SI for transformative change: Scoping, screening, and surveying the experimentation landscape in Austria

Johannes Suitner·, Astrid Krisch·, Anna Aigner·

·Research Unit Urban and Regional Research, Institute of Spatial Planning, TU Wien

Aims and approach

This paper summarizes the empirical steps taken in the course of tasks 2.1 and 2.2 of the SIAMESE project. Building on a comprehensive literature review (cf. SIAMESE Working Paper 1), tasks 2.1 and 2.2 aimed to identify socially innovative climate and sustainability experiments with transformative potential in Austria. **Scoping interviews** with actors from research, policy, and practice served as entry points to the collection of cases. Following that, the project team conducted a **screening** of potentially suitable socially innovative experiments in Austria. The selection of initiatives was made based on the working definition of experiments in SIAMESE and the respective characteristics (cf. SIAMESE Working Paper 1). Building on the scoping and screening process, a differentiated **survey design** was developed that aimed to collect detailed information on the experimental, socially innovative and transformative character of those experiments in consideration. Selected initiatives were invited to participate in the **online survey**, and its results were analyzed and interpreted in succession.

Scoping Interviews: Calibrating SIAMESE objectives and exploring the phenomenon

To initiate the exploratory empirical analysis on socially innovative climate and sustainability experiments in Austria, the SIAMESE team conducted scoping interviews. The aim was to gain further up-to-date knowledge of the Austrian policy landscape, the place-based problematization of climate issues, and notable experiments in practice. Interviewees were selected according to their distinct expertise around SIAMESE topics, their relevant institutional roles, and/or representation of key sectors. We thus invited:

(1) researchers on climate governance, transformative change and experimental approaches to sustainability transformations,
(2) experts in policy development and climate governance in Austria, and
(3) practitioners with experience and knowledge regarding the development and implementation of transformative, socially innovative climate initiatives.

15 interviewees were contacted via e-mail, of which 12 were actually interviewed via Zoom in a three-week timespan between November and December of 2021 (cf. Tab.1). Each interview lasted 30 to 50 minutes and was audio-recorded so that main messages could later be transcribed for further use in the course of the project.

In order to learn about different definitions and approaches to experimentation, we exchanged on analytical understandings of the phenomenon in scientific and practical terms (i.e., key needs for

successful implementation), and further discussed demands to foster transformative change from a research, policy and practice perspective. The addressed experts provided valuable information on their take on experimentation, social innovation, and transformative climate governance (e.g., add-ons to the SIAMESE working definition and key knowledge gaps regarding the application of experiments in specific policy contexts). The key takeaways in a nutshell:

- Social innovation is considered an important and underappreciated perspective in climate governance. While most interviewees agreed that experimentation always involves both technological and social elements, they stressed the importance of social learning to achieve transformative impact and 2nd order change.
- When screening for experiments, initiatives that do not focus explicitly on climate mitigation and adaptation can be insightful. Thus, including non-obvious climate experiments in the analysis could aid explaining the importance of a wider socially innovative take on climate issues.
- Particular emphasis was placed on not forgetting rural and peripheral areas, especially since urban experiments are particularly overrepresented in the literature.
- Focusing on the territorial context of climate experiments (i.e., their place-anchoredness) was stressed as a key analytical perspective.
- The notion of scaling was criticized. Amplification and generalization were instead considered the more suitable terms to describe the multiple ways in which socially innovative experiments can impact change.
- Lastly, interviewees emphasized the need for critical reflection of experimentation itself, particularly its tensions with formalized statutory planning, as experiments could potentially undermine democratically legitimized planning decisions.

