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Executive Summary

- Increased migration flows and disconcerted responses by national governments have led to a proliferation of transnational city networks (TCNs) in the domain of migration.

- This overview of 27 TCNs based in Europe and their activities shows that they have six distinct but overlapping functions: effectively sharing information, showcasing, story-telling, shaming governments, seeking international and European support as well as standard-setting.

- In some instances, this proliferation of networks leads to both an overlap between network activities, as well as inefficiency in resource usage. Means ought to be created to keep an overview of TCNs and their membership, activities and functions in order to avoid unnecessary resource allocation and ensure better coordination, cooperation and possibly a division of labour among these networks.

Introduction

From climate change to sustainable development, cities have come to take the lead in tackling global challenges. The field of migration is no exception. Driven partly by the decentralisation and devolution of authority and partly by the concrete demands posited by diverse and even ‘superdiverse’ urban communities, cities are starting to occupy discretionary the spaces that they identify. The ‘decoupling’ of local policies of refugee reception and migrant integration has reached a point that many scholars even speak of a ‘local turn’. Sanctuary cities in the United States and the shelter city movement in the United Kingdom are only two of many examples that could be mentioned. As a Eurocities report states, “[i]t may be that states grant asylum, but it is cities that provide shelter”.

Wherever cities and local authorities have risen to the challenge and claim their space at the global level, transnational city networks (TCNs) have proven to be a valuable tool to achieve their objectives, as this report will show. Whether it is the sharing of best practices or seeking financial support, TCNs can provide the infrastructure on which local authorities could rely. Simultaneously, there has been a remarkable proliferation of networks, offering cities the opportunity to ‘get connected’ on various issues and to varying extents, thereby tailoring their involvement to their own capacities, needs and priorities. At the same time, some cities may consider whether a saturation point has been reached in the establishment of new networks. Mandates, functions and even membership are often overlapping, making it necessary to map the field and reflect on the strategic direction that cities and town will take in their transnational cooperation.

This policy brief addresses these questions by providing an overview of the state of affairs with a focus on Europe. Even if the majority of refugees lives outside of Europe, it is here that many networks have their genesis and where migration has increasingly been a policy area for cities to ‘decouple’ their local policies, instead teaming up with other cities. This brief first gives a short analysis of the activities and characteristics of 27 TCNs active in the domain of migration governance. It hereby draws on and sums up the findings of a forthcoming academic

1 Vertovec 2007.
3 Eurocities 2016, p. 7.
article that analysed TCNs and related grey literature both qualitatively and quantitatively. The first section of this report defines the notion of TCNs and discusses some features. Next, it sets out their main activities and ‘value added’. In the last section, the discussion turns to challenges presently faced by TCNs and some policy proposals for addressing them.

Transnational city networks and migration

In general, a TCN can be defined as a structure that has local authorities as its ‘core’ constituency and offers them the opportunity to develop policies regarding a certain issue. TCNs dealing with the issues of migration and asylum specifically support local authorities in the challenges of reception and integration. ‘Local authorities’ can hereby be understood both in the legal sense as the lowest tiers of public administration and also as actual cities. This core constituency is often expanded to include international or regional organizations, NGOs, businesses or research centres. For example, the Hague Process on Refugees and Migration started with a strong focus on states in 2002, but works by now also with and for cities, and prides itself in involving business as well, the goal being to foster “tailor-made labor market integration” of migrants and refugees. In many cases, civil society is also a partner, as is the case in the strong relationship between in the UCLG Global Platform for the Right to the City. Finally, universities and even individual academics can play a crucial role in bringing and keeping cities together.

More often than not, TCNs in Europe have a strong link to international or European organizations or have even been created under their auspices. In fact, of the 27 networks considered for this report, 10 were initiated at the European level. Only a few could be considered truly ‘horizontal’ in the sense of not including any international or regional partners. In terms of thematic focus, migration-related TCNs cover a range of topics. A number of networks began with a concern for migration but have recently added a specific focus on refugee integration. Others deal primarily with issues related to refugees. The International Cities of Refuge Network, for example, concentrates on sheltering threatened writers. Other networks have historically prioritized inclusion but have recently started to engage with refugee welcome and integration. A number of established TCNs like the UCLG, Eurocities, the Habitat network have initiated subnetworks or working groups of interested cities.

