

# Community Economic Development Tool Review

## Public Engagement Tools

TABLES Project 2012: Mini reviews	
<b>Guidance</b>	Using your experience and expertise, consider the following tasks in relation to the tool. It may not be possible to complete all tasks for each tool due to a lack of available information, the task not applying to the tool, etc. <b>Please note where this is the case by writing in the reason in the space provided.</b> Please use a maximum of 6 pages of A4 (excluding diagrams and appendices). <b>Your responses are required in the white spaces.</b>
<b>Task 1: Basic information</b>	
<b>Name of the tool</b>	Community Economic Development
<b>Type of tool (list all that apply)</b> <i>Learning and skills (pedagogic); participatory; regulatory; collaborative; mapping; valuation; modelling; decision; futures; financial; ecosystem services</i>	Participatory; collaborative; decision.
<b>Group members</b> <i>(minimum size 3 members, must include a BCU rep)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Paul Cobbing</li> <li>2. Karen Leach</li> <li>3. Michael Hardman</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Please provide a brief synopsis of the tool</b>  <i>This may include: background context, development (and ownership if appropriate), current use and applications etc.</i>  <i>Please also note any desired outcomes of the tool so that you can make reference back to these in Task 7: SWOT analysis</i>	<p>The Canadian Community Economic Development Network definition is: <b>“Community Economic Development (CED) is action by people locally to create economic opportunities and better social conditions, particularly for those who are most disadvantaged. CED is an approach that recognizes that economic, environmental and social challenges are interdependent, complex and ever-changing. To be effective, solutions must be rooted in local knowledge and led by community members. CED promotes holistic approaches, addressing individual, community and regional levels, recognizing that these levels are interconnected.”</b></p> <p>In our recent MCED literature review we defined it as <b>“Community economic development (CED) can be defined as economic development led by people within the community and based on local knowledge and local action, with the aim of creating economic opportunities and better social conditions locally.”</b></p> <p>IDEA/WBS/LGIU define it (in Smarter CED) as <b>“a broad term that seeks to cover a variety of ‘bottom up’ community enterprise in the not-for-profit sector... It has the advantage of drawing on local assets, intelligence, networks (e.g. ethnic minority community businesses) and knowledge... it reflects a proactive, bottom up approach which is more successful than an approach which merely responds to government initiatives · It creates the conditions for economic development within the community, ensuring the recirculation of money within communities, and the reinvestment of profits for mutual benefit... .”</b></p> <p>Their publication Smarter CED goes on to describe a range of economic functions of social enterprise, non-profit activity and local finance institutions, rather than the rather more holistic or strategic approaches described in Canadian and US material. Localise West</p>

Midlands (LWM) would not agree with IDEA's definition, firstly in that CED should not be limited to not-for-profit business, and secondly in that the definition does not reflect the strategic aspects of CED, where a community can together identify holistically how to improve their local economy for social environmental and economic benefit in a way that is more similar to governmental economic development than to micro-scale community initiatives.

This discrepancy in the IDEA definition mirrors a widely held understanding, conforming with our reading, that CED is more advanced in the USA and Canada than it is in the UK.

In the UK, CED is considered to have been commonly used in regional development programmes in the 1990s and early 2000s, following European programmes. But again such CED activity tends to reflect the less holistic, micro, private sector excluding approach that seems more common in the UK – for example “a targeted environmental project, a childcare scheme, a development trust and a credit union” (Armstrong et al, 2000). The one programme that had a more holistic focus was Leader, particularly some of the earlier incarnations.

Desired outcomes of the tool: we would identify these as holistic and strategic economic activity that solves social, environmental and economic challenges; based on local resources and meeting local needs; having a positive impact particularly on the most disadvantaged or excluded and increasing community capacity and social capital.

In both the IDEA and European Commission writing on CED it appears that the strategic aspects are recognised as a goal (European Commission, 1996, pp. 22-23 cited in Armstrong, 2000), but this rarely translates into projects. We suspect that what is missing is: public bodies willing or able to facilitate and respond in an empowering, community focussed way; an inability of many organisations to work across sectors (both internally and externally); the difficulty of delivering outcomes that reflect the needs and aspirations of communities rather than the needs of the programme; and perhaps capacity and knowledge amongst communities to design things in this way.