Name of interviewee	Role	Institutional affiliation	Date
BÄRNTHALER, Richard	Researcher *(Social-eco-logical Transformation)*	Vienna University of Economics & Business, Department for Socioeconomics, Institute for Multi-Level-Governance	16.11.2021
BORRAS, Susanna	Researcher *(Innovation Studies)*	Copenhagen Business School, Department of Organization	23.11.2021
FICKL, Stephan	Research Program Manager *(Climate action)*	Austrian Energy Agency	15.11.2021
FISCHER, Michael	Policy Adviser, Practitioner *(Rural transformations)*	ÖAR Regional Consultancy & Netzwerk Zukunftsraum Land (LE 14-20 Rural Development Program)	16.11.2021
HAAS, Willi	Researcher *(Social-eco-logical Transformation)*	Vienna University of Natural Resources & Life Sciences, Department of Economic & Social Sciences, Institute of Social Ecology	01.12.2021
HADERER, Margarete	Researcher *(Urban experi-mentation)*	Vienna University of Economics & Business, Department of Socioeconomics, Institute for Social Change and Sustainability	29.11.2021
RIEMENSCHNEIDER, Maxie	Policy Adviser *(Social inno-vation, participation)*	ÖGUT – Austrian Society for Environment & Technology	29.11.2021
RUHSMANN, Barbara	Policy Adviser *(Urban Commons, participation)*	ÖGUT – Austrian Society for Environment & Technology & District Councilor in Währing, Vienna (Die Grünen)	29.11.2021
SEEBAUER, Sebastian	Researcher *(Climate policy and economics)*	JOANNEUM Research Graz	27.10.2021
STEINWENDER, David	Researcher & Practitioner *(Grassroots innovations)*	Interdisciplinary Research Center for Technology, Work and Culture	01.12.2021
THALER, Thomas	Researcher *(Flood risk management, adaptigation)*	Vienna University of Natural Resources & Life Sciences, Department of Civil Engineering and Natural Hazards, Institute of Mountain Risk Engineering	20.10.2021
WARMUTH, Hannes	Researcher, Policy Adviser *(Energy, Buildings)*	ÖGUT – Austrian Society for Environment & Technology	23.11.2021

| WEICHHART, Matthias | Research program manager *(Social innovation)* | FFG – Austrian Research Promotion Agency | 06.12. 2021 |

Tab.1: Interview Partners for SIAMESE Scoping Interviews

Interview partners also recommended different online project databases and funding platforms to screen for interesting socially innovative climate experiments in Austria that cover a broad range of topics, regions, and actors. Platforms ranged from international databases (e.g., JPI Urban Europe, European Network of Living Labs) and federal platforms (e.g., FFG, KLIEN) to local repositories (e.g., Transition Graz) and individual projects.

Screening

In order to identify initiatives that comply with the SIAMESE definition of experiments, a comprehensive web screening was conducted via snowball sampling. Starting from those databases, platforms and projects that had been mentioned in the scoping interviews, the screening process hence went through several iterations of selection, reconsideration, and rejection of initiatives. Projects that at initial consideration fit the working definition were ad hoc included in the preliminary sample of experiments, whereas those initiatives that did not show a sufficient climate or sustainability focus or socially innovative character were classified as not fitting and thus eliminated. To determine whether the screened initiatives were relevant to the research objectives, the initiatives had to adhere to the following criteria:

1. Testing **novel** (social) **solutions** in practice (implementation in real-world setting)
2. Bound to a local context in **Austria**
3. Starting **between 2010 and 2022** (in exceptional cases, if the innovative idea has been the first of its kind, the starting date was extended to earlier dates; in order to allow for conclusions about their transformative impact, advanced initiatives were selected preferentially)
4. Thematic focus on **climate action and/or sustainability transformations** (challenge-driven)
5. Aimed at **contributing to social change** by transforming societal configurations (i.e., involving SI elements that led to or will potentially lead to a change of culture)
6. **Transformative initiatives**, i.e., projects tackling more than one sustainability challenge respectively one dimension of urban living and development

Since **bottom-up and civic initiatives** were noticeably less well represented on the screened platforms, several targeted queries on Social Media platforms and via the Google search engine were conducted in addition to ensure that these initiatives were also incorporated in the sample.[1]

Overall, 59 online databases and roughly 1,4000 individual initiatives were screened. The so produced large sample was then refined and reduced in accordance with the literature and project aims. Moreover, it was ensured that it represented both **urban and rural contexts** of experimentation, and the **spectrum of policy contexts** by including initiatives from all Austrian provinces and a variety of sectors (Jänicke, 2017).