4 The empirical assessment of the 27 TCNs was based on data obtained during desk research, with an emphasis on social media, the network websites, Eurostat statistics, policy papers and general media reporting, supplemented with interviews and participant observation. The networks were analyzed qualitatively in NVivo and quantitatively in Excel. See Oomen forthcoming.

5 Hinrichs and Juzwiak 2017, p. 15.

6 As illustrated by Ryerson University in Cities of Migration and Professor Benjamin Barber, the late author of If Mayors Ruled the World, in setting up the Global Parliament of Mayors (Barber 2013)

7 Examples include the UNESCO’s International Coalition of Cities against Racism, the UNITAR Annual Mayoral Forum on Mobility, Migration and Development, the ICMPD’s Mediterranean City-to-City Migration Project (MC2CM) and the UCLG Global Platform for the Right to the City.

8 These include Eurocities (and its ‘subnetworks’ Solidarity Cities and Integrating Cities), the Council of Europe’s Intercultural Cities, the Save Me Campaign of the European Resettlement Network and the Arrival Cities or the Partnership on the Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees brought together as part of the EU’s new Urban Agenda.

9 Namely the Global Parliament of Mayors, the Annual Mayoral Forum on Mobility, Migration and Development and the World Mayors Foundation.

10 For example Integrating Cities and Cities of Migration.

11 These include Solidactities, Solidarity Cities, the cities united in the Hague Process for Refugees and Migration and the Arrival Cities Network.

12 As is the case with Intercultural Cities and UNESCO’s Global Network of Learning Cities.
the size of the networks differs substantially: Eurocities unites 130 of Europe’s largest cities whereas the Urbact Arrival Cities network consists of 10 cities.

Despite these large differences, it is clear that more and more cities and other actors team up in TCNs, many of which were formed in recent years. Many cities participate in several networks at the same time. **Within the nine TCNs with a focus on the welcome and inclusion of refugees in Europe, 30 cities participate in three or more networks, each of which entails new possibilities of forging connections, developing activities and accessing sources of funding.** Whilst the most ‘networked’ cities differ in size, they are all larger cities with an average population of 1.5 million, ranging from Nicosia and Ghent (around 240,000) to ‘global cities’ like London and Paris (8.2 and 6.7 million respectively). Nonetheless, there is no discernible correlation between city size and the amount of TCNs in a given field that a city participates in. Most active cities are centre-left politically, confirming hypotheses formulated in scholarship. Yet, it is noteworthy that TCN membership often outlasts political shifts in municipal councils and executives.

**The value added: City networks and their activities**

Given the proliferation of TCNs, the question arises whether they are complementary or overlapping in terms of their mandates and functions. Setting aside complex aspects related to genesis of, and relation between each network, this section introduces six (partially overlapping) key activities of TCNs: sharing information, showcasing, story-telling, shaming governments, seeking international support, and standard-setting.

**Sharing information**

Virtually all TCNs are geared towards information sharing, the exchange of best practices, providing overviews of the challenges involved, and specific policies in other cities pertaining to refugee transit, but also questions related to integration via housing, education, the labour market and intercultural dialogues. The Hague Process, for instance, produces reports, for instance on how to enhance the role of business in migrant integration. The Integrating Cities network carves out a role for cities as policymakers, service providers, employers and buyers of goods and services and stimulates commitment to strengthening integration in each separate field. Best practices can also concern ways to sustain more open approaches in times of increasingly restrictive national rhetoric and migration policy. Cities of Migration thus provides examples of, and a webinar on cities and the inclusion of migrants with an irregular status. Online presence plays a crucial role more generally as most TCNs have websites with examples of city activities, sometimes supplemented by videos, webinars, graphics and Twitter and Facebook accounts. Some do not have a website but flag physical meetings on Twitter, like #solidacities. Lastly, some TCNs emphasise evidence-based learning and policy-
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13 This stands in contrast to literature on city diplomacy that tends to take global cities as its point of departure, see Acuto et al. 2018.
14 An analysis of local election results in the 30 cities most active in migration-related TCNs over the past 10 years shows that 13 have been predominantly and consistently run by social democrats. Only 3 by parties classified on the centre-right, whereas 11 cities showed such political flux over the years that it was impossible to classify them as consistently left or right-wing. See Annex, Table 1.
15 Filomeno 2016, p. 11.
16 Hinrichs and Juzwiak 2017.
17 Eurocities 2015a.
18 Cities of Migration 2018.
making: *Intercultural Cities*, for example, uses an index to assess member cities’ performance in relation to a specific intercultural integration model.