CED applies Community Development approaches to the development of local economies. Because CED approaches are rare in the UK, we incorporate some Community Development examples within this review where there is an economic element.

Task 2: Use of the tool								
<b>Position / Use</b> <i>If you can, please indicate which stage(s) of the decision / policy making process your tool is / could be used in (these stages were identified in the specification document)</i>	<b>Stage</b>	<b>Currently used</b>	<b>Could be used</b>					
	Ideas	A few community groups; a few public sector agencies	LNPs, NIA partnerships, AONB partnerships, LA economic development depts (including district level) linking to LEP & CoC activity; local business forums, town centre partnerships; neighbourhood planning processes & neighbourhood forums; more community organisations.					
	Survey	As above	As above					
	Assess	As above	As above					
	Policy / decision	As above	As above					
	Implement	As above	As above					
	Evaluate	As above	As above					
<p><b>Please add any further comments here:</b> CED is a broad tool with a number of potential components in its operation. Its main process stages would be around sourcing local knowledge, sharing ideas, participatory decision-making, assessing options for socio-economic and environmental outcomes, informing policies and decisions.</p>								
Task 3: Existing literature about the tool								
<b>Are you aware of any KEY policy and / or academic literature evaluating your tool?</b> <i>(e.g. reports, journal articles, books)</i>	Please add any further comments here: LWM has just completed a review of evidence around the effectiveness of CED (and localisation) approaches. The lack of formal evaluation of CED has been striking. Much can be gleaned from sources and this is collated in our literature review, but very much treating CED as part of a wider localisation approach and therefore not relevant in its entirety here. Most of the sources listed describe but do not evaluate CED; the Armstrong source does not evaluate CED but does discuss the difficulties of evaluating CED and how this can be addressed.							
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Author &amp; Date</th> <th>Title Vol pages</th> <th>Web link (if available)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">See Appendix document for details.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Author & Date	Title Vol pages	Web link (if available)	See Appendix document for details.			
Author & Date	Title Vol pages	Web link (if available)						
See Appendix document for details.								
Task 4: Your experience of working on the tool								
<b>Have you done any</b>	a) Mainstreaming CED – literature review assessing the potential of CED and economic localisation approaches to address social inclusion, income equality and local diversity and							

<b>research/consultancy work on this tool in terms of its development, testing and/or evaluation?</b> <i>If so, please provide an outline.</i>	<p>distinctiveness.</p> <p>b) Experience of engaging with rural development projects in the UK, some of which take a CED approach</p> <p>c) 2 month visit to the LandCare approach in Victoria, Australia, some of which is very much a CED approach</p> <p>In addition, LWM's general experience of promoting and facilitating economic localisation has contained elements of CED approaches such as an emphasis on the social economy as deliverers and of communities in participating in economic decision-making.</p>
<b>Guidance</b>	<p>For Tasks 5-7, please also try to consider the <b>future</b> development and application of this tool in the TABLES project in your answers.</p>

### Task 5: Incorporating the ecosystem approach (EA) and ecosystem services (ES)

*\*\*Please refer to the summary text about ES for concept clarification at the end of this template (appendix)\*\**