---

[1] The following keywords stemming from the literature were used in different combinations in the Google search engine and the search form on Facebook: experiment, climate experiment, initiative, pilot project, social innovation, transdisciplinary, transformative, climate change, governance. Additional search terms stemming from the screening itself that appeared to be relevant in the Austrian context were: urban development, urban planning, co-creation, DIY-urbanism, pop-up-urbanism, participation, bottom-up and civic.

The selection of initiatives required a thoughtful approach to avoid excluding potentially relevant projects that only at first glance did not appear to be novel and thus worthy of examination. Hence, the following considerations were made in addition to the selection criteria:

- First, initiatives don't have to be the first of their kind. They have to be new in the local context and new for the respective target group (Eneqvist & Karvonen, 2021; Fuenfschilling et al., 2019).
- Second, with a view to the project goal of establishing a knowledge hub that supports transformative climate governance, priority was also given to those initiatives that are not yet well-established in the *Austrian* climate governance context, which is why their analysis is expected to yield considerable knowledge and practical benefits (i.e., place-based, challenge-driven, and embedded in specific governance and policy context (cf. SIAMESE Working Paper 1).
- Third, project ideas that have already numerously been implemented in different places in Austria (e.g. e-car sharing, citizen solar power plants) were not surveyed in full. Here, priority was given to those initiatives that showed a novel dimension or a potentially transformative element according to the definition (cf. SIAMESE Working Paper 1).
- Furthermore, a pragmatic approach was taken in that those initiatives were included that were most representative of the respective project idea and for which a contact could be found.

The collected information per initiative included the experiments' names, contact information, and URL (if available). In order to maintain an overview of the screening process and ensure that no relevant areas would be left out, the thematic focus (by policy area and field of action), the location (by province), and a brief description of the project (if available) were further collected. In order to compile a preliminary sample for participation in the survey, ambiguous initiatives from the initial screening that seemed interesting but were lacking information or didn't fit the criteria in all respects, were critically discussed and assessed by the project team. In conclusion, the preliminary sample included **218 experiments** that were invited to complete the SIAMESE online survey.

Conceptualizing the survey

The survey aims to collect in-depth information about the 218 pre-selected initiatives so that a thorough overview and categorization of socially innovative climate experiments in Austria is possible. To that end, the questionnaire has to cover central claims from the experimentation literature as well as the core project hypotheses on social innovation in experimentation. We define the following areas of interest before determining the structure of the questionnaire:

- Experiments are defined as having a limited duration (Torrens & Wirth, 2021) with a place-based focus (Eneqvist & Karvonen, 2021). Accordingly, some questions at the beginning will need to query the starting date, duration and locale of the initiatives.
- As is well known, experiments often depend heavily on public funding (cf. Kronsell & Mukhtar-Landgren, 2018; Eneqvist & Karvonen, 2021; Fuenfschilling et al., 2019). Because our screening was also strongly related to such initiatives for pragmatic reasons (they are usually obliged to provide public information and therefore easier to find in a web search), we want to differentiate between financially funded and non-funded experiments right at the beginning.
- Castan Broto and Bulkeley (2013) and Jänicke (2017) emphasize that climate experimentation can be situated in any policy area or sector. Hence, differentiating by thematic field and policy area seems necessary.

