champion;  Limited scope for	involvement  BGI-driven masterplan algo  Pilot paradox; No experience in appraisal of future CC-induced flood problems  Strong sense of marketing; identify; Community bilding around projects;  Extensive knowledge, egineering capacity on flood risk management; tangible case study  Modest experience in delivery of BGI-based projects;  Modest experience in delivery of BGI-based projects;  Strong sentiments of small groups of stakeholders;  Modest experience in delivery of BGI-based projects;  Limited appreciasion of MBs of BGI; no bsuiness case; becomes integrated pilot;  Extensive knowledge, egineering capacity on flood risk management; cangular planning)  Very traditional approach, engineering driven, little regard for addional aspects (e.g. urban planning)  Very traditional approach to community is informed rather than engaged;  Modest experience in delivery of BGI-based projects;  Strong sentiments of small groups of stakeholders;  Strong sentiments of small groups of stakeholders from community to community c