<b>Using examples (from practice, research or consultancy), explain how EA and/or ES are currently incorporated in/by the tool</b>  <i>If neither approach is currently incorporated, please move to the next question</i>	<p>Broadly, CED has two ways in which it inherently but implicitly values ecosystem services: firstly in its intention to integrate environmental goals with socio-economic goals; and secondly on its emphasis on using local resources to meet these goals.</p> <p>In terms of the specific incorporation of EA/ES approaches, this is demonstrated in some individual CED examples: Bewdley Development Trust, some projects under the Leader Programme and some work led by AONBs, notable Blue Remembered Hills, Shropshire Hills AONB.</p> <p>For example, community based Bewdley Development Trust started as Opportunity Bewdley in 2002, worked with Grow with Wyre (<a href="http://www.growwithwyre.org/">http://www.growwithwyre.org/</a>) to develop biomass projects, setting up Bewdley Energy Company along the way, and more recently has been involved in the development of Bewdley Transition Town. There has been a very wide range of projects, not all of which have been fully successful, ranging from public realm improvements, refurbishment of community assets and Rediscover Bewdley events to energy audits. More details can be found at: <a href="http://www.bewdley.org.uk/bewdley-development-trust/ourWork/">http://www.bewdley.org.uk/bewdley-development-trust/ourWork/</a>. A key theme has been developing projects that deliver economic, social and environmental benefits, thereby supporting and developing local supply and demand chains, as well as improving the environment and helping communities. <i>Selling the Wyre</i>, for example, has established a local food producer group with 29 members, with a producers' affiliation and marketing scheme and an outlet established through Bewdley Local Produce Market.</p>
<b>How could the ecosystem approach and/or ecosystem services be (further) incorporated within the existing tool?</b>	<p>CED guidance in UK is distinctly lacking; such guidance is needed and this provides a timely opportunity to incorporate EA/ES approaches.</p> <p>CED is very much a process-orientated approach that can incorporate a range of tools, where these are useful. One significant gap is the lack of practical understanding in many sectors of the social and economic values of a high quality ecosystem and the services that it delivers, nor of the need for active social and economic activity to build and maintain high quality natural environments. Some of this is beginning to emerge in health and green infrastructure, but for the most part other sectors are unaware, or do not see it as of relevance to them. CED approaches are a useful way of developing this at a community level, particularly through the use of participatory techniques where people often value their local environment in a way that that is easier to engage with than the environment as a whole. The use of tools such as the Environmental Economy tool may help to bridge the gaps between sectors and result in practical programmes of work.</p>

### Task 6: Situating the tool within priority questions/criteria arising from the scoping interviews

<p><b>Explain how the tool can be situated within the priority questions/criteria that arose in the scoping interviews</b></p> <p><i>Complete as many boxes as required</i></p>	<p><b>Priority question/criteria</b></p>	<p><b>Does your tool address/implement this question/criteria? Or does it have the potential if it was better integrated with an EA/ES approach?</b></p> <p><i>Please explain how.</i></p>
	<p><b>Language and communication</b></p>	
	<p>1. Contribution to aiding the development of shared vocabulary within which principles of EA and ES can be shared with multiple stakeholders across built and/or natural environment</p>	<p>CED has the potential to address this given the range of stakeholders and societal roles likely to participate and given CED's integrated goals, if CED guidance and structures incorporated EA/ES thinking.</p>
	<p>2. Capacity of the tool to develop shared understandings of the many identities and values of places from the perspectives of multiple visitors, residents and businesses</p>	<p>CED approaches are fundamentally about sharing understanding of how participants identify and value places in order to inform place-based, local resource-based economic opportunity.</p>
	<p>3. Capacity of the tool to improve or enable engagement across different publics so avoiding the usual suspect problem</p>	<p>CED is likely to bring in 'non-usual-suspects' from a community, perhaps concerned with local business success or with social justice, local jobs and wellbeing. It is therefore likely to bring in people whose first concern is not environmental but who can then potentially engage with EA/ES objectives through the integrated process of CED.</p>
	<p><b>Learning from experience/pedagogy</b></p>	
	<p>4. Capacity of the tool to help reveal and value 'hidden' assets that are not recognised by communities or publics that use them</p>	<p>The integrated approach of CED is already more likely to identify what would otherwise be 'hidden' assets than conventional ED, but would be more so with incorporation of EA/ES.</p>
	<p>5. Extent to which tool is building on other tools or EA/ES progress</p>	<p>CED builds on community participation tools and potentially economic assessment tools... – but not on EA/ES progress.</p>
	<p>6. Extent to which tool is locally derived or grounded or can be adjusted to closely reflect 'local' context. Is the tool suitable for an open source approach?</p>	<p>CED is very much locally derived and locally grounded, this being the whole point. CED is entirely suitable for an open source approach and indeed this is how it is used at the moment.</p>
	<p>7. Extent to which the tool is open to interpretation and application in a variety of forms (that reflect 'cultural' differences)</p>	<p>The tool's use in countries across the world and around the UK in different ways demonstrate its applicability in very different circumstances and forms. .. what sorts of examples do you want here?</p>
	<p><b>Developing and selecting tools</b></p>	
	<p>8. Is the tool dependent on a specific funding source? How onerous is the application procedure? What are the</p>	<p>CED is not dependent on a specific funding source, but requires the resources of one or more organisation to manage the ongoing processes. Chances of success</p>