- Since experiments are challenge-led initiatives (Sengers et al., 2019) and our focus is on climate and sustainability issues, it makes sense to query the initiatives' objectives by asking which societal challenges they aim to address. We will do so by using a condensed list of the SDGs.
- The iterative screening has aimed to discard any experiments that do not have a socially innovative dimension to them. However, SI can range from new, inclusive business models to new forms of cooperation, political participation, and decision-making (Suitner et al., 2022). Differentiating by forms of SI hence can be an important variable to characterize and classify socially innovative climate experiments.
- We have already argued before that SI is not solely a dimension in grassroots innovations but can be part of any type of experiment from experimental governance to transformative research and civic climate action (cf. SIAMESE Working Paper 1). Hence, differentiating by type of intervention seems reasonable. For this we consider differentiating by approach (i.e., research, activism, governance), main objectives (i.e., action, learning, co-creation, inclusion, democratization) (Eneqvist & Karvonen, 2021; Wanner et al., 2018; Wirth et al., 2019), and whether the initiatives consider themselves pilots or replications (Lam et al., 2020; Torrens & Wirth, 2021). Relatedly, it might be helpful for characterization to ask participants to assign fitting adjectives from the experimentation discourse to their initiatives, e.g., drastic and radical (Sengers et al., 2019; Torrens & Wirth, 2021), risky (Loorbach et al., 2015), open-ended (Fuenfschilling et al., 2019; Raven et al., 2019), locally oriented (Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012), and bottom-up (Sengers et al., 2019; Seyfang & Smith, 2007).
- While unveiling beneficial or obstructive events and conditions in detail will be part of the in-depth case study analysis in WPs 3 and 4, addressing those conditions that were hindering or facilitating the implementation of the initiative already in the survey might be insightful for WP2 as well and particularly helpful for case study selection. Funding mechanisms, administrative support (Eneqvist & Karvonen, 2021), scientific consultation (Wanner et al., 2018) and networks of various stakeholders (Ansell & Bartenberger, 2014; Fuenfschilling et al., 2019) come to mind as key variables in this regard that will have to go into the questionnaire.
- In order to characterize and classify the sample of experiments, questions revolving around the actors actually "doing" experimentation will also need to be covered. This includes particularly the initiators of the respective experiments, as well as the central implementers and involved actor groups (McCrory et al., 2020).
- Lastly, the (potential) impact of experiments should also be addressed already in the survey to support the case study selection process. Hence, we will query about the main outputs, pointing to potential scaling (Hildén et al., 2017), cross learning (Torrens & Wirth, 2021) and amplifying (Lam et al., 2020).

Following this list of arguments, the questionnaire was structured into six parts (see the detailed questionnaire below):

1. <u>General information</u>: name, short description, start/end date, location, funding information
2. <u>Content & objectives</u>: thematic areas, sectors, challenges addressed
3. <u>Characteristics</u>: type of experiment, social innovation aspects, connection to SDGs
4. <u>Actors</u>: initiators, implementers, participants
5. <u>Impact</u>: drivers and barriers of implementation, successes and failures
6. <u>Further information</u>: knowledge of similar projects (snowballing), contact information

Technically, the survey was implemented with LimeSurvey, a much-used, powerful online survey tool with reasonable pricing. The initial survey design was first tested by the project team members (alpha test) and only then, after a round of revisions, tested by colleagues from TU Wien and ZSI (beta

test). The final round of revisions led to a significant reduction in length to ensure that completing the survey would not take longer than 20 minutes overall.

The survey design

Diese Befragung ist Teil des Forschungsprojekts SIAMESE von TU Wien und ZSI - Zentrum für Soziale Innovation. SIAMESE untersucht sogenannte "Klimaexperimente" in Österreich, d.h., Projekte und Initiativen, die **Lösungen für den Umgang mit der Klimakrise und eine nachhaltige Lebens- und Wirtschaftsweise erproben**. Das Hauptaugenmerk liegt dabei aber nicht auf technischen Lösungen, sondern auf sozialen Innovationen, d.h., **neuen sozialen Praktiken, inklusiven Geschäftsmodellen, oder neuen Formen der Zusammenarbeit**. In einem österreichweiten Screening wurden bereits knapp 200 solche Projekte lokalisiert. Mit Ihrer Teilnahme an der Befragung helfen Sie uns, einen besseren Überblick über die Vielfalt an Projekten zu erlangen und Initiativen wie Ihre künftig besser zu unterstützen.

*Das Ausfüllen des Fragebogens dauert **ca. 20 Minuten**. Sie können **Zwischenspeichern** und zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt mit der Beantwortung fortfahren. Für **Rückfragen** oder Unterstützung beim Ausfüllen wenden Sie sich bitte an anna.aigner@tuwien.ac.at. Danke, dass Sie sich für unser Anliegen Zeit nehmen!*

Dieses Projekt wird aus Mitteln des Klima- und Energiefonds gefördert und im Rahmen des Austrian Climate Research Programme (ACRP) durchgeführt.