**Showcasing**

Another function of many TCNs is to offer mayors a stage to showcase their best practices and to stand up for the rights of refugees and other migrants. *Eurocities*, for example, displays quotes of mayors willing to welcome refugees, like the mayor of Leipzig: “Nobody becomes a refugee and goes on a dangerous journey without reason. We want refugees to arrive well in Leipzig. It is our duty to provide adequate living conditions and support them on their way into our community.”

The World Mayors Foundation, in electing Mechelen Mayor Bart Somers as the ‘Mayor of the World’, and *Cities of Migration* engage similarly in showcasing individual stances. Furthermore, the UCLG Committee on Social Inclusion, Participatory Democracy and Human Rights held two sessions at the 2017 conference on Cities and Migration, organized by multiple stakeholders, where local leaders “effectively showcased local practices (such as local identity cards, decentralized cooperation initiatives or municipal offices for tackling discrimination”). The transnational recognition of inclusive policies can support local politicians in confrontations with local and national opposition and can also contribute to city branding. *Eurocities* thus highlights that it “provides a high-profile international platform for ambitious, outward-looking cities... and enables you to showcase your achievements to your peers as well as to influential stakeholders”.

**Story-telling: Discursive inspiration**

Showcasing can facilitate the travelling of ideas and best practices. These, in turn, are received by urban actors which, in a policy domain subject to heated local and national debates, often actively search for a narrative to convince those opposed of the need to strengthen refugee welcome and integration. To be effective, narratives have to connect local culture and tradition to wider global struggles and objectives. Whilst all TCNs engage in such ‘story-telling’, different narratives are employed. Some rely on a rights-based approach or centre their activities around the notion of the ‘right to the city’. Here, the need to welcome migrants is presented as a human rights issue. Other TCNs have taken inspiration from the UN Global Sustainable Development Goals, which explicitly includes making cities “inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable” as one of its 17 objectives. Yet other discursive strategies focus on the importance of refugees for local economies, and stress the cultural enrichment that comes with open local policies. Finally, mayors can invoke local history to justify their commitment to diversity.

---

19 Eurocities 2015.
20 UCLG, n.d.
21 Eurocities, n.d.a.
23 The UCLG Committee on Social Inclusion, Participatory Democracy and Human Rights as the main example, see Harvey 2012 and UCLG Committee of Social Inclusion 2011.
24 UNITAR’s *Annual Mayoral Forum on Mobility, Migration and Development* relates its activities to SDGs like promoting the protection of migrant workers (Goal 8 (Target 8)), countering human trafficking (5 and 16(2)), promoting better migration governance (10(7)), skills transfers through international education opportunities (4 (4b)), and data generation by migratory status (17 (18)), see UNITAR 2015.
26 As in the case of *Cities of Refuge*, which emphasizes how ‘ICORN writers and artists represent a rich resource for the entire network of cities’, see ICORN, n.d.
27 *Integrating Cities* cites the Mayor of Genoa, who describes how “[d]iversity is embedded in Genoa’s heritage and history as a city on the sea”, see Integrating Cities 2014, p. 6.
**Shaming**

TCNs can also seek to shame national governments and, to a lesser degree, European and international institutions. One of the first city networks in the field, CLIP, opens its information sheet with a quote of the President of the Council of Europe Congress on Local and Regional Authorities describing the network as a “visible counterbalance to what used to be called just a few years ago ‘Fortress Europe’”. The backdrop is the perceived inability of the nation-state to deal with key global challenges and the corresponding need to further empower cities to take up responsibility in this field.

Eurocities thus states that “[t]he capacity of city authorities to deal with refugees is heavily dependent of the fact that asylum policy is a responsibility of national governments, with local authorities often given little room for manoeuvre”. A resolution adopted by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities called on states “to remove administrative and practical barriers encountered by asylum seekers… as well as to develop clear legal frameworks and ensure financial support for local and regional governments.”

The importance of the shaming function is likely to increase with the adoption of global norms like the Global Compact for a Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, as one may hypothesize looking at the evolution of climate TCNs in the aftermath of the Paris Agreement.