	chances of success?	are most increased by the willingness of resourced organisations – business fora, local authorities, other public bodies – to engage with the CED structure and respond to ongoing outcomes.
	9. Does skills development (essential or optional?) and support exist for the tool or is there a body to ensure the optimal and correct use of it?	There is little support in the UK for CED skills development or guidance – see attached document for more information.
	10. Extent to which current statutory hooks can be exploited by the tool or will benefit the quality or application of the tool (e.g. NNPF's duty to cooperate, SUDS, ecol. networks)	There is potential in the Localism Act and in parts of the NPPF.
<b>Informing resultant policies effectively</b>		
	11. Extent to which the tool informs or improves policies/decisions. What does the tool cover? (full range of positive and negative economic, social and environment impacts / tradeoffs?)	<p>This is CED's main strength, as its purpose is to bring a local community together to share ideas and make decisions based on local needs, local resources, socio-economic and environmental goals.</p> <p>There is a potential negative impact on the ecosystem services agenda if a CED approach values immediate local economic need over more global or long term environmental impact. For example if the exploitation of a local ecosystem service has a negative impact globally or if that ecosystem service does not have the capacity needed to sustain the economic needs of the local population. Thus CED approaches that incorporate EA/ES thinking have potential to create balanced decisions.</p>
	12. How does the tool link into the planning system (applications and processes). At what cost / extra burden?	CED could link very effectively into neighbourhood planning process, but should ideally also link well into other LA planning processes.
<b>Delivering management objectives</b>		
	13. Suitability or capacity of the tool to assist with managing visitor needs and pressures within protected areas / the considered area? How?	If visitor management is a significant issue for community economic development, CED provides a vehicle to progress this.
<b>Local ownership/new governance</b>		
	14. To what extent can the tool assist in developing statutory plans (local and management plans) and improve ownership and use by publics?	<p>CED has considerable potential to assist in developing statutory plans and in improving ownership and use by publics... existing examples?</p> <p>Community development approaches (as opposed to CED) have been extensively used in developing rural plans, typically parish plans, parish maps, AONB</p>

		management plans.
15. To what extent does/could the tool contribute to a new form of community governance in management of the environment?		One of its primary potential uses. Existing examples?
<b>Improved tools: understanding flows, interconnections and spatial issues</b>		
16. Capacity to improve spatial understandings of the flows and interactions of various ecosystem services between sectors and at different scales		CED would have limited ability to do this even if guidance on CED operation incorporated ES and EA approaches. The only small contribution CED might make would be very locally specific knowledge of local ecosystems - depending entirely on participants' interests and understanding.
17. Capacity of the tool to reconcile assessments of options and benefits across different scales (and sectors)		N/A
18. Extent to which the tool is capable or can be manipulated to work across sectoral and administrative boundaries		CED can work across sectoral and administrative boundaries; community boundaries would be self-defined and engage with public bodies of different areas as required.
19. Extent to which the tool can handle data shortages and gaps (or is effectiveness considerably compromised?)		N/A.
20. To what extent has/could the tool put landscape/nature conservation and designated species/sites on the radar (positively or resulting in resentment?)		Yes, by ensuring the ES that 'makes' the landscape/nature designation feeds into a community-led local economy.

Please add any further comments here:

### Task 7: A SWOT analysis of the tool

**Referring back to the relevant policy and academic literature (listed in Task 3), plus your own expertise (listed in Task 4) and the way in which the tool is situated**

**Strengths** *(of the tool in delivering intended outcomes)*

As a reminder: the tool's intended outcomes are: holistic and strategic economic activity that solves social, environmental and economic challenges; based on local resources and meeting local needs; having a positive impact particularly on the most disadvantaged of excluded and increasing community capacity and social capital.