I.1. Wie lautet der Name Ihrer Initiative? _____

I.2. Wie würden Sie selbst die Initiative in wenigen Worten beschreiben? _____

I.3. **Wann hat Ihre Initiative gestartet?** *[Sollte eine exakte Antwort nicht möglich sein, versuchen Sie bitte eine ungefähre Angabe von Monat und Jahr.]* _____

I.4. **Welche Laufzeit hat bzw. hatte Ihr Vorhaben?**

- Punktuelles Ereignis (z.B. Veranstaltung)
- unter 3 Monate
- 3-6 Monate
- 6-12 Monate
- 12-24 Monate
- über 24 Monate
- Die Laufzeit ist noch nicht final festgelegt.
- Es ist kein Ende geplant.

I.5. **Wird/wurde Ihre Initiative im Rahmen eines Förderprogramms umgesetzt?** *[Wenn „Ja", spezifizieren Sie bitte Ihre Auswahl im entsprechenden Textfeld.]*

- Ja *(bitte anführen)* _____
- Nein
- Weiß nicht

I.6. **Wo in Österreich wird/wurde Ihre Initiative umgesetzt? Nennen Sie bitte die Gemeinde(n) oder Region(en) möglichst genau.** *[Sie können bis zu 5 Orte angeben. Falls eine Verortung der Initiative nicht möglich ist, geben Sie bitte jenen Ort an, von dem aus das Vorhaben koordiniert und abgewickelt wird/wurde.]*

II.1. **Mit welchen Themenbereichen setzt(e) sich Ihre Initiative im Kern auseinander?** *[Mehrfachauswahl möglich]*

- Bauen & Wohnen
- Energie
- Mobilität
- Arbeit & Wirtschaft, Produktion & Konsum
- Landwirtschaft & Ernährung
- Landnutzung, Natur, Umwelt
- Industrie, Innovation, Infrastruktur
- Soziales, Gesundheit, Bildung
- Politik & Governance
- Sonstiges: _____

II.2. Welchen der folgenden gesellschaftlichen Herausforderungen versucht Ihre Initiative zu begegnen? Wählen Sie bitte aus der untenstehenden Liste aus. *[Mehrfachauswahl möglich]*

- ○ Bekämpfung sozialer Ungleichheit
- ○ Zugang zu Bildung
  & Schaffung neuen Wissens
- ○ Leistbare Grundversorgung
  (z.B. leistbares Wohnen)
- ○ Nachhaltige Städte und Gemeinden
- ○ Nachhaltige Wirtschaft
- ○ Klimaschutz (Reduktion von
  Treibhausgasen)

- ○ Anpassung an die Folgen des Klimawandels
- ○ Umweltschutz
  (z.B. Erhaltung der Biodiversität)
- ○ Soziale Inklusion
  und Teilhabe
- ○ Stärkung von Politik und Institutionen
- ○ Neue Formen der Zusammenarbeit
- ○ Sonstiges: _____

II.3. Waren spezifische *lokale* Herausforderungen in Ihrer Gemeinde/Region (z.B. besondere Betroffenheit von Klimawandelfolgen, mangelnde Versorgungsqualität, demographischer Wandel) ein wichtiger Antrieb für die Entwicklung der Initiative?

○ ja   ○ eher ja   ○ eher nein   ○ nein   ○ weiß nicht

II.4. Soziale Innovation ist der Versuch, auf gesellschaftliche Herausforderungen (z.B. Klimawandel) und die damit zusammenhängenden sozialen Bedürfnisse (z.B. Leistbarkeit von Lebensmitteln) mit neuen sozialen Praktiken und inklusiven Formen der Zusammenarbeit zu reagieren. Die folgende Auflistung umfasst Beispiele für verschiedene Formen sozialer Innovation. Inwieweit entsprechen diese dem Wesen und Ziel Ihrer Initiative?