**Seeking international political and financial support**

Another objective of many TCNs is to obtain European or international endorsement for refugee policies that go further than that of states. One specific goal is hereby to advocate for a recognition of the role played by cities or for specific policy objectives. The Mayoral Forum on Migration, Mobility and Development adopted a declaration stressing the general need to strengthen the “voice and role of cities in migration policies”. Eurocities works specifically towards objectives such as solidarity sharing throughout Europe, free movement for refugees with a recognized status and UNHCR and European recognition of cities as frontline operators. It has also argued for a stronger focus on integration in the European Agenda for Migration and for making use of the Temporary Protection Directive 2001/55/EC in the event of a mass influx, with a key role for cities. Eurocities has also been involved in the development of the EU Urban Agenda through its participation in the Urban Development Group.

Other times, the type of international support that is being called for is financial. The EU Partnership for the Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees lobbies for the earmarking of an even wider range of EU funds and for aligning them with the needs of municipalities. A number of networks are, in fact, made possible by outside funds: the Arrival Cities program is funded by EU’s Urbact, while the MC2CM project is receiving assistance from the DG for Neighbourhood and Enlargement negotiations (co-funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation). The Global Parliament of Mayors, finally, calls in its business plan “upon international
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organisations and governments to work with us, and be sure to build upon the bottom-up wisdom and practical experience of urban mayors.\textsuperscript{39}

\textbf{Standard-setting}

TCNs are not only talking shops but can set standards for themselves, which often amount to local ‘translations’ and concretizations of international law. In doing so, they generate joint declarations, charters and the setting of common standards or call for the changes in (international or European law. Human Rights Cities, with its recent focus on refugees, adopted a ‘Declaration on Human Rights Cities’ in 2012, as a global sequel to the ‘European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City’ adopted in St Denis in 2002.\textsuperscript{40} The European Coalition of Cities against Racism even prepared a comprehensive framework guidance handbook. It also adopted a Declaration in this field with a 10-point action plan, in which signatories pledged to take actions like setting up “formal mechanisms of collecting data and information on racism and discrimination” and to “establish disciplinary measures within the routine functions of city authority in regards to racist acts or behaviour by city employees”.\textsuperscript{41} Such instruments may not be legally binding but serve to influence the behaviour of urban actors especially coupled to monitoring mechanisms of the standards involved: the Eurocities ‘Integrating Cities Charter’, for instance, uses a process of benchmarking and peer review on questions like facilitating engagement from migrant communities in policy-making processes and removing barriers to participation.\textsuperscript{42} Finally, TCNs increasingly contribute to the development of international standards, the point in case being the involvement in the process leading up to the Global Compact for a Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, to be finalized in December 2018.

\textbf{The way forward: Opportunities and challenges}

With TCNs continuing to proliferate and expand, this report draws attention to several developments and corresponding opportunities and challenges:

1. \textit{Institutional aspects}: So far, TCNs have emerged ‘organically’, meaning through the initiatives of local, European and international policymakers, and based on the need to come together for the realization of a shared objective. The fact that the networks pursue several distinct (though interrelated) activities suggests that they have different functions in the eyes of their members, which is likely one of the factors explaining their multitude. Nonetheless, some of the same (usually large) cities participate in several TCNs at once while other (often smaller) towns remain underrepresented. One plausible conclusion is that the ‘organic proliferation’ has been somewhat lopsided and that the TCN environment need some consolidation. This gives rise to three challenges:

\textit{a. Addressing functional overlap}: As shown, several TCNs engage in similar activities, often even adopting comparable strategies. While replication is not necessarily a problem, it implies real risks of an inefficient usage of resources, an overemphasis on certain activities and even an unnecessary competition between (principally

\textsuperscript{39} Global Parliament of Mayors, 2017, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{40} Oomen, Davis, and Grigolo 2016.
\textsuperscript{41} ECCAR, 2004.
\textsuperscript{42} Eurocities 2015a.
aligned) networks. A better coordination of efforts is hence necessary, with an immediate role falling to those ‘most-connected’ cities participating in several TCNs. In the medium- and long-term, networks should establish direct links via their governing bodies and steering committees to coordinate and optimize their strategies. Escaping the logic of a zero-sum game, such cooperation is likely to further elevate the already growing influence of cities and their networks on the global stage.