- it is grounded in a community's knowledge of local resources and needs.
- it particularly aims to target the most disadvantaged and to integrate social, environmental and economic goals, which gives it a much higher likelihood of achieving this in comparison with mainstream economic approaches
- Its processes in themselves, being participative, have the potential to generate some of the desired outcomes such as increasing social capital.

**within the priority questions/criteria (listed in Task 6), please complete a summary SWOT analysis ensuring that each point is well justified**

*Where possible, this analysis should reflect the tool's past and current application, as well as its effectiveness in policy and decision making processes*

**Weaknesses** *(factors that detract from the tool's ability to deliver intended outcomes)*

- There is not necessarily or naturally ecosystems expertise within CED approaches, so even if CED is structured to include ES/EA approaches, expertise may need to be sought to participate in the partnership. This also goes for other types of expertise.
- Lack of guidance and supporting bodies in the UK for CED approaches
- Lack of understanding in the UK, including some use of the term to mean purely the third sector economy, which reduces its apparent significance.
- CED is difficult to evaluate as it often has much complexity of objectives, beneficiary groups and constituent projects. This does not directly detract from its ability to deliver outcomes but presents challenges for learning from and justifying support and funding for CED initiatives.

**Opportunities** *(consider opportunities for application of the ecosystem approach and services)*

There is an opportunity for partnerships with a local nature remit to use CED approaches particularly where communities are or need to be involved.  
 CED's focus on integrated sustainability outcomes and on local resources give it a good basis for accepting and trialling ecosystems approaches.  
 The lack of existing CED guidance in the UK means that there is an opportunity to produce such guidance and to incorporate ES/EA into it.  
 The economic focus on LNPs also presents an opportunity to incorporate CED and ES approaches.

**Threats** *(factors which negatively affect the tool and its outcomes)*

*Classify these by their "seriousness" and "probability of occurrence" in the table below, and pay particular attention to the threats associated with potential use of ecosystem approach/ecosystem services.*

Threat	Seriousness (high, medium, low)	Probability of occurrence (high, medium, low)
Lack of a supportive public policy environment; (general threat to tool effectiveness)	High	High
Lack of engagement with conventional business fora; (general threat to tool effectiveness)	Medium	Medium
Where CED approaches are adopted, potential lack of ES expertise to identify options of lasting economic merit	Low	Low within this project, medium normally

Please add further comments here:

## Appendix

H.W. Armstrong, P. Wells and A.M. Wood August 2000.	THE EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES, Department of Geography, Sheffield University	<a href="http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docconf/edimbourg/pdf/arms2_en.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docconf/edimbourg/pdf/arms2_en.pdf</a>	This paper discusses how evaluating CED initiatives can be done more effectively. It's a useful paper, but not what you were looking for.
	SMARTER COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - IDEA	<a href="http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/aio/28200484">http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/aio/28200484</a>	Not evaluation, but contains recommendations for 'smarter' CED which we refer to in the tool review
Perry, Stewart E. 1987	<i>Communities on the Way: Rebuilding Local Economies in the United States and Canada.</i> Albany: State University of New York Press.		According to our colleague Pat this is the definitive CED piece of literature, but we are unsure as to whether it contains any evaluation and have not yet tracked down a copy.
Schaffer et al	<a href="#">Community Economics: Linking Theory and Practice</a>		Recommended on Canadian CED website
Shragge & Toye	Community Economic Development - Building for Social Change	<a href="http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/node/4537">http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/node/4537</a>	Recommended on Canadian CED website
Blanchard & Matthews (2006)	<i>The Configuration of Local Economic Power &amp; Civic Participation in the Global Economy.</i> Mississippi State University.		Read as part of the literature review and does contain some evidence around effectiveness of localisation and CED approaches.
Dongier P. et al (2002)	Community-Driven Development. In: <i>Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) Sourcebook</i> , World Bank, Ch. 9		Read as part of the literature review and contains recommendations for CDD (relates to CED) but not evaluation
Chan, R.K.H. (2006)	<i>Community economic development: Applications and limitations in Hong Kong</i> , International Social Work, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 483–493		Contains limited evaluation of CED in Hong Kong.