- ○ Entwicklung neuer, inklusiver Geschäftsmodelle (z.B. Bürger:innensolarkraftwerke, Lebensmittelkooperativen, Sharing-Modelle)
- ○ Umsetzung neuer Formen politischer Teilhabe und Entscheidungsfindung (z.B. Bürger:innenräte, partizipatives Budgets)
- ○ Veränderung gesellschaftlicher Rollen (z.B. private Haushalte, die Strom ins Netz einspeisen und so von Konsument:innen zu Prosumern werden)
- ○ Adaption von Handlungen & Alltagspraktiken (z.B. private Haushalte, die ihr Mobilitätsverhalten nachhaltiger gestalten)
- ○ Zugang zu Ressourcen (z.B. Zugriff auf Information & Wissen für bestimmte Gruppen, Nutzbarmachung von Infrastrukturen wie öffentlicher Raum, Teilhabe an gemeinschaftlichen Aktivitäten)

Page III: Charakteristik

III.1. Wie gut beschreiben die folgenden Schlagwörter Ihre Initiative?

	sehr gut	eher gut	eher nicht	gar nicht
Climate Action	○	○	○	○
Learning-by-doing	○	○	○	○
Ko-Kreation	○	○	○	○
Inklusion	○	○	○	○
Demokratisierung	○	○	○	○
Aktivismus	○	○	○	○
Forschung	○	○	○	○
Pilotprojekt	○	○	○	○
Produktentwicklung od. Produkttest	○	○	○	○
Serviceentwicklung	○	○	○	○
Skalierung od. Nachahmung	○	○	○	○
Politischer Prozess	○	○	○	○

III.2. Wie gut beschreiben die folgenden Adjektive Ihre Initiative?

	sehr gut	eher gut	eher nicht	gar nicht
drastisch	○	○	○	○
riskant	○	○	○	○
ergebnisoffen	○	○	○	○
lokal orientiert	○	○	○	○
bottom-up	○	○	○	○

III.3. Wie wichtig waren folgende Aspekte bei der Vorbereitung bzw. Umsetzung Ihrer Initiative?

	unverzichtbar	sehr wichtig	wichtig	weniger wichtig	irrelevant
Finanzielle Förderung (z.B. im Rahmen eines Forschungsprogramms oder Preises)	○	○	○	○	○
Administrative Unterstützung (z.B. durch die öffentliche Verwaltung oder eine dezidierte Projektstelle)	○	○	○	○	○
Wissenschaftliche Begleitung (z.B. durch Forscher:innen, die den Kommunikationsprozess unterstützen)	○	○	○	○	○
Persönliche Kontakte und Netzwerke (z.B. Bekannte oder Kolleg:innen, deren Wissen wichtig für die Umsetzung der Initiative war)	○	○	○	○	○
Kenntnis ähnlicher Initiativen (z.B. von den dortigen Erfolgen und Misserfolgen)	○	○	○	○	○
Vernetzung mit ähnlichen Initiativen (z.B. im Rahmen von Austauschplattformen, Netzwerktreffen)	○	○	○	○	○
Lokales Wissen (z.B. Kenntnis über die speziellen lokalen Herausforderungen im Umgang mit dem Klimawandel)	○	○	○	○	○

III.4. Was ist Ihrer Einschätzung nach ein innovatives Element der Initiative (z.B. das Ausprobieren einer potentiellen Nachhaltigkeitslösung, die Verwendung bestimmter Tools, die Projektidee an sich, der Prozess, ...)? *[Nennen Sie bitte 1-3 Aspekte]*

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

Page IV: Akteur:innen

Um eine bessere Vorstellung von den handelnden Personen zu bekommen, haben wir nun ein paar Fragen zu den Beteiligten Ihrer Initiative. Wir unterscheiden dabei zwischen Initiator:innen, die die Initiative ins Leben gerufen und zu Beginn mit auf den Weg gebracht haben, Umsetzer:innen, die die Initiative realisieren und begleiten, und Adressat:innen, die als Zielgruppe der Initiative angesprochen, erreicht und zum Mitmachen animiert werden sollen.