b. **Enhancing access and representation:** Our screening shows that there is a small core of ‘most-connected’ cities that is at the heart of many networks. This, in and of itself, is not unusual. However, steering committees, governing bodies and donors should try to involve not only the ‘usual suspects’ and reach out to other municipal bodies and especially smaller towns, which often lack the resources to launch an initiative. Improving performance in terms of access and representation will increase the ‘input legitimacy’ and thus the international influence of TCNs.

c. **Strengthening results and monitoring:** Despite shortcomings in access and representation, TCNs enjoy a relatively high ‘input legitimacy’ given the fact that local authorities are directly involved with the developments on the ground. By contrast, networks are likely to be increasingly confronted with donors and constituents who demand to see results in terms of ‘output legitimacy’. The existence of multiple partially overlapping networks will accelerate this process but will offer cities the chance to achieve an evaluation of the networks and their activities through the establishment of a few overarching monitoring bodies. Cooperation between the networks will once again be essential to ensure success (see point 1.a).

2. **International status:** Supporting and sometimes even funding TCNs, international and regional organizations remain indispensable partners for ‘elevating’ local agendas to the status of transnational norms and, more generally, for conveying and defending them in front of the main international actors – nation states. While it is therefore critical to retain a close cooperation with international organisations, TCNs should be careful to guard their independence and should try, where possible, to foster the autonomy of cities and networks, for example in seeking recognition as participants and observers in international forums. Particular attention should also be paid to norm development and interpretation as international law is potentially moving to a greater recognition of the standard-setting initiatives of local authorities.

3. **Thematic focus:** As stated, some TCNs started with a specific concern, for instance for refugees, and expanded their focus subsequently (and vice-versa). Generally, a thematic emphasis on inclusion and a wider human rights-based approach connected to the sustainable development goals may enable more inclusive policies. Such policies ensure that the most vulnerable in society (like undocumented migrants) are not left out, and that the population at large also benefits from measures adopted. In a similar vein, there is a great deal of policy learning that can take place from the city networks focussing on climate change.

---

43 A good example from the climate change domain is the selective C40 network, as analysed in Aust 2018, p.4.
44 Oomen and Baumgärtel 2018.
4. **Moral leadership:** As the showcasing and storytelling activities show, individuals play a vital part in the workings of TCNs. In the highly politicized area of migration in particular, their role in welcoming and integration may be even more important than is usually recognised. The continuous involvement of mayors and other prominent figures is therefore likely to increase the visibility of migration-related TCNs. At the same time, the main claim for the input legitimacy of these networks lies in the fact that cities and municipalities are ‘closer’ to the people than national authorities. In promoting and showcasing moral leadership, TCNs should thus try to take a balanced approach featuring not only prominent office-holders but also grassroots activists, community organisers and migrants. The challenge will be to retain authenticity and local ownership while connecting transnationally, an act that is often (wrongly) ascribed to elites.

5. **Research:** Scholarship has made good progress in investigating the ‘local’ turn in migration policy and the demands of ‘multilevel governance’. However, with the rise of TCNs being a rather recent phenomenon especially in the area of migration, their genesis, functioning, and influence are under-researched. Another notable blindspot is the relation of TCNs to national networks (which gives rise to many of the same issues mentioned under point 1). With TCNs in need of consolidation and coordination, universities, think tanks and independent researchers should be mobilised to provide empirical studies that can inform evidence-based policies. Particular attention ought to be paid to lessons that could be learnt from other policy domains such as climate change, where TCNs have played an important role for a longer time.45

---

45 For example, research on climate change TCNs includes both methodologies and substantive findings regarding the impact of TCNs in terms of policy output; see Aust 2018, p. 8.
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Table 1: The attributes of the 30 European cities most active in migration-related TCNs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>European Cities</th>
<th>GDP</th>
<th>ESCLAR</th>
<th>Integrating Cities</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
<th>Arrived Cities</th>
<th>MCDM</th>
<th>Partnership Include</th>
<th>Solidarity Cities</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>Population (2021)</th>
<th>City Size</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Non EU %</th>
<th>Politics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghent</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>260,341</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,191,604</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicosia</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>239,277</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Centre-right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>579,550</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>529,407</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,550,000</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,072,922</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Centre-left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riga</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>753,000</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,051,587</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>977,584</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Right-wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>665,759</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothenburg</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>462,300</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Centre to center-right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmo</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>351,201</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,579,896</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,173,943</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>714,318</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,695,456</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantes</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,641,858</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Centre-right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,265,038</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,867,582</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aarhus</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>XXL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>Social Democratic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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