IV.1. Wer waren die wichtigsten Initiator:innen zu Beginn? Nennen Sie bitte bis zu 3. *[Sie können sowohl Einzelpersonen, als auch Organisationen oder Institutionen nennen. Sie können sich auch selbst angeben, wenn Sie Initiator:in waren.]*

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

IV.2. Wer sind/waren die zentralsten Umsetzer:innen der Initiative? Nennen Sie bitte bis zu 3. *[Sind Initiator:innen und Umsetzer:innen die selben, geben Sie bitte "siehe oben" an.]*

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

IV.3. Welche Personengruppen adressiert Ihre Initiative und wie intensiv sind oder waren diese involviert?

	Zielgruppe			
	jedenfalls	eher schon	eher nicht	gar nicht
Politik & Verwaltung	○	○	○	○
Bürger:innen	○	○	○	○
Unternehmen	○	○	○	○
Wissenschaft	○	○	○	○
Medien & Kommunikation	○	○	○	○
NGOs	○	○	○	○
Kunst & Kultur	○	○	○	○
Sozialarbeit	○	○	○	○
Intermediäre Akteure (z.B. Verbände, Plattformen)	○	○	○	○

	Beteiligung			
	durchgehend	häufig	vereinzelt	gar nicht
Politik & Verwaltung	○	○	○	○
Bürger:innen	○	○	○	○
Unternehmen	○	○	○	○
Wissenschaft	○	○	○	○
Medien & Kommunikation	○	○	○	○
NGOs	○	○	○	○
Kunst & Kultur	○	○	○	○
Sozialarbeit	○	○	○	○
Intermediäre Akteure (z.B. Verbände, Plattformen)	○	○	○	○

Page V: Ergebnisse

V.1. Welche Erfolge hat die Initiative Ihrer Einschätzung nach bis heute erreicht? Nennen Sie bitte 1-3.

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

V.2. Würden Sie sagen, dass diese Erfolge über die Initiative hinaus Wirkung erzielt haben *(z.B. weil Ihre Idee Nachahmer:innen gefunden hat, weil die Initiative langfristig fortgeführt werden konnte, oder weil das entstandene Wissen auf andere Ebenen oder in andere Bereiche getragen wurde)*?

○ Ja *(bitte anführen)* _____   ○ Nein   ○ Kann ich nicht beurteilen

V.3. Gab oder gibt es etwas, das die Realisierung oder den langfristigen Erfolg Ihrer Initiative erschwert hat? Nennen Sie bitte 1-3 Aspekte.

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

V.4. Möchten Sie uns noch etwas Anderes zu Ihrer Initiative mitteilen, das Ihnen wichtig erscheint?

_____

Page VI: Zum Schluss …

VI.1. Kennen Sie ähnliche Initiativen in Österreich, die wie Ihre im Klima- und/oder Nachhaltigkeitskontext tätig sind? Wenn ja, geben Sie bitte die Namen dieser Initiativen an. *[Sie können bis zu 10 Initiativen anführen.]*

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____ 5. _____

6. _____ 7. _____ 8. _____ 9. _____ 10. _____

VI.2. Wie dürfen wir Sie bei weiteren Fragen kontaktieren? *[Diese Informationen werden entsprechend unserer Datenschutzerklärung streng vertraulich behandelt und ausschließlich im Rahmen unserer Forschung genutzt, um sie bei etwaigen Rückfragen kontaktieren zu können.]*

Name: _____ E-Mail: _____ Telefon: _____ Social: _____

VI.3. Gibt es abschließend etwas, das Sie zum Fragebogen oder darüber hinaus loswerden möchten?
_____

Final Page: Vielen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme an unserer Befragung!

Implementing the survey

In a first round, 182 initiatives were invited via e-mail to participate in the online survey. No deadline was given, but the initiatives received a friendly reminder after 10 days. The survey addressed another 36 initiatives in a second round of invitations for participation based on snowball sampling. 66 complete responses were received within the first four weeks after the initial round of invitations. The SIAMESE project team then started to contact initiatives individually via phone to invite the responsible individuals to participate in the survey or answer the questionnaire on the phone. That way, the sample of surveyed initiatives could be increased to an overall **116 Austrian climate experiments** within 8 weeks from the start of the survey.

The analysis and interpretation of results, respectively the systematization and initial study of the geography of experimentation will be described in a separate SIAMESE Working Paper 3.

References

Ansell, C. K., & Bartenberger, M. (2014). Expanding the Toolkit of Experimentation. *SSRN Electronic Journal.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2475844

Broto, V. C., & Bulkeley, H. (2013). Maintaining Climate Change Experiments: Urban Political Ecology and the Everyday Reconfiguration of Urban Infrastructure. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *37*(6), 1934–1948. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12050

Eneqvist, E., & Karvonen, A. (2021). Experimental Governance and Urban Planning Futures: Five Strategic Functions for Municipalities in Local Innovation. *Urban Planning*, *6*(1), 183–194. https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v6i1.3396

Fuenfschilling, L., Frantzeskaki, N., & Coenen, L. (2019). Urban experimentation & sustainability transitions. *European Planning Studies*, *27*(2), 219–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2018.1532977

Hildén, M., Jordan, A., & Huitema, D. (2017). Special issue on experimentation for climate change solutions editorial: The search for climate change and sustainability solutions - The promise and the pitfalls of experimentation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *169*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.019

Jänicke, M. (2017). The Multi-level System of Global Climate Governance - the Model and its Current State. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, *27*(2), 108–121. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1747

Kronsell, A., & Mukhtar-Landgren, D. (2018). Experimental governance: the role of municipalities in urban living labs. *European Planning Studies*, *26*(5), 988–1007. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2018.1435631

Lam, D. P. M., Martín-López, B., Wiek, A., Bennett, E. M., Frantzeskaki, N., Horcea-Milcu, A. I., & Lang, D. J. (2020). Scaling the impact of sustainability initiatives: a typology of amplification processes. *Urban Transformations*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s42854-020-00007-9

Loorbach, D., Frantzeskaki, N., & Lijnis Huffenreuter, R. (2015). Transition Management: Taking Stock from Governance Experimentation. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, *2015*(58), 48–66. https://doi.org/10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2015.ju.00008

McCrory, G., Schäpke, N., Holmén, J., & Holmberg, J. (2020). Sustainability-oriented labs in real-world contexts: An exploratory review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *277*, 123202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123202

Raven, Rob, Sengers, Frans, Spaeth, Philipp, Xie, Linjun, Cheshmehzangi, Ali, de Jong, & Martin (2019). Urban experimentation and institutional arrangements. *European Planning Studies*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2017.1393047

Sengers, F., Wieczorek, A. J., & Raven, R. (2019). Experimenting for sustainability transitions: A systematic literature review. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *145*, 153–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.031

Seyfang, G., & Haxeltine, A. (2012). Growing Grassroots Innovations: Exploring the Role of Community-Based Initiatives in Governing Sustainable Energy Transitions. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, *30*(3), 381–400. https://doi.org/10.1068/c10222

Seyfang, G., & Smith, A. (2007). Grassroots innovations for sustainable development: Towards a new research and policy agenda. *Environmental Politics*, *16*(4), 584–603. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644010701419121

Suitner, J., Haider, W., & Philipp, S. (2022). Social innovation for regional energy transition? An agency perspective on transformative change in non-core regions. *Regional Studies*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2022.2053096

Torrens, J., & Wirth, T. von (2021). Experimentation or projectification of urban change? A critical appraisal and three steps forward. *Urban Transformations*, *3*(1), 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42854-021-00025-1

Wanner, M., Hilger, A., Westerkowski, J., Rose, M., Stelzer, F., & Schäpke, N. (2018). Towards a Cyclical Concept of Real-World Laboratories. *DisP - the Planning Review*, *54*(2), 94–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2018.1487651

Wirth, T. von, Fuenfschilling, L., Frantzeskaki, N., & Coenen, L. (2019). Impacts of urban living labs on sustainability transitions: mechanisms and strategies for systemic change through experimentation. *European Planning Studies*, *27*(2), 229–257. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2018.1504895